

each, so that in doing the one he must be careful not to leave the other undone. The question recurs: Is there any necessary antagonism between the two, and if so, how is it to be obviated?

In a sense there is such an antagonism. The tendency of intense devotion to study, just as of intense devotion to any other earthly pursuit, however right in itself, is unfriendly to spirituality of mind. There is no secular duty in which we can engage which may not be so performed as to intercept our heavenward prospect, and cast its own earth-shadow upon our spirits. We doubt not that even the most devoted minister of the Gospel may often find a tendency in the zealously followed routine of his most religious duties, to dull his spiritual sensibilities and mar religious enjoyment. This is a part of the inevitable life conflict. The "things seen" are temporal, and the Christian is of the earth. Shall he then fold his hands, and bewail that "the world is no friend to grace?" that it is so difficult to be "in" it and yet not "of" it? Shall he not rather recognize that it is by virtue of these very tendencies rendered all the fitter place of discipline? God's methods are best and wisest, and he does not take his people at once out of the world. The choicest plants in his garden are no hot-house exotics. Those of his right hand's planting, whose fragrance most delights Him, are often the hardy ones, inured to cold and storm on earth before being transplanted to the bowers of perpetual bloom. The fact, then, that diligence in study tends to hinder spirituality of mind, is as much an argument for relaxing diligence in the pursuit of mental culture, as the inevitable spiritual hinderances which beset the father in his daily toil as bread winner for his family, are an argument for his abandoning that toil for a life of religious meditation in cloister or hermitage—no more.

The practical lessons at which we are aiming are, if these