

his followers is, in all likelihood, "Ye did run well, who did hinder that ye should not obey the truth."

But why should Augustine be so restive about such an apparently innocent *heresy* as appears in these words of Pelagius? One would think that a paragraph or two would be sufficient attention given to such teaching.

We were once informed by an enthusiastic teacher concerning the absence of the quantity, *entire depravity*, from the make up of the children of pious parents, of his belief that his child would grow up without the taint. Our reply was that a few years would destroy his creed if the child lived. So Augustine, if thoroughly entrenched in his contrary belief, could have urged Pelagius to try to live without sin for a few years and then report, expecting with confidence that his conscious and manifest failure so to do would be sufficient refutation of his creed.

Now this would manifestly have been the common-sense way to deal with such heresy, if heresy really and truly it was. And further, we hesitate not to say that some such treatment would have been all that it would have received, if the position of Augustine was absolutely right, and that of Pelagius as certainly wrong. It is because of some suspicion concerning the soundness of their position, which only can account for the intense uneasiness which is evinced by those holding the creed of Augustine, when it is assailed by contrary argument, or testimony.

In reading his writings, it is an interesting fact to notice how Paul's vague allusion to the possible advantages of single life has grown through the centuries, until Augustine hesitates not to dogmatize on the subject, declaring that *a nun had more merit before God than married women who believed*.

He also pointedly taught that Paul's reference to the contrast between the letter and the Spirit alluded only to the difference between the Old and New Testament Scriptures. An absurd position, which, of itself, tends to undervalue all his writings, and prove him, at best, to be but an industrious and enthusiastic defender of other people's theories.

MAN'S WORD GOD'S WORD.

Can a man in this year 1891 know that he speaks the mind of God? The God who spoke to Moses at the burning bush, as recorded in Exodus third chapter, is represented in chapters four to twelve, as saying to him, "Now, therefore, go, and I will be with thy mouth and teach thee what thou shalt speak." Moses' modesty produced unbelief in him, and "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses." And so Aaron, his brother, became God's chief spokesman to Israel. (Perhaps that distrust on Moses' part, so shut God away from his mouth, as to lead to the one offence in speech that is recorded on his part during the forty years of his career as leader of Israel.) We meet the sentence, "And the Lord spake unto Moses," or "unto Moses and Aaron," or "unto Moses and Eleazar," "saying," about ninety-five times in the Pentateuch, and in a large proportion of instances, God spake to Moses or the others, words which they afterwards repeated in the hearing of the people of Israel. We have in the third chapter of first Samuel the record of God speaking to a child, who, it would appear, was not yet in his teens, and that boy uttering the words that God gave him. Throughout his life Samuel was the recipient of God's words and the utterer of them, as every reader of the Bible knows. Indeed, the meaning of the title "Prophet" is one who tells out what God tells him; and the prophets frequently prefaced their speeches with the formula, "Thus saith the Lord." Jeremiah records that the "word of God came unto me, saying, I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations, and the Lord said, Behold I have put my words into thy mouth, arise and speak unto them all that I command thee," first chapter. At least seventeen times does he declare in his book, "and the word 'from' or 'of' the Lord came unto me, saying." So the words of Jeremiah, as those of Samuel and Moses, were the words of God, whenever God spoke to him and required him to deliver his message to others.

But now that the Bible is believed to be complete, has not this privilege ceased