

*JUDGMENT TO COME.*¹

THE subject on which I am to speak this afternoon is Judgment to Come. I suppose that most of us are conscious that the anticipation of that great hour when we are to appear before God and give account of the deeds done in the body does not exert the power over our own life that it exerted over the life of Christian men in earlier generations.

It is also certain that it does not hold so large a place in theological thought. Neither in practice nor in speculation does it retain the position which it once held. I doubt whether even the preachers of the Salvation Army insist upon the terrors of Judgment to come as many of the preachers of the Evangelical Revival insisted upon them, as great Roman Catholic preachers in past times insisted upon them.

No Christian man, indeed, seriously and deliberately denies that the Lord Jesus Christ will judge the world, and that when this life is over we shall appear before Him that we may receive the things done in the body, whether it be good or bad. Our Lord's own declarations are too appalling to escape notice—too definite to be explained away. He says that He has authority to execute judgment, and that the dead shall hear His voice and shall come forth—they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of judgment. In His impressive dramatic representation of the judgment of the heathen, the righteous learn from

¹ A lecture delivered at Gordon Hall, March 2, 1891.

His own lips for the first time that the compassion they had shown to the hungry, to the sick, to strangers, to prisoners, was compassion shown to Himself, and they hear with astonishment the words of happy praise and His welcome into eternal blessedness; the wicked, on the other hand, discover with amazement that in their disregard of the claims of human misery they had refused to listen to the claims of the Supreme, and they learn for the first time that their sin is to be punished with an awful penalty.

Paul and the other Apostles are equally explicit and equally firm in declaring that Christ will come to judge the world, and on Paul himself the vision of the coming judgment seems to have exerted great and constant influence. He looked forward to it with awe. It steadied him, gave him an additional motive to self-discipline and to earnestness in his apostolic work.

The truth is not *denied*, but truths which are not denied are often suppressed and dislodged by habits of thought which are inconsistent with them. They are not consciously rejected, they are displaced. And in the minds of many Christian people certain theories of the universe and of human life have dislodged, displaced, the truth of Judgment to come. I propose to ask you to consider one conception of human life very prevalent just now, which has had this effect.

Judgment after death—men say—where is the need of it? We are being judged now. Every hour that passes bears witness before God to what we are. We ourselves are putting in the evidence day after day. The Court is already opened; the Judge is already sitting; and further, the penalties of sin and the rewards of fidelity, these are being received already. They are not to begin in another world and after death. Here and now the laws of the universe, which are the laws of God, eternally just, are

executing themselves; the reward comes, the punishment comes, at once. It is this that gives solemnity and dignity to life.

Yes, but if so, what did Christ mean? What did Paul mean? They spoke of a judgment which for every man lies in the future, and of penalties and rewards which are to be the result of that judgment. If this theory be true, that the laws of God, eternally just, are executing themselves, there is no need for the intervention of Christ as Judge; if the rewards and penalties come now, it is an error to be looking forward to an awful hour when there shall be a revelation of the righteous judgment of God:

Let us consider whether this theory of an automatic system of the Universe is a sound one; whether it is true that the great ethical laws which should regulate human conduct execute themselves and confer, at once, rewards on the righteous man, and inflict, at once, penalties on the wrongdoer. The theory sounds philosophical. Is it consistent with facts? Is it consistent with the profoundest conceptions of the divine order of the world?

The theory is that the great moral laws of God are automatic, that they execute themselves, that they begin to inflict at once the just penalty on every one that violates them, begin to confer at once on every one that obeys them the just reward. That is the theory. Have men made it out of their own heads? or does it represent the actual facts of human life?

If the theory is true, how is it that for thousands of years men have insisted that there is no such apparent vindication of the principle of Eternal Justice? How is it that heathens, Jews, and Christians have been on this point all of one mind? The faith of those who have believed in the justice of God has been severely tried by what seemed to them the inequalities in the actual order of the world. Righteousness has been oppressed; wickedness has been

triumphant. This has been so always, from the earliest times which have left any trace on human memory till now.

