

close to our teaching, it after all taught another gospel, and so was utterly and radically different from our writings. The editor of one of our exchanges wrote to us to learn the name of the periodical from which we had clipped said article, but as we had forgotten we had to reply to this effect. What was our surprise to find this identical article, minus our remarks, published in his paper, and also in tract form, but credited to the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS.

Now, we ask, could the fact that this editor was a conspicuous professor and evangelist in the holiness movement change the character of that unrighteous act? No more can the claim to walk in the Spirit be allowed in any case to change the nature of any act from unrighteousness to righteousness. Much less can the mere effort to substitute lawlessness for legalism be allowed its claim to exhibit true spirituality.

One takes an attitude in an assembly which contrasts with all others. Now the bare fact that said party has discovered that the postures of the assembly are legalistic will not make this his posture unlegalistic. Indeed, unless clearly the result of obedience to the Holy Spirit it must partake of the nature of legalism in its intensest form, namely, lawlessness.

So, too, it is quite possible, because of former loyalty to traditional teaching, to become unduly suspicious of all traditions, but this is credulity in its intenser forms. A truth in fact may have as great a claim on our acceptance although it comes to us as a tradition, as if it were the conscious offspring of our reason or observation, nay, even a distinct revelation to us from the Spirit. He, therefore, who permits the general unreliability of tradition to influence his mind in examining into any isolated fact or truth, wrapped up, or even said to be wrapped up, in a tradition, has permitted himself to be swung to an opposite extreme, and so is not able to prove all things and hold fast that which is good.

MAN is not merely the architect of his own fortune, but he must lay the bricks himself.

OUR WORK IS OF GOD.

It is constantly said by the enemies of this Pentecostal movement that it is of the devil.

Persons who have attended our meetings and have become interested in them, and beginning to enquire about the work of the Holy Ghost, with more or less longing to become acquainted with Him, have been met by the enemy of the movement, who sometimes, alas! is their pastor, and in vigorous terms have been warned against the teaching, and told that it is as black as the pit.

In one or two notable instances the attempted proof of this statement has been by impeaching the character of the President of the Canada Holiness Association with falsehoods a hundred times refuted, and in most instances by holding up some person or persons as a warning, who in professing this experience of a constant walk with God, have been reported as saying some strange things.

I propose in this paper to give some, to me, conclusive reasons that this movement is of God and not of the devil.

And first, the very fact that it is said to be of the devil is one of the evidences, taken with others, that it is of God. The enemies of Jesus, his persecutors, and finally his murderers, were the priests and others appointed by God as His representatives, and Jesus warned His disciples that what they had done to Him they would do to His followers.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the Church of God, while being the organization through which He carries on His work, at the same time has always been the barrier through which that work has been impeded.

The blood of the martyrs has been shed by the visible Church, and not by the world. Professional priests and preachers have often, in all the ages, and especially in the Christian dispensation, been the enemies of men who walk with God.

The same spirit that now opposes this work, lit the fires of Smithfield Market, and burned Ridley and Latimer at the stake. A professional priest or preacher, if he has authority in the Church of God, and does not himself walk with