

to speculate carries with it the right to publish the speculations at any stage, and however crude. It is a mistake, common alike to the enemies and friends of religion, to regard every novel, scientific doctrine as necessarily atheistical. A very foolish and sinful practice is that of taking flings at the departments of science that are subjects of popular suspicion. Men are rendering a poor service to religion who attempt to get up an issue between it and evolution. Such attempts nearly always show misapprehension as to the meaning of evolution. It is a grave wrong to denounce scientific work because of the infidelity of some of its disciples. It is an error, likewise, to brand unwelcome doctrines as false because of a supposed evil tendency. In science, as in religion, we can only take what comes to us, without asking whether it is likely to prove beneficial or otherwise to faith. It is sometimes an error to condemn a book because you cannot accept its conclusions. A mischievous error noted bears on the relation of Divine Providence to Physical Causation. Able men have supposed that the less science you find in things, the more Divinity belongs to them. On the other hand, it is an error to suppose that we can explain how the Divine Being operates on nature. It is a mistake to assume that the conflict between religion and faith is only mischievous. But religion and science are greatly helped by the brisk controversy that attracts public attention. If physical and religious questions were all settled, they would lose their attractive force.

"The Descent of the New Jerusalem," *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, is a vigorous article by the Rev. W. E. Barton, in which it is held that the New Jerusalem spoken of in the Book of Revelation is, first of all, related to individual character, and is personal and present. The kingdom of heaven is not heaven; the New Jerusalem is not geographical. It is spiritual, personal, present. Each progressive descent of the holy city begins in an individual call, as of Abraham. But the New Jerusalem is also social and political. It was neither heaven nor a *post-mortem* earth that John saw. We are not to go to heaven to find the New Jerusalem. It is but another term for this present earth, with its present tides and seasons, inhabited by people like those who at present live here, but under the sway of the spirit of Christ. It is more than personal redemption. It is social, industrial and political. That Christ is to reign in human society means simply that He is to reign in the hearts of its individual members, so that they shall manifest His spirit in all their manifold relations. With these relations sanctified, there will arise a new condition of affairs on earth between man and man, and between man and God. Men will build factories in the same spirit in which they ordain foreign missionaries; they will plough their fields in the same spirit in which they pray and worship.

"An Irenicon." Prof. G. Frederick Wright, in the January *Bibliotheca Sacra*, makes a plea for mutual tolerance and understanding between the advocates of the inerrancy of Scripture and the critics who maintain that the Bible is not inerrant in matters not directly relating to salvation. Not only do the disputants give different sides of the same shield, but much of the language employed by them is understood by each in a sense different from that intended by each other. Quotations from the advocates of inerrancy, *e.g.*, Dr. A. A. Hodge, and from representatives of the evangelical wing of the liberal party, *e.g.*, President J. H. Fairchild, reveal a nearer approach of view than might at first sight be supposed. Three important limitations are insisted upon as necessary to this mutual understanding. 1. The doctrine of the inerrancy of Scripture is to be limited to the autographs. 2. Some theory of accommodation is held by all interpreters. 3. Both letter and spirit are to be duly emphasized. Concluding, Prof.