

tant truth contained in Calvinism, and fixing contemplation chiefly on man's freedom, Arminius made the human will the starting point of theological thought, and in effect subordinated God to man."

"Calvinism assigns false predominance to the sovereignty of God's will, and overlooks the intrinsic necessities of man's ethical life." "Arminianism lays false stress on the freedom of the natural man. Recognizing and asserting the necessities of his ethical life, it fails adequately to emphasize the prerogatives of God. Divine Majesty is falsely subordinated to human will. Instead of God acting at will upon man unto salvation, it may be said that man acts at will upon God; that is to say, God governs the universe in the interest of man and according to man's self-determinations." (p. 111, Vol. I.)

We shall see presently what is our author's positive and modern reconstruction of these doctrines. In the meantime we must say that he has failed to grasp and state the true formative spirit of Arminianism as held by Arminius himself, and as developed by the Methodist theology of our time. Arminius does indeed recognize the necessities of man's ethical life. But he does so, not on the basis of "the freedom of the natural man, but on the basis of a universal grace: Salvation is all of grace and all of God, but on the basis of our being workers with God. It is not right or true to speak of this as subordinating the Divine Majesty to the human will. God does act at will upon man unto salvation; but instead of that action being arbitrarily limited it is universal, as a father's love to all his children. Nay, more, it grants with grace the dignity of sonship." "Son, give me thine heart," is the language which expresses at once the supremacy and majesty of Divine grace, and the fulness of that grace in permitting to man that choice and return towards God which makes him truly the child of God. There is no limit put upon the majesty or sovereignty of God, except that of his own moral attributes of holiness and love, to exalt sovereignty above these is to overthrow all moral foundations.

After reading the author's criticism of the two great evangelical systems of the past, one is naturally curious to see what he would give us in their place. This

we shall give in his own words: "Against both forms of theological one-sidedness, the false exaltation of God above man, and the false subordination of God's majesty and sovereignty to man's freedom, a strong reaction has set in toward a different fundamental principle of theology, the concrete union of the two essential factors. Reasoning in the light of a more scriptural conception of Christianity it has come to be seen that neither God alone nor man alone, neither Divine sovereignty nor human freedom, is the point of departure. Both require full recognition, God in His paternal relation to man, and man in his filial relation to God. These conditions of a theology, at once more scriptural and more Christian, are met by the Christ idea—the idea concerning the Divine-human personality of Jesus, the incarnate Son of God."

If we understand this, it is that the formative conception around which theology is to be constructed is not God and the manifestation of his glory as in the Augustinian, nor man and his responsibility; but the union of God and man in Christ Jesus. The incarnation is the end toward which all things move, the standpoint in relation to which all truth must be considered.

While admitting that great names of diverse schools have committed themselves to this departure in theology, we do not think it is at all likely to afford the expected results. It has too much of the vagueness of a mystic pantheism. It lacks the strong distinctive elements of either the old Calvinism or the Arminian doctrine of responsibility. While seeming to glorify Christ as the final goal of the world coming forth from God and taking humanity up into unity with himself, like all pantheistic or semi-pantheistic systems, it fails to give to God that distinct personality which places Him above all created, being as Sovereign ruler demanding moral obedience, and it fails to give to man that distinctive individuality which we think needed as the basis of true ethical responsibility. Such a theology may well accord with the present popular Neo-Hegelian philosophy, but with the passing away of that philosophy and the return to a more strongly ethical concept of humanity we think the theology will also lose its hold.

Make Thou my spirit pure and clear
As are the frosty skies,

Or this first snowdrop of the year,
That in my bosom lies.—*Tennyson.*