

anity be a reve-
vinely commis-
e, therefore it is
ourselves to the
reveals himself
True there are
but these limi-
ich are inaccess-
ence; or in the
ake of himself
veal to us; or
ble to grasp all
toriness in the
religion; for as
h each other if
ion, or mutual
pprehension on
ed religion are
To discriminate
e of those truths
g, are exercises
investigation,
ot on a *priori*
e inductive and
er branches of
h God has en-
uchsafed us in
defined. If no
velation alone,
ependent testi-
ate basis of our
tion must rest
sis at all. So
e because God
d in it—reason
d and reasons
can be accept-
mmon convic-

tion, and man believes only himself when he is professing to believe God. On the other hand we must give to reason its true place. In the language of Locke, "He that takes away reason to make way for revelation puts out the light of both, and does much the same as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope." But reason is out of its true place when it demands of us to surrender a genuine doctrine of revelation. Here we are called to distinguish well and warily between God's truth and man's interpretation, between divine verities and human opinions—we may willingly part with opinions, but it is the highest office of reason to grasp firmly the truth divine.

3rd. There is still another school of theologians who grant the fact of a revelation, but who object to Christian dogmas, and who represent a plain statement of the doctrines of the Bible as opposed to a devotional faith. Christianity we are told must abandon the pretension to offer a fixed, sharply defined body of truth to the acceptance or rejection of the mind of man. Thus one writes, "Any one who has ever read his Bible in the hope of learning something of the divine lessons which it teaches, necessarily and unconsciously abstracts his mind from the mere words, and still more from the outlines of facts, in order to fix it on the sacred meaning which underlies them. Devotional reading is a thing apart from and incompatible with historical study. The absorption of the spirit of the Bible, is not consistent with the absorption of the facts into the memory."* Here we concede at once that the devotional reading of the Bible is one thing, and the historical or doctrinal study of the Bible is another; but to say that they are things inconsistent and incompatible is to sweep away not only all theology but also all study of the Bible. However such sentiments may be expressed, there is at the foundation of this opposition to dogma, the feeling that however beautiful Christianity may be it does not contain settled and fixed truths; as a poem, "its utterances flowing in a ceaseless rhythm of antitheses," such men will study it, and love it and learn from it, and it will "breathe upon the character

* R. F. Clarke, M.A., as quoted by Archdeacon Jones.