

many a daily paper do not furnish material that is quite as damaging to the community and quite as disastrous to the developing minds of our well-regulated homes.

If it requires years of training to be able to select the books that are best suited to the peculiar needs of an individual mind; and if it requires the formation of habits of attention, discrimination and assimilation in order to reduce them to thinking, acting, working shape in a human life, no less does it require all the advantages of taste, tact and culture to lead the growing mind through the mazy medium of newspaper influence, up to the point where from the home to the community, and from the community to the nation, we may realize the highest, the noblest and the best.

\* \* \*

The calling home of the Rev. Mr. McGilvary, one of their most successful missionaries in China, by the U. S. Presbyterian Board of Missions, seems a most extraordinary act. Mr. McGilvary, while at College carefully preparing himself for what he thought would be his life's work, gave evidence of most exceptional ability, and his work in China amply justified the high hopes of his many friends. He, however, came to the conclusion, to which a great many Biblical scholars have come, that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, nor both parts of Isaiah by the same author. These conclusions in no way hindered his being one of the most zealous and successful missionaries in China but, learning that the Home church regarded such views as erroneous, he wrote stating his belief in them and enclosing his resignation, to be acted on if the church deemed him unworthy to work under their direction. The Board without bringing the matter before any church court accepted the conditional resignation and called back a man who longed to remain in China and whose efficiency his associates are unanimous in admitting.

It seems strange, that some men should think themselves wiser than God, and that the church may no longer regard the fruit of a missionary's labor, the sign of God's approval of him, sufficient warrant for its approval. Such things recall to one's mind the words of Carlyle, "God must needs laugh outright, could such a thing be, to see his wonderous manikins here below."

\* \* \*

In this age of keen criticism, when the ideas of many men expand more quickly than their intellects, we hear considerable about liberality of mind. Undoubtedly this is a high attainment, and one much needed in the world to-day, as it ever has been. But like many other things of value it is rare as it is precious, and is frequently counterfeited.

Of late we have entertained serious doubts as to whether this virtue is to be found in many of those

who talk most about it, in any higher degree than it is in some of the brethren who are looked down upon as narrow and bigoted. This has led to the inquiry: What is true Liberality?

According to some, the liberal-minded man is none other than the agnostic. He must allow others to think as they please, and at the same time believe that they are quite as likely to know, and express the truth as he is, even though their thoughts and expressions be diametrically opposed to his. He must never say "this is truth, that is error," of anything concerning which men hold different opinions—and what is there about which men do not differ?—but must always be ready to admit that the other may be right. In other words, he may have his opinions about things, but knowledge he cannot have, or at least cannot know when he has it.

It may be our own innate conceit, but, whatever the reason, we cannot accept such a position, but maintain that man is capable of knowledge. We conceive of Liberality as a willingness to look at a thing from all sides before coming to an ultimate decision, and especially as *being ready to see new sides* when they are pointed out. Finding that there is another side from which we have to view an object, may greatly change our idea of the whole, and therefore change our idea of the relation between the sides already seen and the whole, but it does not prove that we knew nothing about the object before, and that our conception of the object was entirely wrong, but merely that it was incomplete.

Liberality demands that we weigh all things carefully and give to each its proper position, but not that we accept all things as equally true. What reason and experience has proven true should be firmly held, not as complete truth, but as an element of truth, the essence of which any more complete knowledge must contain. Further, true Liberality recognizes that in mental development there is a change not from wholly false to perfectly true, but from incomplete to less incomplete conceptions.

If therefore a man thinks that he has advanced in this line, advanced perhaps with gigantic strides, he will not with any spirit of true liberality look back and condemn those, who seem to remain away down where he was, as wallowing in the mire of error, but will recognize that they too have an element of truth. And yet this seems to be one of the great mistakes which men who pride themselves on their liberality are likely to make. The range of their vision has become so broad that they are unable to see the little narrow streak of truth they have left so far behind. In short they have become so broad and know it so well they are really narrow. Extremes are never far apart.

---

The first complete Bible that was printed in England appeared in 1535.