Occasionally, no doubt, men have been disposed to argue as if even in this world happiness, prosperity, honour, always went with merit; loss, suffering, shame with vice. Job's friends, for example, thought that he must have sinned greatly because he suffered greatly. Our Lord's disciples, when they saw a blind man, asked, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" There were Jews in our Lord's time who appear to have thought that those eighteen on whom the Tower of Siloam fell and killed them were sinners above all that dwelt in Jerusalem. But Job's friends were wrong, and the disciples were wrong, and the Jews who had these uncharitable and self-complacent thoughts about the poor people who were killed by the fall of the tower, were wrong. Men who have considered human life and the order of the world more seriously and more deeply have not discovered that there is this close connection between sin and penalty, between righteousness and reward; and the confusions of this present life have led many to believe that since God is just there must be another life in which all present inequalities will be remedied.

But we are told that this is a mistake, that here and now the laws execute themselves, that there are no inequalities to rectify, that there is no injustice to redress. The penalty is inflicted as soon as the sin is committed, the reward is present as soon as the righteous deed is done. And the same automatic laws which begin instantaneously to avenge the sin will continue to work; their action cannot be arrested till the full penalty is exhausted. The same automatic laws which begin instantaneously to reward the deed of righteousness will continue to work; their action cannot be arrested till all the golden harvest is reaped.

This, so we are assured, is the true account of the actual order of the world.

Well, since through so many generations men have had a wholly different impression, the proofs of the theory should be decisive. Where do you find them?

Let us ask, first, in what region of the environment of the life of man these proofs are apparent?

There is the material universe. Do you mean to say that all its forces are in such a sense in alliance with righteousness that they bless the good man and punish the liar, the thief, the sensualist? Christ says that God causes His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends His rain on the just and on the unjust. Lightning, storm, earthquake, blight, floods—who will venture to declare that these terrible evils, which destroy life or bring misery where life is spared, have any commission to distinguish between the sinner and the saint?

Or take our social environment, the political, the economic, and the social order under which we live. It is true no doubt that the natural laws which govern human society are to a certain extent favourable to virtue and hostile to vice: a society in which there is no industry, or temperance, or good faith, or in which there is no habit of subordination and obedience among the people, and in which the rulers have no sense of justice or of honour, will come to ruin. But the mills of the gods grind slowly, and the social penalties often come not upon those who have done the wrong, but on their children and their children's children. Again, a large part of human happiness and a large part of human misery comes from political institutions. Do these institutions embody an ideal justice? In Turkey, in Russia, or even in England, do they illustrate the automatic action of moral laws which inflict on men what they deserve and reward them according to their merit?

Is no man really wronged by the extortionate rapacity of

Turkish pashas? Is no man unjustly imprisoned by the Russian police? Even in England does every rascal get his deserts from judge and jury? Does no innocent man ever suffer from the delay or the expense of the law? Or, again, the economic order,—is that absolutely just in its workings? Does it distribute economic rewards and penalties according to men's moral deserts? Must I regard every millionaire as a saint, ask for his prayers, imitate his example?

Is every workman that has only 25s. a week a little less righteous than every workman who earns 30s., and are they both great sinners compared with the duke who has £100,000 a year? Is the lady who teaches in a High School with £200 a year incomparably better, morally, than the maid-of-all-work with her £10 and her board, and incomparably worse than the actress with her £5,000? Can we construct a calendar of saints by consulting the authorities at Somerset House and learning the amount of real and personal property that men leave behind them when they die?

Is every man that can afford to drive his carriage and pair more likely to get to heaven than the man who has to go about in a cab or who cannot afford to drive at all? Is it only wicked people who are swindled? Do good men and women always get twenty per cent. on their investments and leave fortunes to their children? If it is so, I have been in error about the world all my days, and am in error still.

The truth is that the political, economic, social order, is largely the expression and creation of the life of man. We were made in the image of God, and this implies that within limits and on an inferior level the powers of man correspond with the power of God. The social order is within limits man's creation: it carries on it the proof of human injustice, selfishness, cruelty, covetousness, lust. It does not give to every man according to his works.

The order of the material world does not at once inflict material penalties, does not at once confer material rewards according to men's deserts. Its political, economic, social order, does not inflict these penalties or confer these rewards. As yet the theory which dispenses with a future judgment is not proved.

Now let us pass from the environment of man to man himself that we may learn whether all the disorders that surround him have their compensations in the immediate rewards and penalties which come to him from the automatic laws of his own nature.

I will begin with the physical life of man.

It is true that there are certain forms of sin which are punished with physical disease. Habitual drunkenness has its physical penalties, and other grosser and more shameful vices bring in their train grosser and more shameful forms of suffering: the Nemesis is sometimes terrible; the secret offence is punished with open and public shame. But is it true that all physical suffering, even the sharpest and most agonizing, is the result of wrong-doing?

