

ahead of the "back numbers" who originated the creeds. And yet the authorities are not a unit about this matter. Principal Grant, of Queen's College, says of the "Westminster Confession," that what was the best outcome or experience of those who wrote it, is made the test for all succeeding generations. This certainly should not be. And yet the editor of *The Canada Presbyterian* dares not say so, without awaking the antagonism and wrath of all the "moss backs" in his denomination. Possibly the terms "moss back" and "back number" are too expressive to suit the fastidious taste of some Expositor readers. They don't believe in calling a spade a spade. They could have given Jesus some healthy advice on the matter of "calling names." He should not have called the Scribes a "generation of vipers,"—Paul should not have called Elymas "a son of the devil" or the high priest "a whited wall."

But we must not commence moralizing on names else some one will be "worrying."

"Walking in the Spirit" might be tried as an antidote for "worry." Of course "walking in the Spirit" does not necessarily mean fulfilling all the injunctions of church courts, creeds, etc. But it does mean that liberty to disobey church courts or go contrary to the creeds must be obtained from the Spirit.

"Stayed upon Jehovah,"

[In other words, being "Divinely Guided"]

"Not a surge of worry

Not a shade of care,

Not a blast of hurry

Touch the spirit there."

H. DICKENSON.

The care of no bird that flutters over her nest to feed her young, and the care of no mother who watches the cradle of her babe, is to be compared with God's tender care for us.—*United Presbyterian.*

"DANGER AHEAD" AGAIN.

IN the *Guardian* of Jan. 17th we find the following among the editorial notes, "Phrases in Genesis and other books of the Old Testament which refer to something later than the time of the narrative are given in proof of the late date of the books in which they occur. *That these may be explanatory words added by a later copyist is a natural explanation.*"

Italics ours. What is to become of the church if such liberties are taken with the Bible as this editorial suggestion implies? If later copyists have added *explanatory* words, how are said words to be detected? And if words and sentences have been *added*, have not many words been *subtracted* from the originals also? And if the undoubted fact of there having been additions to and subtractions from the original documents is to be appealed to in support of the orthodox view, have not the critics of orthodoxy the same right of appeal? For instance, if Dr. Dewart defends the historic accuracy of the Old Testament writings, despite discrepancies and contradictions, on the ground of later additions of copyists, why may not "that man Dickenson" call in question the doctrine of the miraculous conception on the ground that the account given in Matthew is most likely an interpolation, seeing so little is said about the matter elsewhere, either by Evangelists or Apostles?

Those who look for God in a book (where no God can be found any more than in a stone image) are being gradually driven into the saddest straits. There was when mother church would have it that the translated Bible was exactly correct in every particular. Criticism has compelled her to give up this view, and she now takes refuge in the no less indefensible and useless dogma that the originals were free from every particle of error.

The only merit of this dogma seems to