

Is the nature of sin psychological (mental) exclusively, or ethical (moral) exclusively, or both, or wider than both, being physical as well? Did the first sin seriously affect the essential elements of manhood, or did it leave them perfectly intact and simply weakened in their action or deteriorated in their condition?

Is the work of divine grace in the man psychological (mental) exclusively, or ethical (moral) exclusively, or both, or wider than both, being physical as well?

As the work of grace is a full and perfect remedy for sin, for all there is of sin, the solution of one of these questions answers the other.

Our view, from the study of the scripture, is that both the work of sin and the work of grace are anthropological, *i.e.*, over the entire man in all his parts.

More particularly, both the work of sin and the work of grace are psychological first, and ethical and physical afterward and in consequence, *i.e.*, that the ethical and physical effects flow from the spiritual or psychological disturbance. Both sin and grace in their works are psychologically instantaneous, but ethically and physically progressive.

If sin and grace only made an ethical alteration in man, the one deteriorating and the other elevating, there would be no room for a psychology underlying redemption; indeed, the terms of scripture *death* because of sin, and *new birth* as the initial remedy for sin, would seem to be entirely out of place.

But such a subject is possible if the work of grace in remedying sin and its effects "penetrates and changes fundamentally, newly creating and newly moulding the essential elements of our inner and outer manhood."

#### RACIAL ANTHROPOLOGY.

"The universal provisions of the atonement enter at every point into Mr. Wesley's anthropology as well as into his soteriology.

"He knows nothing of a human race without a provided salvation in Christ."—*Burwash*.

The anthropology underlying redemption is partly *racial* and