these experiences, coupled with their more thorough study of the questions discussed, the appellants ought to accept their teachings as authoritative, and abide by them as truth—truth of course in the form of correct interpretation of the Bible.

What is this, we ask, but claiming infallibility for a branch of the visible Church of Christ?

Now had the appellants, after listening to this scarcely disguised dogma of infallibility for the Church in assembly, paid a visit to the Methodist Conference, then in session, they might have heard, if occasion had called for it, claims equal to these, concerning consecration, piety and learning, but with deliverances concerning doctrine diametrically opposed to the deliverance of the Assembly concerning inbred sin.

Now, even if the Methodist Conference in the person of one of its leading members, did not claim infallibility in its teaching concerning doctrine, all the grounds for that claim, mentioned at the Assembly, would be found in equal strength. Therefore, for them to accept it as true on these grounds, in the one gathering, would require them to accept it as true in the other. We can then better imagine than describe their bewilderment concerning these contrary, although equally infallible, deliverances.

But the confusion would become still worse confounded if they visited other gatherings of equal, or even greater importance, in sister churches, for the contrary deliverances would only be multiplied and intensified, whilst according to the showing of this representative speaker, they all would be infallable teaching, unless there was implied by this speaker something which his modesty forbade him utter, viz.:—that infallability was confined to Presbyterian Assemblies.

But the marvellous thing was, that this assumption, worthy of the dark ages, and so compromising to the Presbyterian Church, was not at once repudiated by some leading man on behalf of the Assembly, and not permitted by silence to receive its quasi sanction.

## WHAT IS SPIRITUALITY!

The answers to this question are very various, but they can all be brought under two heads or divisions, viz.: those which make spirituality represent some essence or quality subsisting in one's being, and those, or rather that—for there are no varieties in this division—which represents an attitude or action of the believer.

Much labor has been expended in striving to get some answer under the first division which has a positive something in it which can be clearly defined, but, thus far, we think, with indifferent success. Nor, do we believe that success will ever reward labor in this direction, for it will ever prove an effort to define a nonentity?

One maintains that so soon as a sinner comes to God and obtains converting grace, a spiritual element is introduced into his being which begins at once to antagonize his naturally depraved nature; now, if his will is more and more enlisted on the side of this spiritual entity and against the evil essence, the man, who is the battle ground of this interminable warfare, will become more and more spiritual. Hence the effort to define spiritual in this creed is the labor to get hold of this spiritual entity and explain what it really is. Then, if this ethereal quality or essence is connected in thought with the man himself, you have a spiritual man.

According to this theory spiritual is not a positive, definite quantity, and so admits of endless comparison as spiritual, more spiritual. But whilst the comparative degree goes on as an ever changing quantity, the superlative absolute can never be reached.

Now, according to this creed, the weakest, the most imperfect believer, is a spiritual man, and the one to whom the apostolic direction is given, "If any man be overtaken in a fault, ye that are spiritual restore such an one." Again, it would not apply to the Apostle Paul when in the seventh chapter of Romans describing, according to the teachers of this creed, his own Christian experience, "But I am carnal, sold under sin."

This difficulty is attempted to be over-