Is it true that physical suffering is measured by the degree of a man's moral guilt? Is a slight cold which occasions temporary inconvenience the infallible sign of a slight offence? And is a severe and prolonged attack of rheumatism the decisive proof that a man has broken two or three of the greater commandments?

If physical penalties come upon men according to the measure of their vices, and physical rewards according to the measure of their virtues, every saint should be a healthy athlete, and every sinner should be a miserable cripple; methods for the treatment of the sick would be methods for the treatment of a particular class of criminals, and to be in a hospital would be as disgraceful as to be in a gaol.

It is true, I say, that physical sufferings come upon some men for their wickedness, but physical sufferings not less severe come upon other men for unselfish devotion in the discharge of duty. The husband may lie in his bed for weeks, his strength wasted, his life in peril, as the result of his vices: the wife that watches him day and night with a love which his evil ways have not quenched may lose her own health and suffer physical agony for years as the result of her devotion to him.

One man becomes blind through his immoralities, another through his glorious passion for learning. The health of one man is broken because he has spent his days and nights in reckless vice, but the health of another man is broken because, with a feeble constitution, he has given his days and nights to the public service.

The illustrations are endless. The laws of our physical life do not automatically punish or reward us according to the moral character of our work.

Now let us pass to a higher level, where those who maintain this theory suppose that they find the stronghold of their position. It is alleged that we can really see in the moral and spiritual nature of man, if nowhere else, the action of the automatic laws which inflict, and begin to inflict at once, the adequate punishment for every act of sin, and confer, and begin to confer at once, the adequate reward for every act of goodness.

Can we? I should like to hear the proof.

It is said in reply that every offence against moral law is followed, and followed immediately, by injury to the moral life, and that the injury is exactly proportioned to the magnitude of the offence,—that every violation of the claims of God on our love, trust, reverence, obedience, is followed immediately by injury to the spiritual life, and that the injury is exactly proportioned to the magnitude of the violation.

Good moral habits are lessened by every immoral act, and as the result of one vicious indulgence a man is more likely to be guilty of another. His moral perception becomes less clear, his sense of the authority of the moral law is enfeebled, the power of conscience is diminished. And so the ascendancy of the spiritual life over the baser forces of our nature is shaken whenever we decline from our duty to God ; every act of spiritual unfaithfulness dims our vision of God, lessens the vigour of our loyalty to His Will, makes us more accessible to our next temptation and less able to resist it.

This, I say, is the stronghold of those who maintain that automatic laws reward and punish men according to their works. I have stated their case as clearly and fairly as I am able to state it.

I admit the facts, I deny the interpretation of the facts. It is true, no doubt, that every wrong act and word and thought is followed by a certain deterioration of the moral and spiritual life, and the peril of this deterioration is a serious reason for standing immovably firm in our fidelity to duty and to God. But I want to know whether this deterioration is the penalty and the adequate penalty of the act.

Let us try the principle in a concrete case or two ; perhaps I may be allowed to take very homely cases.

A schoolmaster discovers that yesterday a boy told a lie. The boy is called up to his desk, the lie is proved, the master is considering what punishment must be inflicted.

“ Sir,” says the boy, “ I have already been punished. Its full punishment has come upon me already.” How ? “ Why, sir, as I told you a lie yesterday I found it much easier to tell you another lie this morning, and I have told it.” On this theory the second lie ought to protect the boy from all other punishment for the first. He has already suffered deterioration of his moral nature.

Take another case. You find out that a housemaid of yours stole half a crown yesterday; you call her into your room, you begin to speak to her sharply, you warn her of the penalties of theft. Imagine her protesting against your severity, complaining of the injustice of your reproaches, alleging that she has been already punished, and adequately punished, for the theft. How? She answers that having stolen half a crown yesterday she has found it quite easy to steal half a sovereign this morning: her sin has punished itself by leading her to commit a greater sin. Will you apologise to her? Will you say that you did not know that she had already suffered so much, that you recall your hard words, and are very sorry that after the automatic laws had inflicted the adequate penalty you had added anything to the weight of her punishment. If the automatic laws inflict the adequate punishment, the defence is sound.

