

been righteous all his life. The question is—not 'is there a hell?' for there is: it is not about punishment, but the eternity of it. It is not the question of suffering beyond the grave: for we shall suffer as surely as we go to bed to-night. But there is nothing dangerous in telling poor sinners that men will have a chance to gain life, beyond the grave." And again:—"the death, spiritual and carnal, shall be eternally done away." To quote once more:—"For good or evil the race is one organic whole. The stream of sin has flowed uninter-ruptedly from the one fountain, Adam; the stream of righteousness flows perennally from the one fountain, Jesus Christ. As the whole race suffered through Adam's sin, so the whole race shall be benefitted by Christ's righteousness." On these pretty broad utterances of universalism, a battle royal raged in Presbytery and General Assembly for nearly two years. Significantly enough, the men of the old Kirk (to which Mr. Macdonnell had belonged) rallied round the young brother. They defended him on the ground that his words were the expression of a hope, and not a dogmatic utterance! So serious was the controversy that for some time it bade fair to break up the lately formed Union of the Churches. It was tided over at the Toronto Assembly, to come up again at the Halifax the next year. The hope of the church leaders was that the logic of events would settle the question by Mr. Macdonnell's translation to another sphere:—perhaps to a heavenly! But the Halifax Assembly came round without this happening; and the respective champions went down to do or die. But they did neither. By some mystical hocus-pocus, Mr. Macdonnell (who held tenaciously to his position) was supposed to have said something which—in a Pickwickian sense—implied that, under certain circumstances, it might possibly be wrong in him to make certain statements in a certain sense, and so, —and so. Both parties professed themselves satisfied, and Mr. Macdonnell (who had reason to be) came back to Toronto with flying colors to the embrace of his church, which had stood loyally by him through the whole business. It was a lame and impotent conclusion to a sufficiently serious matter. Mr. Macdonnell still holds his own; though he has now formidable rivals in the Toronto pulpit. His nervous constitution, which is other men's weakness, is to him a source of power. It seems to put him *en rapport* with his audience: so that the eager over-lapping of his words, and the stuttering, almost chattering—movement—of his speech is quite overlooked.

Of the formidable rivals, one is Dr. Castle. (By the way, the doctorial fever has broken out virulently in Toronto!) Dr. Castle is minister of the new and palatial Baptist Church on Gerrard Street. This magnificent building is constructed after the most approved American type. It is an immense structure; quite an ecclesiastical "establishment" in itself: its array of lecture-rooms and class-rooms, and church-parlors and church-kitchens covering with the church proper a large space of ground. Internally the building is amphitheatric in form; highly decorated in black walnut mouldings and carvings. At the back is the grand organ, a notable feature; then comes a platform for the choir; then the pulpit-desk, well advanced towards the middle of the church. This is not all, for in front of the minister sits the organist, separated from his instrument by pulpit and choir, and simply fingering a bank of keys which have no visible connection with the organ structure in the rear. Of all the novelties and attractions of this place, the pastor is, however, the greatest. He is an elaborate and finished actor, who throws himself into the characters he portrays and gives a vivid *resemblance* to the scenes he sketches. Though generally deprecated, this method of dramatic action in the pulpit has much to say for itself. Certainly the old Hebrew prophets with their acted parables, or charades, worked out in the presence of the people, must have been intensely dramatic. One can be more lenient, also, when—as in the case of Dr. Castle—the dramatic gift is used solely for the enforcement of stern moral truth and the persuading of men to righteousness.

In concluding these notices of the Toronto Pulpit, only a passing reference can be made to other worthy men and good preachers, clerical and lay. Presbyterian professors in the college do much to strengthen the Toronto pulpit. Principal Cavan is deservedly liked and respected. Apart from his singularly high-pitched and monotonous voice, there are few more instructive and interesting preachers in Canada. In the Methodist body, also, are some who cannot be named, but who are doing good service. The Primitive Methodists are also ably represented in Toronto. Of the laymen, Mr. John Macdonald might almost be called a "stated supply," so frequent is his appearance in the pulpit. Of somewhat less note is Mr. Robert Walker and Mr. Robert Wilkes, who always find willing listeners. And if in these rapid sketches the writer has touched the sensibilities of any worthy minister, let such an one accept his assurance that no harm is intended, and he may be sure that an one accept his assurance that no harm is intended, and he may be sure that ephemeral as our newspaper literature is—no harm is done.

QUIEN SABE?

SUFFERING WITH CHRIST, A CONDITION OF GLORY WITH CHRIST.

A Sermon Preached at Manchester, by Alexander MacLaren.

"Joint-heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together."—ROMANS, viii. 17.

In the former part of this verse the Apostle tells us that in order to be heirs of God we must become sons through and joint-heirs with Christ. He seems at first sight to add in these words of our text another condition to those already specified, namely, that of suffering with Christ.

Now, of course, whatever may be the operation of suffering in fitting for the possession of the Christian inheritance, either here or in another world, the sonship and the sorrows do not stand on the same level in regard to it. The one is the indispensable condition of all; the other is but a means for the operation of the condition. The one,—being sons, "joint-heirs with Christ," is the root of the whole matter; the other,—the "suffering with Him," is but the various process by which from the root there come "the blade, and the ear, and the full corn in the ear." Given, the sonship,—if it is to be worked out into power and beauty, there must be suffering with Christ. But unless there be sonship, there is no possibility of inheriting God; discipline and suffering will be of no use at all.

