

mony with the principles which dominate their life, and into better harmony, as they conceive, with the truth as it is in Jesus. They may be mistaken, but it would be worse than useless to dismiss their arguments with a sneer.

Nor will any fair-minded man in the church feel inclined to do so. The temperate and charitable tone which marks previous writers on this subject in the JOURNAL sets a good example to others. The subject is not an easy one to deal with, and we must expect to find good and able men taking different sides. We cannot afford to stop anyone in the reverent discussion of religious questions by accusing him of disloyalty or egotism. The creeds of Christendom are not necessarily identical with Christianity. They are, at best, the efforts of wise and godly, though fallible men, to express their conception of it. Because of our finite capacities, truth must needs come to us in the form of a gradually evolving revelation upon which *Finis* cannot be written until human life is perfected. In this purely subjective sense, Christianity is capable of constant improvement, not that its principles change—for they are eternal and immutable as God Himself—but that by earnest thought and action we come into a better understanding of them. To suppose that no new glimpses of heavenly light may appear to each succeeding age would be to ignore the universal laws of growth, and the methods of Divine Providence. So far from being disloyal to the faith if we venture with the prophet of Israel to mount to the watchtower of the soul to hear what God will say, we would be disloyal if we thought that the human soul is now impenetrable, and that the sacred oracles are heard no more.

The most radical member of the school of revisionists, therefore, whether we agree with him or not, must be treated without prejudice; for except with those who regard creeds as an infallible idol until the matter is discussed on all sides, the question of "heterodoxy" is still an open one. Nothing but the blindest ignorance can ever lead us to suppose that the reasoning process which makes a formal creed is of Divine origin, while that which seems to discover some flaws in it is an invention of the devil. We are false to the spirit of our boasted Protestantism if we brand dissent by social disabilities or ecclesiastical censure. If the great Master had followed that method with the perplexed and doubting disciples by whom He was surrounded, we should have had no Church at all.

Nor does there seem to me much force in the argument that, though a difficulty may present itself to some minds in fitting our religious thought