To affirm that since a man becomes a worse man as the result of every sin, this is an adequate punishment for his sin, is to play fast and loose with words and to pervert the clear declarations of conscience. Punishment includes pain, the loss of some good the man cares to have. It includes what is symbolically set forth in Scripture by the many stripes which are to punish great sin, the fewer stripes which are to punish sin of less gravity. It includes what is symbolically set forth by the weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth of those who by their sin and their rejection of deliverance from sin have incurred irretrievable ruin. It includes what is symbolically set forth by the fires which burn and destroy the chaff that has been separated from the wheat.

In this world that suffering is not inflicted. A saint suffers keener pain from the reproaches of conscience for a light sin committed thoughtlessly than a wicked man for gross crimes deliberately planned and relentlessly executed.

We shall be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad.

II.

The theory which I am discussing rests upon a confusion between physical laws and moral laws. They bear the same name, but in their nature and in the methods by which we come to know them they are widely different from each other. We discover physical laws by observation. To use the language of Mr. John Stuart Mill, "A certain fact invariably occurs whenever certain circumstances are present, and does not occur when they are absent; the like is true of another fact, and so on. . . . These various uniformities, when ascertained by what is regarded as a sufficient induction, we call in common parlance laws of nature. Scientifically speaking, that title is employed, in a more restricted sense, to designate the uniformities when reduced to their most simple expression."¹

To take an illustration. We observe that when the thermometer is at 32° water freezes. We call that a law. It always happens. Again, let the barometer stand at 30°, let the temperature be raised to 212°, and the water in an open vessel will begin to boil. But carry the water up a mountain, and it will begin to boil at a lower temperature, because the pressure of air on it is lighter. At the height of 18,000 feet it will boil at 180° instead of 212°. That is very inconvenient if you want to use it for cooking. When it begins to boil it gives off steam; if the vessel is open, the steam passes off, and then no matter how you may increase the heat of the fire the water becomes no hotter. It is boiling, but it is boiling at 180° instead of 212°, and it is not hot enough to cook your potatoes. That, I say, is very

¹ *Logic*, iii., c. iv. 1.

inconvenient, but there is no help for it. It is no use to argue with the water, to entreat it not to boil so soon, to point out the inconvenience to which you are put by its perverse habit. The law is absolute, inevitable.

Now consider the difference between that and any moral law—the law that men ought to tell the truth, for example. You do not discover the moral law in the same way. It is not based upon careful observations which show that men always tell the truth. It does not express any uniformity in the practice of men that has been established by a wide induction. If half, if two-thirds, of the human race were habitual liars, that would not make the law that men ought to tell the truth less certain.

If it can be shown that in a single case an alleged physical law breaks down, it is no law at all; under the same conditions, material things always behave in the same way, and the law is the scientific expression of how they behave. But a moral law does not express how men actually behave, but how they ought to behave. In short a physical law declares what is, what happens always, happens invariably; a moral law declares what ought to be, what ought to happen.

Let me illustrate the contrast.

Nero was afraid that his enemies who wanted to deprive him of the empire might find a useful instrument in his young stepbrother Britannicus, and so one day, when the boy was dining with him, he ordered poison to be put in the boy's wine, and Britannicus died. The poison acted precisely as it always acts under similar conditions. No physical law was violated by the boy's death; physical laws would have been violated if the boy had not died. But a moral law was violated. The moral law declared that Nero ought not to commit murder, and he defied it. There was no moral law that he did not break. He plundered where he did not murder, and his lust was shameless and

ungovernable. Moral laws he could violate, but physical laws are absolute ; even the power of an emperor of Rome could not shake their authority.

But you say that his violations of moral laws were punished, awfully punished, adequately punished, because they corrupted and ruined his moral life. That objection brings us back to the argument which I dealt with just now. Perhaps I may as well say a little more about it.

That every crime of which Nero was guilty made him more brutal is no doubt true. There are certain laws—structural laws they might be called—of our moral life which are the expression of uniformities as constant as those which are expressed by the laws of the physical universe, and Nero became a worse man as the result of every fresh wickedness. But the assassination of his mother cannot be described as the punishment of Nero for the poisoning of his stepbrother. Nor can the atrocity of his ingratitude in giving orders to Seneca to put an end to his own life be described as the punishment for his similar atrocity in murdering Burrus. In his successive crimes you cannot believe that he was exhausting the penalties for his previous deeds of injustice and cruelty and lust ; he was incurring fresh guilt, he was treasuring up to himself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.

In the present and visible order we can nowhere discover the automatic action of the moral laws which Nero violated. They were not automatic in compelling obedience ; they were not automatic in avenging the crimes which violated them.

