

through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Nehemiah did not go down to Sanballat and Tobiah to argue with them.

But in this quest for variety, for interest, the theological graduate or the bookish preacher may be led to bring into the pulpit questions of criticism, disquisitions as to the sources of Scripture documents, what we call the embryonic history of the Bible. Is this class of study valuable? Surely it is. We as a church believe in full investigation. We have nothing to hide. We have no clandestine conclaves. We want every student to be fully instructed in Biblical literature. I may say, also, that in my opinion the so-called Higher Criticism movement of the last twenty-five years has done good. It has reminded us that the Bible is not a mere ecclesiastical preserve; it has shown us clearly the human element in the Bible, but has in doing this, brought us face to face, in numberless cases, with the divine as the only intelligible explanation of the facts, and it has done away with the charge that religious teachers hold the truth as dogma, and without investigation. All this is a gain, but this line of investigation is for the college, not for the forum, for the study not for the pulpit. It is, after all, the mere husk of truth. What we need in the pulpit and the Sunday school class is the kernel, the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. That only can save the soul. Foolish and unearned questions we are to avoid, since they gender strife, and also for the sake of the hungry sheep that look up to be fed we should avoid unprofitable questions, even if they are learned.

Not Mere Worldly Aspirations.

Further, we are doing a great work and cannot come down to mere worldly aspirations. In our church and in our congregations there is no doubt a large share of the worldly prosperity which God has granted to the Canadian people. This is universally conceded. In this, brethren, there is a snare. To feel the sense of superiority is the spirit of the ecclesiastic and not of the Christian. The world is apt to see, and rightly, an inconsistency in this kind of religion. Moses had to choose between the reproach of Christ and the treasures of Egypt. The Christian must in some true sense feel this reproach. Humility must be the ideal, especially of the Christian minister or elder. I think it is to the pastors and officers of the church that St. Peter says they are not to aim at being lords over God's heritage. It was to the Apostles, and we claim to be their successors, that it was said, while the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion and authority, "it shall not be so among you." Nehemiah had the high dream of a perfected Jerusalem, and could not come down even to consider Sanballat's worldly propositions.

Nor, brethren, should the minister engage himself with doing things not legitimately connected with his office. Some do almost all that should be done in their parishes except study and prepare for preaching. On a memorable occasion, which stands for all time, the twelve apostles called the multitude of the disciples together and said, "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables." Brethren, one great evil I see in our Canadian church to-day is that often the minister has not a high enough ideal of preaching. He organizes everything in his church, even to the sports, is a leader in getting up entertainments, with a perfectly good motive spends much of his time in society, in some cases (and we admire him for it), devotes attention to charities, consulting with people in distressed circumstances, finding situations for new comers, and writing letters for and about people, but often in order to do this he has to leave the Word of God. There ought to be a division of this labor. Other Christian workers should take more responsibility. That is the Apostolic model, and is so arranged that the minister may devote himself to "prayer and the ministry of the Word." I am old fashioned enough