

to the ages, or even if He had clothed a line of successive apostles with this authority, and this fact was clearly and unmistakably demonstrated, then, whosoever became Christ's loyal follower would, as a matter of course, accept such teachers as the infallible mouthpieces of God, and abide by their dicta without questioning or gainsaying. But no man should abide by such teachings if there was a legitimate doubt as to the fact of Christ having ordained and clothed them with such authority.

Just so, without such clear and minute directions from Christ concerning Peter, John, Luke or Paul, one cannot be loyal to Christ and accept them as clothed with equal authority with Christ, as teacher of ultimate truth to humanity. The utmost these can do is to report correctly the facts connected with the life of Christ, and the result to themselves in living out Christ's teachings, whilst the only relative advantage possessed by them, above others since their day, is in their nearness to the times of Christ, or being contemporaries of His.

SOME DOGMA CONCERNING THE INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES NE- CESSARY TO A CREED LIFE.

A creed life rejects, of necessity, the teaching of Christ concerning the Holy Ghost as the only ultimate teacher and guide to His people, and, therefore, must manufacture some substitute.

This substitute, generally speaking, is the infallible guidance of the New Testament writings, both with Roman Catholics and Protestants.

In the Roman Catholic Church, along with their dogma, is taught their complementary one, viz., that the Holy Ghost is the true interpreter of the Bible, but He is confined in His work to interpreting it to the collective Church as represented by its chief officer, that is, the Pope.

With many Protestants the work of the Holy Ghost, as interpreter of the Scriptures, is placed under such restrictions as to deprive the whole subject of

any *practical* importance, it becomes a mere embellishment of the creed.

This creed life demands, as before stated, infallible and universal authority to every part of the New Testament, otherwise there would be no *apparent* basis of faith for that life. Now it is this necessity which forces it to fly in the face of reason, common-sense and the Bible itself, in dogmatizing concerning whatever kind of inspiration it may please to adopt, for it truthfully exclaims, "Without my dogma about inspiration my creed is destroyed and my creed life is without foundation!" And just as Roman Catholicism delights to meet arguments against its fundamental doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope with pains and penalties rather than by fair argument, so will this creed life meet sober, convincing arguments, against its foundational dogma concerning inspiration. This battle, when it comes to the front, will not be characterized by sober argument and investigation on both sides, but anathemas and ecclesiastical pains and penalties will be resorted to by creedists as their favorite and most effectual weapons.

Why, then, it will be asked by some, do we apparently strive to awaken this conflict? Why not let the avalanche slumber peacefully on its cold mountain height? Even if a whisper would let loose its violence, let that whisper be suppressed. Is not a creed life a good thing in the absence of a better? Certainly. But seeing there is a better life provided in the Gospel, it is right and proper to preach this better Gospel at all hazards.

Shall men and women be robbed of their glorious heritage because, forsooth, the creedist everywhere will imagine, yea, know that in this Gospel of Pentecostal blessing his inferior life is threatened with extinction? He has the true remedy in his hands, which is exchanging the inferior for the better. Granted that, generally speaking, he will not adopt this sensible course, even as he did not in the days of Christ, but will the rather enter upon the insane course of antagonism; still all will not. And in this instance, securing the good of the few will justify braving the opposition of the