Those who insist that the laws which sustain the order of human life inflict on men, and begin to inflict at once, the full penalty of their crimes, seem to forget that the divine order to which we belong rests on Christ, who is the propitiation for the sin of the world ; that we are not

under Law but under Grace. This was known even before the manifestation of Christ in the flesh. Jewish saints had discovered what we are asked to deny, "that God is long-suffering and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in mercy." They did not believe that they were in the iron grip of a relentless Justice, which seized them as soon as they sinned, and would never let them go until they had suffered the full penalty of their wrong-doing; but that, although the God they worshipped was a righteous God, He was ready to forgive. When they were forgiven they exclaimed, "As far as the east is from the west, so far hast Thou removed our transgressions from us."

And they meant just what they said. They meant that God had done it—done it at the impulse of His infinite mercy and compassion. They did not mean that they themselves, by moral amendment, had succeeded in slipping out of the iron hand which had seized them and tortured them. They did not mean that when they suffered they suffered from the action of automatic laws, and that when they ceased to suffer the automatic laws had ceased to punish. Such a conception of the order of the world would have made a Living God unnecessary. It would have been enough if He had constructed the great machine of the universe and left it to work. He might have passed away to regions of space too remote for the penitent cries of His unhappy creatures to reach Him, and yet when they confessed their sins and asked for His mercy they would have received remission. But they knew that He was near, and that when they entreated Him to be merciful He Himself answered and forgave them.

And this has been the faith of Christian men through eighteen centuries, a faith which has been verified in their experience. They have believed that they were not under the relentless control of an awful system of law, which inflicted on them by its automatic action the just penalties

of every sin, but under the rule of a God who was also a Father, and that the order of human life rested on a stupendous and mysterious sacrifice for the sin of the race. They have believed that they were living not in a prison, where every offence against the rules was at once and adequately punished, but in a home where a righteous Love, a loving Righteousness was supreme.

To declare that the order of human life rests on law—automatic law—not on grace—the grace of God revealed through our Lord Jesus Christ—is to dry up the fountains of Christian joy, to paralyse the strength of Christian faith, to deprive Christian obedience of the force which has been its mightiest inspiration, and to quench the glory of the Christian Gospel.

This theory of automatic laws which inflict, and begin to inflict at once, all the penalties which the sins of men deserve, and which confer, and begin to confer at once, all the rewards of righteousness, is not only a serious speculative error striking at the root of several great Christian doctrines, it places us in a wholly false relation to the actual conditions of life.

If we assume it as the basis of expectation, if we give it any authority over conduct, we shall be subjected to constant disappointment. There is no such certain and invariable connection in this life between sin and its penalty, between righteousness and what may seem to be its natural reward, as this theory affirms. Men may be honest, truthful, industrious, and skilful in their business, but commercial ruin may come upon them from the flagrant dishonesty of people whom they had a right to trust, or from political troubles on the other side of the world.

Acts of self-sacrificing generosity extending over many years are sometimes met with the most disgraceful ingratitude; a single deed of kindness which was done almost with-

out effort sometimes inspires an enduring devotion. One man, under the impulse of sudden temptation, is guilty of a slight offence ; he is treated harshly and ruined for life, ruined in fortune, ruined in character ; no chance is given him ; he is driven into misery, recklessness, despair. Another man is guilty, and guilty deliberately, of a far graver crime ; he is treated mercifully, his wrong-doing is concealed, his expressions of penitence are accepted and believed by the only persons who know of his fall, and his subsequent life is honourable and happy. The loyal, upright, zealous servant is distrusted by his employers and is never promoted ; the servant who cares nothing for his employer's interests, but humours his weaknesses, attains a partnership. A mere accident gives one man a great position, great honour, and great opportunities of usefulness, another man who has higher qualities is by a mere accident condemned to obscurity. Public honour comes to one man for public services which were not prompted by any strong desire to promote the public interest ; another man serves his country for years with an unsparing devotion, and through some misunderstanding or some jealousy his career has an inglorious close. Men do well, and suffer for it ; they do ill, and receive praise.

The truth is that during our mortal years we are under probation and discipline. The probation would be less searching, the discipline would be almost worthless, if the rewards of well-doing came to us as soon as we had done well, and if the lash of Justice descended as soon as we had done ill.

