

may contain that is incongruous therewith, whatever be the explanation of the incongruity, is not to be held as authoritative for us, but is virtually suspended as an imperfect and provisional inspiration. (Pp. 167 68.)

"The same writer says :—'It is often asserted most positively in controversy with those who refer discriminately to the different parts of the Bible, assigning a higher value to the latter than to the earlier revelation, that the Old Testament, as well as the New, is perfect and infallible in its minutest details. The highest inspiration is claimed equally for every part. But, who can say intelligently, in this sweeping sense, that the entire Bible for all time is the perfect and infallible rule of faith and practice, or any one book in the Old Testament? To press this familiar statement from the confession against those who find serious imperfection in the earlier Scriptures were jugglery of words. No one who uses it against others as condemnatory believes it himself of the Old Testament, apart from the New. If we would avoid confusion of thought, nothing is more important than reasonable discrimination. (P. 165.)'

"Christ is the end of the law to him that believeth, a more excellent way, the son as opposed to the servant, the bringer in of a better covenant. If the Old Testament were perfect, why should He have come to make known the Father? If the prophets of old were infallibly inspired to make known the character and the will of God, how came it that the least in the kingdom of Heaven was greater than John the Baptist, the greatest of them all. I am charged with dishonoring God. God forbid! else did the son dishonor the father.

"I have simply recognized progress in revelation, development in doctrine, a shining light that shineth more and more to the perfect day. What does John mean by saying: 'The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ,' it the doctrine

of Christ were not greater and more in accordance with absolute truth than Moses' law? What is the meaning of apostolic contest of the Gospel against the law? Does the chronicler in I Chronicles xxi., 1, impugn the author of Samuel in II. Samuel, xxiv., 1, because he puts Satan in the place of God as the tempter of David? No doubt he does, but he magnifies the character of God, which is far more important. So, by reading the Scriptures, have I sought to vindicate the character of the Father. To find the infallible in the progressive at every stage of its progress is an impossibility. Christ is the infallible, the teacher sent from God above all other teachers. To Moses and his successors in the prophetic office, the holy spirit was given by measure, but to Jesus Christ without measure. To place the teachings of Moses on a par with those of Christ is to dishonor him who reveals the Father.

THE SECOND COUNT.

"The second count is that I have presented a view of God which sets Him forth as one who does not smite, either in the way of punishment or discipline and who has nothing to do with the judging or punishing of the wicked. My address was a popular one, written to set forth Jesus Christ as the true revelation of the Father, not a scholastic thesis to be guarded on every point. My contention was and is that God the Father is the antipodes of God the Son in scholastic theology; that he is regarded as arbitrary emperor and judge, and as a being tolerably different from his revelation, Jesus Christ, in his relations with our fallen humanity. Stated more logically, my thesis is this, that sin and illwill, moral and physical, are no part of God's notion nor God's plan. No theologian dare affirm that God decrees sin or any evil; they are not of God. God gave freedom to fallible angels and men, and doubtless foresaw the evil that would arise from the liberty of choice granted to a being of finite knowledge. Yet,