

we come to? What ground is there for thinking that God would be more likely to interfere to prevent mistakes in such matters than in matters purely secular of like grade?

Further, in regard to the whole religious field the argument is substantially the same as that just used, viz., that a man left to his own unaided resources, though morally perfect from the outset, could not be expected to wholly escape mistake; and that God could not be counted on to do for him in every case what he could not do for himself.

Suppose a man left to his own resources. In general, religious questions are fully as difficult as any. Who knows a problem in physics or metaphysics so profound that one in morals and theology can not be found to equal it? When Newton turned from the study, of celestial mechanics to the study of the Scriptures, he found that the power that strode so sublimely from mountain-top to mountain-top of analytical and astronomical discovery could strain and falter in dealing with the more intense Switzerland of theology. When Pascal withdrew from that abstruse geometry of which he was the natural high-priest, it was to bow like a child before many a religious mystery which his vast powers sought in vain to solve. When Locke retired from his stubborn metaphysics to a more thorough religious study, it was to feel that in his new vocation he needed all the great powers that had grappled so masterfully with the recondite theory of mind. The religious studies of these men were approached under circumstances at least as favorable as belonged to their secular. They brought to them the full maturity of their powers, long practise in investigation, the highest zeal, and a moral condition even more favorable to religious investigation than to other. As a corrupt tendency and sin do more to obscure moral than other truth, so a correct tendency and holiness do more to illustrate it. Now the latter were largely dominant in these equal ornaments of science and religion. Genius was the least part of their greatness. They were good men—best men. They were largely under the influence of the Holy Spirit, who is specially an illuminator in religious things. And yet—these men with all their accomplishments as investigators—with as masterful ability in dealing with probabilities as with differentials, in dealing with moral and revealed law as with the laws of Nature, found their hardest and most brow-wrinkling task among religious problems. It follows that one left to his own unaided resources would, even tho morally perfect, be at least as liable to mistake in the religious field as in the secular.

But would not God, in the case of such a person, step in to prevent all mistakes of any considerable importance—for example, in such matters as are at issue between the various evangelical denominations? Looking about us, we find that He does not, in the lower ranges of religious inquiry, always proportion immunity from error to goodness. In minor religious points, tho of some consequence, the various evangelical denominations differ widely among themselves and of course