

pure, unadulterated word of God for all men.

When, then, they left out of the revised text the word fasting so as to make Mark IX. 29 read: "This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer," and left a similar verse altogether out of Matthew's gospel, they left out some of the inspired words of God. And so of many another passage. No wonder, therefore, that our confident questioner was greatly perplexed when we simply drew his attention to these things. And so will any stickler for the modern dogma of inspiration be put to his wit's ends to get around the difficulty.

The only way to get around it is to adopt the tactics of the cuttle-fish, which inks the sea around itself and then hides behind the darkened mixture. Who of all the theologians will meet such simple issues with short replies? Wordy explanations are needful for themselves even. For it is only after spinning a string of platitudes that they can assume that they themselves are sure of the truth of their dogma.

Just look again at the simplicity of the argument which overthrows all their wordy explanations. If only one version is the word of the Lord, then none others are, and as all the versions with which we are acquainted differ, it is impossible to correctly know which is the genuine word of the Lord.

If the original manuscript only is the true word of the Lord to man, we cannot apply any human rules to discover the original text amidst the multiplied variations. For as the word of the Lord is divine and not human, all the rules which scholars go by in discovering the original text of profane authors are out of place in searching for the divine text, seeing it cannot be shown that the divine would conform itself to the human idiosyncrasies of the writer. It would not be to search after Paul's opinions, but after what God told him, irrespective of his personal views.

For example, if there was some doubt as to the exact words which God spoke to Saul when on his way to Damascus, how would Paul's style of writing or his peculiar environment throw any light on the subject? These words of the Lord rush into his history as a something foreign to it all—like a freak in nature.

And such is the character of all personal revelations. How fix up the call of God to Abraham and clear it of inaccuracies by the ordinary methods of criticism? What about the word of the Lord to Samuel, when he was called on to utter his vengeful message to his foster-father, Eli? Did not this run counter to all his previous thoughts and imaginings? Indeed, if any rules of criticism could be applied to such messages from God it would be the rule of contraries; and so we should rather be suspicious of any passages of an inspired writer which would come under the ordinary rules of criticism, as giving signs of a human rather than a divine origin.

But all this snarl of perplexities is done away with when the Bible takes its proper place as a human production, but as the only book which contains the history of the word of the Lord to men culminating in the history of the first man who gave himself up in the absolute sense to be controlled, taught and guided by the word of the Lord alone.

WITCHERY.

THE history of Saul furnishes many a lesson to the close student.

Saul once knew the voice of the Lord and obeyed. When he did so, all went well. But the time came when he began to hesitate in his obedience, to temporize.

Impatience of delay in waiting for God's time lost him his kingdom in prospective. Half-hearted obedience sealed his doom. And then followed years of trouble, and finally destruction.