The chief lesson which I wish to gather from this text now is that all God's sons must suffer with Christ, and in addition to this principle, we may complete our considerations by adding briefly, that the inheritance must be won by suffering, and that if we suffer with Him, we certainly shall receive the inheritance.

First, then, *Sonship with Christ necessarily involves suffering with Him.* I think that we entirely misapprehend the force of this passage before us, if we suppose it to refer principally or merely to the outward calamities, what you call trials and afflictions, which befall people; and see in it only the teaching, that the sorrows of daily life may have in them a sign of our being children of God, and some power to prepare us for the glory that is to come. There is a great deal more in the thought than that, brethren. This is not merely a text for people that are in affliction, but for all of us. It does not merely contain a law for a certain part of life, but it contains a law for the whole of life. It is not merely a promise that "in all our afflictions Christ shall be afflicted," but it is a solemn injunction that we seek to know "the fellowship of His sufferings, and be made comfortable to the image of His death," if we expect to be "found in the likeness of His resurrection," and to have any share in the community of His glory. In other words, the foundation of it is not that Christ shares in our sufferings; but that we, as Christians, in a deep and real sense do necessarily share and participate in Christ's. We "suffer with Him;" *not*, He suffers with us.

Now, do not let us misunderstand each other, or the Apostle's teaching. Do not suppose that I am forgetting, or wishing you to account as of small importance, the awful sense in which Christ's suffering stands as a thing by itself and unapproachable, a solitary pillar rising up, above the waste of time, to which all men everywhere are to turn with the one thought. "I can do nothing like that; I need to do nothing like it; it has been done once, and once for all; and what I have to do is, simply to lie down before Him, and let the power and the blessings of that death and those sufferings flow into my heart." The Divine Redeemer makes eternal redemption. The sufferings of Christ—the sufferings of His life, and the sufferings of His death—both because of the nature which bore them, and of the aspect which they wore in regard to us, are in their source, in their intensity, in their character, and consequences, unapproachable, incapable of repetition, and needing no repetition whilst the world shall stand. But then, do not let us forget that the very books and writers in the New Testament that preach most broadly Christ's sole, all-sufficient, eternal redemption for the world, by His sufferings and death, turn round and say to us too, "Be planted together in the likeness of His death," you are crucified to the world by the cross of Christ; you are to fill up that which is behind of the sufferings of Christ." He Himself speaks of our drinking of the cup that He drank of, and being baptized with the baptism that he was baptized with, if we desire to sit yonder on His throne, and share with Him in His glory. Now what do the Apostles, and what does Christ Himself, in that passage that I have quoted, mean, by such solemn words as these? Some people shrink from them, and say that it is trenching upon the central doctrines of the Gospel, when we speak about drinking of the cup which Christ drank of. They ask, Can it be? Yes, it can be, if you will think thus:—If a Christian has the spirit and life of Christ in him, his career will be moulded, imperfectly but really, by the same spirit that dwelt in his Lord; and similar causes will produce corresponding effects. The life of Christ which—Divine, pure, incapable of copy and repetition—in one aspect has passed away for ever from men, remains to be lived, in another view of it, by every Christian, who in like manner has to fight with the world, who in like manner has to resist temptation, who in like manner has to stand, by God's help, pure and sinless, in so far as the new nature of him is concerned, in the midst of a world that is full of evil. For were the sufferings of the Lord only the sufferings that were wrought upon Calvary? Were the sufferings of the Lord only the sufferings which came from the "contradiction of sinners against Himself?" Were the sufferings of the Lord only the sufferings which were connected with the bodily afflictions and pain, precious and priceless as they were, and operative causes of our redemption as they were? Oh no. Conceive of that perfect, sinless, really human life, in the midst of a system of things that is all full of corruption and of sin; coming ever and anon against misery, and wrong-doing, and rebellion; and ask yourselves whether part of His sufferings did not spring from the contact of the sinless Son of man with a sinful world, and the apparently vain attempt to influence and leaven that sinful world with care for itself and love for the Father. If there had been nothing more than that, yet Christ's sufferings as the Son of God in the minds of sinful men would have been deep and real. "Oh faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you?" was wrung from Him by the painful sense of want of sympathy between His aims and theirs. "Oh that I had wings like a dove, for then I would fly away and be at rest," must often be the language of those who are like Him in spirit, and in consequent sufferings.

And then again, another branch of the "sufferings of Christ" is to be found in that deep and mysterious fact on which I durst not venture to speak beyond what the actual words of Scripture put into my lips—the fact that Christ wrought out His perfect obedience as a man, *through temptation, and by suffering.* There was no sin *within* Him, no tendency to sin, no yielding to the evil that assailed. "The Prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me." But yet, when that dark Power stood by His side, and said, "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down," it was a real temptation and not a sham one. No wish to do it, no faltering for a moment, no hesitation. There was no rising up in that calm will, of even a moment's impulse to do the thing that was presented; but yet it was presented, and, when Christ triumphed, and the tempter departed for a season, there had been a temptation and there had been a conflict. And though obedience be a joy, and the doing of His Father's will was His delight, as it must needs be in pure and in purified hearts; yet obedience which is sustained in the face of temptation, and which never fails, though its path lead to bodily pains, and the "contradiction of sinners," may well be called suffering. We cannot speak of our Lord's obedience as the surrender of His own will to the Father's, with the implication that these two wills ever did or could move except in harmony. There was no place in Christ's obedience for that casting out of sinful self, which makes our submission a surrender joined with suffering. But He knew temptation. Flesh, and sense, and the world, and the prince of