

to reclaim him, but to warn all other dogs, especially good ones, that they may shun him.

We humbly submitted that we understood it to be the especial business of all good dogs to save or reclaim the bad ones, and particularly those who erred through ignorance, but to this we got no answer. So we went our way, pondering deeply the strange conduct of some dogs.

A. TRUAX.

TAKING THINGS FOR GRANTED.

Well, we would have a queer time of it if we did not take things for granted, and go on our way in this faith.

What if when we were young we had refused to take what our parents and guardians said, without exhaustive investigation. If as scholars we had refused to accept the dicta of our teachers as ultimate truth, what possibility of progress would have been left? And even in our riper years how absolutely necessary it was to take the bulk of our knowledge for granted, and act upon it in perfect faith.

Even some things which we may now reject, we, in former years, took for granted, simply because others did the same. And this gives colour to the suspicion that there are still some things in our creeds, which, after some future investigation, may be eliminated therefrom.

The pendulum of human thought, nay, even of conviction, ever tends to swing from one extreme to the opposite, and hence we expect to see some who have heretofore been extreme in their acceptance of, and attachment to, traditional dogmas, or implicit in their obedience to recognized human teachers, swing off into the opposite direction, until they exhibit a tendency to accept dogmas as true, from the simple fact that they profess to be the negatives of formerly accepted creeds.

Now if the subject be fully examined this latter tendency will be found to be tenfold worse than the other, for whilst it is foolish not to give up a good thing

for a better, it is decidedly more silly to part with it for what is inferior.

Granted that legalism is greatly inferior to spiritualism, nevertheless it is, in a much greater ratio, better than lawlessness?

Apply these thoughts to the possibility of evil, *apparently* resulting from this revolutionary movement, and he is a very superficial observer who does not see this evil threatening us in every direction.

We preach that by deeds of the law no flesh can be justified, that is that no one by the use of church services, Christian works, or private devotional exercises, can live a justified life in the sight of God and man. How natural, then, it is to denounce all such legalisms as utterly worthless in themselves, and maintain that there is real virtue in refraining & together from their practice.

But such sweeping assertions, if acted on generally, would tend to disorganize society, because apparently destroying the pains and penalties connected with disobedience to law.

Now what must be deprecated when witnessed in the community as a whole, cannot be right in individuals.

It follows then, that whilst he who exchanges legalism for spirituality is to be rejoiced over, he who exchanges it for lawlessness is not only an object for the exercise of our pity but also at times for our just indignation. He then who accounts for his ability to live righteously, that is, a justified life, by his acceptance of the Holy Ghost in the Pentecostal sense, must awaken our admiration, and draw us to him in the unity of the Spirit, but he who undertakes to account for unrighteous conduct by a professed walk in the Spirit, not only does not justify his unrighteousness by such a profession, but should awaken our utmost sense of indignation and unqualified repudiation. It matters not how slight the departure from rectitude, this law of repudiation must hold good, for there are no exceptions to this rule.

We once republished a thoughtful and well written article, clipped from one of our exchanges, for the purpose of showing, by lengthened remarks upon it, that although it seemed to approach