

quirer may ask, can the Spirit lead a person to break the positive injunction of Jesus, "do this?" Do what? Luke records that Jesus said before Pentecost, "Eat bread." John just as positively records, "Eat flesh." Luke says, "Drink wine." John says, "Drink blood." Which are we to obey? And if we must "drink wine," because Luke records that Jesus said we had to; must we not drink blood, because John records that Jesus said we had to; must we not wash one another's feet, because John recorded that Jesus said, "If I, then the Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that ye also should do as I have done to you." And what about those words of the Lord Jesus, as recorded by Matthew, chap. vi. 17, "But thou when thou fastest anoint thy head and wash thy face?" Did not Jesus set us an example in this respect also by fasting forty days? And did not they fast after Pentecost when the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul, and when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them they sent them away." If these "prophets and teachers, as they ministered to the Lord fasted," why should there not be just as punctilious observance of fast days now, as of sacrament days? It is quite true that when the Lord Jesus inaugurated this, the Spirit's dispensation, we were to be no longer under bondage to the letter that killeth, but to the Spirit that quickeneth, that the Spirit was to take the place of Jesus, that the words of the Spirit were to be to us what the words of Jesus were to those who lived before the advent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, that on the matter of the fulfilment of the whole law of which not one jot or one tittle was to pass away till all be fulfilled, we were to have absolute trust that this would take place under the guidance of the Spirit, that it would be apparent to the one who walked in the Spirit, that the Spirit could not come into collision with any of the recorded sayings of Jesus that were binding upon the generations, that all the words of Jesus which include the Mosaic law would be perfectly safe in the hands of

the Holy Ghost to take of them and reveal them to us just as Jesus revealed the law in His day. Is there anything wrong about this? Is not this teaching Scriptural? If not, let it be pointed out. The columns of the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS are open, we have no doubt, to those who have a more excellent way to discourse about. Let some of those who are ready to denounce the Editor of the EXPOSITOR and his teachings have the courage of their convictions and right the wrongs. Explode the false teachings, unearth the delusions, heresies and fanaticism with which, according to the verdict in popular holiness quarters, this magazine abounds. Let some of the champions of orthodox holiness hasten to keep those other words of the Lord Jesus, to go and show their brother his fault between thee and him alone. Then if the brother be not gained in that way, take one or two with them, then tell it to the Church through the official Church organ or otherwise. Then let the EXPOSITOR people be as the heathen and the publican. Be sure and don't let them be as the latter till every one of the former words of the Lord Jesus be fulfilled.

We have been expostulated with some ourselves by officials of the Presbyterian Church. They insist upon us coming to the table of the Lord. We have no scruples in the matter. But we require a "thus saith the Lord" for the same. We could go fifty times a year for that matter. But is it not peculiar that the same Church for the same belief as to absolute guidance of the Holy Ghost and for having the temerity or hardihood of acting up to their belief, suspended the "seven alleged Galt heretics" from the privileges of the Lord's table—the same branch of the Protestant Church, through its officials, insisting upon some coming to, and others staying from, the Lord's table for the same cause? How is this? Is it orthodoxy? Then orthodoxy and consistency have parted company. Officialism lays claim to large liberty here. We await explanation as to whether liberty is not supplanted by license in this instance. Possibly some of the fathers and brethren will condescend to explain. We patiently await developments.