

that the writings of Paul, as they have come down to us, be excepted as infallibly correct as to letter, word and sentence, save only where some undoubted proof is afforded by new discoveries of ancient manuscripts which effect the letter without touching the inherent original accuracy and absolute perfection of the original production. To even give birth to the public utterance of a suspicion that Paul ever made a mistake like that on the face of this verse must be pronounced on, without investigation, as a deadly sin, and therefore unforgivable by all true, orthodox Christians.

For our part, having once for all, years ago, braved this orthodox bogie, we have become so convinced of its flimsy superstitious character that we not only smile at its fancied terrors but also at our former superstitious awe in its ghostly presence. Just as when one has surmounted the prevailing fears concerning a reputed ghost, and by fearless examination has found his ghostship to resolve itself into some natural object acted on by moonlight or comparative darkness, we now handle such matters as the consideration of this or any other part of Paul's writings. We examine them precisely as we do those of Wesley, Luther or Augustine.

Hence we infer that the anacronism of this verse may be the outcome of carelessness on the part of the writer, or of his copyists, or both, but in any case it is a trifling matter, and as such will be treated by all, excepting by those who are still in the thralldom of a ghostly superstition concerning the *inerrancy* of all *Scripture*.

THE GUARDIAN AND MR. TRUAX.

WE DO not take up our pen to champion friend Truax. Of this there is no need. We simply do so to utilize one expression of his critics, for it is food for thoughtful remarks. "He finds it convenient to omit that he maintained that we must know the will of the Father just as well as He knew it in order to do it."

We pass by the open accusation of intentional concealment, or omission for dishonest purpose, as simply characteristic of the writer of the criticism. Certainly we must know the will of the Father as Jesus did if we are to do the will as He did, for if not then would we far surpass him in succeeding. This is so evident that it is necessarily implied He that doeth the will of the Father must know that will, or as Paul puts it—know that good and acceptable and *perfect* will of God.

Now if Jesus knew the will of the Father better than we can know it then is there a serious defect in his character if he taught that we should imitate Him in doing the will of God. And for Dr. Dewart or any other religionist to bewail his manifold failures whilst subscribing to this characterization of Jesus is to be a party in the attempted fraud.

Just look at the question from this standpoint, and the true inwardness of the thoughts of the editor about Christ will appear. Every time he regrets in penitential words his failure to imitate Christ in doing the will of the Father, he virtually laments his inability to learn the will of the Father, implying, if he is an honest man that if he only knew the will of the Father as well as Jesus did, he, too, would do it. Are not contrition and self accusation wrong, yea, foolish here? Fancy a person looking admiringly at the flight of an eagle heavenward and then bewailing his manifold failures to do the same thing, in a self-accusing spirit!

Hence, whilst this editor goes back from our conclusions to our premises, and he has a right to so do, we also insist on his facing necessary conclusions from his premises. He declares that he cannot know the perfect will of God, then he cannot do this perfect will. Well then, we demand that his conduct correspond with this his belief, and we henceforth righteously accuse him, not only of foolish acts, but of downright hypocrisy when in his public or private prayers he confesses, as sins,