Can you remain honest, although while you are honest you have no chance of escaping from poverty, and although a very slight deflection from the line of righteousness would give you ease and wealth ? Can you continue, month after month, year after year, to put your whole strength into the duties of your profession although you are winning no

praise, and are often unjustly censured by people who are not competent to form a judgment on your work? Can you serve a man faithfully, serve him with your very best, although he never gives any sign of satisfaction and often makes unreasonable complaints? Can you see other people getting the honours of your work and still work as earnestly and zealously as if the honours came to yourself? Can you be persistent in your kindness though your kindness wins no gratitude? Can you continue to do well though all the immediate and visible rewards of well-doing which it would be very pleasant to receive are denied you? Can you endure injustice, slander, cruelty with impatience and without yielding to a spirit of revenge?

These are the tests of an incorruptible fidelity to God, to our fellow-men, and to conscience, and by these our fidelity is disciplined and perfected.

We are here to be subjected to these tests, and to be disciplined by them to the consummate righteousness for which God created us. Saints of other generations, whose names are an enduring inspiration and glory to the Church, were "hated of all men" for the sake of Christ; the heathen believed that they were guilty of the foulest and most flagrant crimes. In their days to be a Christian was to incur the worst infamy; the choice was given to them to revile Christ or to endure imprisonment and torture, to be flung to the lions, or to die a fiery death. A great chance came to them, and they met it with high courage, sometimes with exulting joy, and so they won their crowns.

To many in these times, though in forms which are less tragic and which appeal less powerfully to the imagination of mankind, there come, as I believe, chances equally great of proving their incorruptible fidelity to Christ, and in meeting the chances with an immovable fortitude the fidelity is perfected. Tests demanding not the decision of one heroic moment but the persistent faithfulness of weary

and exhausting years, tests under which we are not sustained by the presence of crowds of foes, whose very storm of hatred for Christ might provoke to an intenser flame the fires of an enthusiastic love for Him, nor by the presence of comrades and friends whose courage might sustain our own resoluteness and in whose presence we should be ashamed to fall, but which have to be endured in solitude and silence, the conflict and victory alike unknown,—these are in our days the probation and the discipline which have to be endured by many of us.

Automatic laws punishing sin and rewarding righteousness! Why, there are times when it seems to many of us as if there were no righteousness on the throne of the Supreme, as if God had forgotten not only to be gracious, but to be just. For these confusions we should do well to be prepared. We may rely on the grace and goodness of God to enable us to endure injustice but not to protect us from it; nor can we rely upon Him to give us immediate compensation for it. We may rely upon Him to compel the most adverse and cruel conditions of life to contribute to our fitness for ultimate glory and blessedness, but not to make the conditions less adverse or less cruel. Nor have we any sure, adequate grounds for believing that while these hard conditions remain He will give us an intenser joy that will make us almost unconscious of the pain inflicted by outward calamities; the joy, if given, might lessen both the effectiveness of the discipline and the decisiveness of the test.

And yet happiness and righteousness ought to go together, and loss and pain should be the penalty of sin. This is the indestructible conviction of the human heart. Where is the solution of the difficulty? The answer is to be found in the Christian doctrine of Judgment to come. Grace and law will be resolved into a transcendent unity. Those who have received the redemption which Christ has

achieved will be delivered by God's mercy from the awful penalties of their sin, and will inherit a glory transcending their deserts; and yet "we shall all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

And to those by whom the Christian redemption is finally rejected, the ruin of their destiny will be aggravated or lessened by the measure of their virtues or their crimes. The gloriously good will be princes, crowned and sceptred among the commonalty of the city of God; for the shamefully wicked there will be fathomless depths of gloom and of despair.

R. W. DALE.

CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT AND EVOLUTION.

5. SPENCER AND ARGYLL ON "ORGANIC EVOLUTION."

THE doctrine of Evolution being left in this apparently helpless condition by Salisbury and his opponents in the fields both of biology and geology, Mr. Herbert Spencer, the greatest champion of this philosophy, enters the arena in the number of the *Nineteenth Century* for November, 1895, and takes up the original issue as raised by Lord Salisbury. In doing so he at once dissociates evolution from Darwin's doctrine of Natural Selection, affirming that this is incompetent to account for the primary origin of living organisms or for their subsequent elevation. In truth even "Nature," as personified by Darwin, approaches too near to the character of a divinity to suit his nescience, and he prefers without her aid to imagine a purely fortuitous or necessary origin and progress of living beings by the interaction of the organism and its environment, which leads to the "survival of the fittest"; and he appeals to