

plication, are the things that mark the progress of the Church. We admit that the Scriptures are capable of development, but they are not capable of a supplement.

What a glorious illustration of this we have in the history of missions! I suppose there is no theory that the Church now understands better than the theory of missions; and there is no duty that the Church recognizes as a more onerous duty than that of sustaining them; and yet the theory and the practice of missions was lost sight of for long centuries. Why? Because they were not in Bible? Oh, no; they were there all the while. The Bible is full of both the theory and the practice; and, my friends, no missionary hymn was ever sung sweeter and higher than those of David and Isaiah, when, with the light of morning in their eyes and the glories of Messiah's reign in their ears, they hailed the advent of the day when His name would be known on earth, and His saving health among all nations. And yet the missionary development in modern times is not a hundred years old. What the world wanted was not a new revelation of missions; it only required some one to look into that book and tell us of the missionary principles which are there taught.

Take another illustration: Would not you think I was spending time in a very remarkable manner, if I should argue this morning that every man has a right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience? "Why, my friend," you say, "that is a self-evident truth." It is not any such thing; that is a truth that very few people recognize. Why, there are men in this house who can recollect the time when that long-protracted and bitter discussion took place in the Virginia Legislature, that ended in the bill for religious freedom, which was afterward incorporated in the laws of the United States; and Mr. Jefferson, the author of that bill, was so proud of it that he directed this inscription to be placed on his tombstone: "Thomas Jefferson, author

of the Declaration of Independence, the founder of the University of Virginia, and the author of the bill for religious freedom." "But," you say, "is not religion free all over civilized Europe? Do they not, all over Europe, tolerate every form of religious faith?" I beg your pardon; toleration is not religious liberty; and the government that arrogates to itself the right to tolerate any particular form of faith, by an arbitrary exercise of the same power may suppress any form of faith. I do not wish to accept toleration of what God has given me as a free heritage of my birth. How many governments are there in the world under which religion is free? Cannot you count them? How many are there? What Christendom wants is, not a new revelation, but a recognition that God has given us an inalienable right to worship our God according to the dictates of His Word, interpreted by our enlightened consciences.

So, too, when new forms of old errors arise, we do not want a new Bible to find new truths with which to antagonize these old errors. And, when I talk about old errors, do not misunderstand me. The fact is, there are no new forms of skepticism. Those forms of skepticism that now go masquerading over the boards are nothing but the ghosts of the old heresies, slain a thousand years ago; they are only the old heresies dressed up in new forms. But if there are new attacks of skepticism in the armory of the divine Word, there hang the swords of the mighty, and those weapons of celestial temper that can smite and pierce any foe, and all we have to do is to go and open the armory and take down from the walls the neglected weapons that have long been rusting there, and put on the panoply of God and go forth to meet any foe-man.

What an illustration we had of this, when the gigantic error arose in the Church, that salvation could be purchased by self-inflicted penalties, or by meritorious sacrifices! And what a memorable day that was in the Church, when Luther (whose anniversary we