

hallowed be Thy name. To compare small things with great, I do not find that truth-lovers found fault with Luther and Knox for using strong language, or that they sat in judgment on Paul for calling Moses' ceremonial enactments "weak and beggarly elements." Suppose that certain sentences in the lecture convey an exaggeration, is this wrong? Has not every fervent speaker and writer the right to employ the rhetorical idiom of exaggerated contrast? In the lecture it was done in order to call attention to an obscured truth, since then happily coming to the front on all sides. This idiom was used by the prophets and apostles, and the Psalms are full of it. Every preacher and public speaker is allowed this liberty, save when some small verbal peg is wanted on which to hang a large charge of heresy. Moses (Exod. xxxii. 32) prayed God to blot him out of His book; Paul (Rom. ix. 3) wished himself accursed from Christ; Jesus (John ix. 3) said concerning the man born blind, "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents." When that same Saviour told men to offer their left cheeks to the smiter, to give the coat-thief their cloak, to go two miles for the offender that took them one out of their way, He used the idiom of exaggerated contrast, as He did when He said, "If any man hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." There is a very pertinent Scripture which says (Isaiah xxix. 20), "For the terrible one is brought to naught, and the scorner is consumed, and all that watch for iniquity are cut off: *that make a man an offender for a word*, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate, and turn aside the just for a thing of naught." To any candid examiner my meaning is plain and the exaggerated idiom is in no danger of leading such astray.

The subordinate standard of our Church is the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Church does not accept