

'godliness,' how will you answer the question, are not (very much at least) the acts precisely the same?" Exactly so; and that is the very point. Identically the same to man, they have before God the difference between death and life. In the regenerated man, what are these acts? They are the works of faith, the labours of love, the natural expressions of gratitude, joy, and peace; they are the healthy actings of a free service; they are *not* done in self-complacency, but the reverse; they value no smile but that of God, fear no frown but His; they know nothing of any reference to *self* but for abasement, nor to others but for their benefit, but to the Lord and Him alone, for His glory; and all this for *one reason only*—they are "THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT." *This is not Religiousness, this is GODLINESS.*

In the *unregenerated* man, what are these it may be the same acts? Why they are either the self-complacent doings of Pharisaism (than which nothing can be worse), or the most sleepy, indifferent concession to custom, as little caring to quarrel as to approve; or the grudging contributions to a stern necessity,—the only available mode of dealing with what it is of no use to deny and impossible to laugh at,—an unpleasant expediency to keep certain matters, too solemn and future to be talked about, tolerably square against, not a good, but "an evil time coming;" that is to say, death and judgment. *This is not Godliness, but Religiousness.*

The things which follow are its Progeny.

*Symbolism.*—Fewer words about this the better. It brings a *double* blush for the honour of true religion. Is it not enough that a thing be *bad* but it must be *silly also*? Even a carnal man, with the letter of the word in his hand, ought to be ashamed of it. If he used the same common sense in matters of religion, that he employs in matters of business, he *would* be ashamed of it. It seems like the devices for teaching infants to count, only without their apology, and certainly without their usefulness. Wherein lie its charms, even to those who adopt it? Is it not in the idleness of a dreamy spiritualism, in the dispensing with thought, in the carnal-minded gratification to the supposed religious feelings afforded by sensuous abstractions of soul, and mainly in that does really (however far it may be from avowing or even intending it) *keep the truth out* under the very pretence of bringing it in?

EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE SUPERFICIALLY STATED and received. Many an unregenerate man's religiousness is not to be met, but only assaulted by a metal cross, and the largest variety of coverings for the Communion Table. But it is no nearer the being godliness for all that. The degrees of evil are far from being unimportant, but the equal separation of them from all identity with good is of an importance which is paramount. Evangelical truth is a solemn thing. A solemn thing to handle, either for others or ourselves. And it is a fact not less solemn, that a *form* of this stands in precisely the same position to many unregenerate religious persons that symbolism sustains to others. How often do we not meet with an *equal* abhorrence of Popery, and of "the truth as it is in Jesus?" of symbolism, and the real worship of a broken, contrite, and believing heart? of *any* preaching but that which is denominated Evangelical, and the saving doctrines of Christ's Gospel received in their power through the ministration of the Holy Ghost? Oh, we may have strong preferences, and draw, as we think, most edifying comparisons amongst the things which are not of Christ, but are only so many Anti-Christianisms more or less apologetical, all coming from the same source, Satan, who is "the god of this world," and all adapted to the varied cravings of depraved human nature, whose conscience is *not* yet "seared as with a hot iron"—but, it may be that they are all *alike* hateful, certainly all infinitely hateful, to the Triune Jehovah. And we know not why a professed adhesion to Evangelical truth, with a real shunning of it, should, even if there are degrees of Divine repugnance, be amongst the less abominable of the "abominable things which God hateth:" perhaps it stands in awful preëminence there. Few things can we less afford to overlook than this; that we may grow up with a mere constitutional preference for the Evangelical form of doctrine, just as, under other influences, we may of antipathy to it. And thus it may be, and by many is, held with the