

"So you are, my dearest, and it is the difference that makes you so dear to me. But you have done me a great wrong, and there is only one way in which you can atone for it."

Condemned and abashed, Hester did not attempt to exculpate herself.

"Will you agree to the reparation I am going to propose, Hester?"

"Yes," she sobbed.

"Then," said the Doctor, glancing round the room, "Mrs. Chester, you will be kind enough to order another bridal outfit. We will have a double wedding."

TWO OR THREE AUTHORS OF OUR OWN.

THE sermon preached by the Rev. James Bennet, of this City, before the Synod of the Lower Provinces, the Hon. T. D. McGee's paper on "The Mental Outfit of the New Dominion," and Professor Jardine's Inaugural Lecture on entering on the duties of the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of New Brunswick, deserve particular notice in our columns. Mr. Bennet is one of our best thinkers and most polished writers, Mr. Jardine enters, with much promise, on the duties of a new and important chair, and Mr. McGee's comprehensive mind and learned and eloquent pen grasp the interests of the whole Dominion.

The title of Mr. Bennet's sermon is "The Logical consequences of the acquittal of Jesus; or His Divinity deduced from his character and claims." Mr. Bennet's theme is based on the action of Pilate in declaring that he found no fault in Jesus, and yet delivering him up to death. It was very inconsistent and very wicked of Pilate to do so. Yet something of the same kind is done by the unbelievers of the present age. We quote a short presentation of the scope of the preacher's argument:

Pilate is not alone in his inconsistency. There are many even in the present day who after examination of the charges which have been brought against Christ, have pronounced his character faultless, and yet with strange conclusion they condemn his claims. They would not crucify him, but they would consign him to a place in which he will hurt the world no longer with his superstitious. Covering him with the mockeries of royalty they even pretend to bow to his sceptre, and, while acknowledging his superiority, they reduce him to a rank to which he refuses to descend, coupling his name with that of Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates or Mahomet. Such judgment Christ deems only another sentence to crucifixion, and he will hold those who pronounce it guilty of his shame.

The burden of the discourse is the elaboration of the argument here indicated; an argument which rises from the moral purity of Jesus, as admitted by sceptics, to his veracity, and thence to his claims to have performed miraculous works and to possess true Deity. This is a line of argument which has recently been much more cultivated than that derived from the Historical Evidences, especially by such writers as Ullmann, Young in his "Christ of History," Bushnell on "The Character of Jesus," (a reprint of a chapter from one of his larger works), Channing, Pressense and Schaff, though these writers deal less with the con-

cessions of unbelievers than directly with the argument based on the character of Jesus. In the somewhat novel and striking form in which Mr. Bennet deals with the subject, he does not seek directly to establish the moral perfection of Jesus. He accepts the admissions of sceptics who virtually say "We find no fault in him," and who yet refuse to recognize the claims which Jesus puts forth. It is an argument in which unbelievers are pressed with their logical inconsistencies, and which is fitted to affect the hearts and consciences of nominal, yet professing, Christians. It is true that in following out this argument, Mr. Bennet is compelled to encounter the *a priori* objection to the possibility of miracles. This position he argues, at length, can only be consistently taken by Atheists. If God exists, if he has called the worlds into being, who will say that he cannot interfere, or has never interfered, with what appears to be the ordinary course of nature as regards the works of his hands? This is entirely a question of fact, and consequently a question of evidence. The whole argument is sustained with great ability and eloquence in a fresh and vigorous style, displaying the high culture and extensive reading of the preacher. It is rare to meet with such a sermon; the thoughts which it contains might readily be expanded into a treatise which would take high rank as a contribution to Christian Evidences. In saying so much we do not wish to convey the idea that the method of the preacher is perfect or that his logic might not be improved. The idea of the discourse being that of an argument based on the admission of sceptics, and mainly addressed to them, it ought to contain little or nothing which they would refuse to grant. But would they concede the validity of the preacher's argument in support of miracles? In point of method the introduction of this argument spoils the unity of the discourse, and, what is more, introduces an element which mars its cogency as addressed to professed unbelievers. There are two other points which may be raised as to the argument of the discourse. Is it good as against the sceptics whose admissions form the premises on which the preacher basis his conclusions? Is it good absolutely and without reference to mere admissions? It is not the latter simply