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## The Pilgrim

Tho way is dark, my Father I clond on clond Is gathoring gaickly o'er my bead; and loud The thunders roar above me. See, I etand Like one bewildered. Father, take ray hand, And through the gloom lesd eafely homo Thy child,
The way ia long my Fathorl and my boul Longs for the rest and caniet of tho goal, While jet I jousnoy through this reary land Keep me from mandering! Father, take my hand: Qaickly and straight lead to hesven's gato Thy child.

The cross is heary, Father! I have borno It long and atill do bear it. Let my worn And faintiog spirit rise to that bleseed land Where crowne aro hiven. Fatber, take my hand, And, resohing down, losd to the crown Thy child.
Tho way is dark, Aly chilj, but leads to light!
I would not havo thee always walk by sight.
My deslings now thoa csnst not anderstand
I meant it 80 ; bus 1 will tako thy hand, And through the gloom lead salety homo lly chiid
The ras is long, Ay child ! bat it shall be Not one step looger than is best for thee.
And thon shatit know at leas, when thou ghalt stand
Close to tho gato, hom I did tako thy band, And qaick and straight led to hearen's gato My child.
The cross is beary, child ! yet tbero is Une Who bore a beavier for thee: My Son, My Well-Belored ; rith Mim bear thico and atand; With IIm at labt, and Irom thy Faiber'a hand, Thy cross laid down, receivo thy crown, My ckild!

## The One Lawgiver.

hy tathot w. Chaminers, D.d.

$0^{N}$E of the most distinctly marked features of the Church of the present day is the weakened held which men have of the doctrine of fulure retribution. This is shown not by the alteration of creeds and confessions, but by the publication of books and pamphiets, by the utterances of prominent men in different communions and by the action of various local ecelesiastical hodies. In these it is declared with more or less emphasis that $\sin$ is not eternal, and that one day all men without exception will be broug at home to happiness and to God. But if this be true then there is no such thing as retribution. All the penal sanctions of the law are changed into corrections, their real ultimate end being not the satisfaction of justice, but the selormation of the trangressor. Sympathy with the wreng doer takes the place of sympathy with eternal rectitude. This arises from al fecble sense of the evil of $\sin$. Men shrink from the unsparing denunciations of Scripture, and are disposed to palliate and excuse moral delinquencies as if they were infirmitues, accidents due to the weakness of man's nature, greatly to be regretted indeed and avoided, yet not by any means demanding a penalty stricily endless. If we trace further back the sourse of these views, we find it in the inadequate apprehensions mea have of the divine law. They do not recognize its absolute and unchangeable authority. They merge all the perfections of Godinto his one aspect as a Father, and so overlook his majesty
as a moral governor. Forgetting, too, that a father must rule, and that a family without discipline is on the road to ruin, they so explain the divine paternity as to make it mere good nature. The Father of all cannot finally reject any, and His grace is as universal as mankmd. Making happiness rather than holiness the last end of His procedures, they resolve the law into an educational institution instead of an original and unbending standard of duty, In direct opposition to all such loose and indefinite opinions stands the positive assertion of the Apostle James (iv:12), "There is one Lawgiver." That God is a Lawgiver arises from the fact that he is Creator. Even in the lower sphere of physical forces it would be inconsistent with His perfections to allow the existence of a permanent chas. Were there no uniformity in natural sequences, science would become guesswork and life a riddle.

But if God imposes law upon unorganized matter, much more must He upon rational beings. Man, we are told, was made in the image of God, a free selfconscious agent, endowed with reason, conscience athd will, and therefore raised immeasurably above all others order of being on earth. As the immediate offspring of God he partakes of his spiritual nature, and therefore is capable of knowing Himand having commumon with Him. But he is also capable of turning away from Him and pursuing wrong courses. Man, therefore, must have a rulc of action. His own moral constitution requires i:, as well as his relation to his Maker upon whom he is dependent and to whom he is subject. The wise and holy God cannot be indifferent to the character of His intelligent creatures ether in respect to their dispoitions or their conduct. He must have a will upon the subject, and that will must necessarily take the shapt of haw. It is indeed conccivable that he might have so constituted men that they would always be disposed to do right, an infallible propensity of nature guiding them at every step, so that there never could be a possibility of their going wrong cither from inclination or from mistake. But, so far as we know, the Almighty never did constitete any sf his creatures after this manner. Such being the case, man with all his high endowments being fallible aud peaceable, zhere must needs be given to him a fixed rule of conduct. Meresuggestion or advice will not answer. There must be something absolute and peremptory, something that comes as the irrcuocable declaration ol God's own judyment of good and evil, something establivhed over mankind, like the sun in the firmament, the same from the world's first day to the last. It says, Thou shatt or Thun shale not, and it means to be obeyed. It has, therefore, sanctions, as it, incieced, must have; otherwise it would not be law at all, but in mere expression of opinion. And these sanctions mast be enforced. For if not, then they might just as well not exist.

