

claim this fact; but unless he tests the matter personally his teaching power stops short at this point. It must be impossible for him to teach anything concerning the experience of the fact, or adapt himself in teaching power to the needs of one who has entered into the experience. Such an one is as much beyond his reach as a teacher as the Greek student is beyond the teacher who has never studied that language; nay, more so.

So, too, of walking in the Spirit. Any teacher of religion who is sufficiently conversant with his Bible can formulate a creed concerning this thing, if it be only the bare statement of the fact as a Bible truth. But unless he actually walks in the Spirit himself, it is utterly beyond his power to teach him who does. Would not the contrary statement be as absurd as the other cases considered? All Christian teachers, then, who only can talk *about* Pentecost, clearly are incompetent to instruct those who know it as an experience.

Granted their power of instruction in many, yea, all other directions, still it is axiomatic that concerning the experience of Pentecost and continued walk in the Spirit, they cannot be teachers, from the necessities of the case. It matters not, then, how teachable the subject they may have to deal with, or how anxious themselves to teach, the attitude of the pupil cannot in the least degree change these facts, nor yet can the assumptions or voluntary humility of the would-be teacher affect the situation in the slightest. A man cannot impart knowledge to another beyond what he personally knows.

We expect in the course of time to see much priestly pretension and bluster exhibited over this inexorable fact, but it will affect the fact about as much as the anathemas of the Pope affected the fact of the earth revolving around the sun.

A great deal of sentimental nonsense has been written about the duties of professors of holiness towards pastors and teachers who either opposed or taught the impossibility of living a holy life, the undisguised object of all which was to urge men and women to admit the impossible, or act out a lie.

What is necessary for the present times is to get down to hard common sense in this as well as in other matters, and we maintain that it is impossible to touch bottom in the ordinary exercise of our judgment unless every vestige of transcendental trash is flung out upon the rubbish heap.

But will not, say some timorous souls, the bringing out this truth tend to undermine the authority of the pulpit, and breed lawlessness and want of respect in the pew? Well, all we have to say concerning such fears is, that if respect for the pulpit is built on a falsehood, the sooner it is destroyed the better. Any pulpit which is not founded on truth is not founded on Christ, the embodiment of truth, and therefore is not the *Christian* pulpit.

But we also maintain that healthy, common-sensed views entertained here are best for all concerned. The man who occupies a pulpit, and can give the voucher of examining boards as to his mental power and discipline is clearly capable, other things being equal, to teach concerning the letter of the Bible and Bible truth, and as such is valuable, and saint and sinner can gain positive advantage from his superior literary acquirements. If along with these acquired gifts he possesses eloquence and unction, he becomes still more desirable as a teacher.

Again, if his Church vouches for his experience of converting grace, we have the right to expect that he can be helpful both to saint and sinner concerning this thing. And, moreover, according to his growth along this line of development, so can he be a teacher of the deep things of God. But if he has failed to advance, if his experience is confined to this starting point, then, of course, his powers of teaching are limited to this his experience; much more if he has gone back, is back-slidden in heart or life, is he circumscribed in his teaching powers. And will not, we ask, those who have need of teaching beyond this point of experience realize that he is unfurnished for this work? What priestly arrogance on his part can conceal the fact, or what church or denominational ordinances can supplement his lack, or trick an honest