

Moses' miraculous plagues upon the Egyptians are no evidence of Moses' divinity. His striking the rock and the water gushing forth required as much supernatural power as turning water into wine. Commanding the sun and moon to stand still is only on a par with Jesus' miracles. Then why not content ourselves with being what Jesus was, doers of God's will.

H. DICKENSON.

CRITICISM.

QUR sermons, lectures, and addresses—our appeals, prayers, and *even words* must be impressive, penetrating, and irresistible under the inspiration and touch of the Holy Ghost.—*King's Messenger*.

Why single out "words" here? "Even our words must be impressive, etc." Are not our words as important as prayers, as sermons, as addresses? Then what about actions? Must they not be irresistible also? If by our fruits we shall be known, surely actions have as much to do with fruits as words.

Then regarding "harping on one string," having a "one idea hobby, etc." the editor of the same paper says "that he cannot hold his peace," and amongst other terms, he applies to himself the term "infatuated." We would hesitate before applying this term to him. We don't think a sober minded Christian, one who properly represents Christ in this world, can justly be charged with being "infatuated."

"We also wish we could multiply ourselves over and over again." If this editor has the desire of his heart constantly, why is it that he has not this his wish about the multiplication of himself gratified?

He says: "refuse the Holy Ghost's guidance in one thing, and it interferes with the action of our faith."

We can scarcely imagine the results of the catastrophe, did the Holy Ghost ask the editor to obtain guidance apart from "the word"—or teach him anything but the words of Jesus?

The greatest study in the "Word of God" this writer says, is the "work of the Holy Spirit."

But what about the work of the Holy Spirit apart from the Bible? Are the words of teaching of the "Teacher" not the word of God as much as the Bible? If so, then why this stereotyped reference to the "Bible" as "the" Word of God?

Where he says "we will desire nothing else but the Holy Ghost," we were led on reading this to wonder what about the Bible in this connection? We wonder if it was a possible or an impossible work for the Holy Ghost to cause this writer not only to desire nothing else, but to obtain nothing else but God, to the utter exclusion of the Bible. He says it is one of the brightest signs of the times, that men are "searching the scriptures" and "studying the word" under Holy Ghost teaching.

Again we ask, whether the past recorded words of Jesus and the Apostles are of more importance than the present utterances of the Holy Ghost?

We also cannot help characterizing the terms "unique organ" and "Mother God" when applied to the Holy Ghost, as at least "peculiar."

Then where he refers in "alliance parlance" to Jesus as saviour, healer, sanctifier and coming king, and limits the operation of the Holy Ghost to that of Teacher, we cannot help but wonder where the Kingship of the Holy Ghost comes in. His monarchy is only a limited one—limited to that of teaching. And if we are in the attitude of waiting for a coming king, we must be living in an interregnum—a period without a king.

We have also got to where we almost invariably interpret the use of such quotations as "sanctify me by thy truth," "taking of the things of Jesus," as meaning that the Holy Ghost can do no sanctifying where the Bible is not the means—that is, the puny hand of man would limit the operations of God.