

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR. POSTAGE PAID BY PUBLISHER.

JUNE, 1893.



Toronto:

Published under the Auspices of the Canada Holiness Association.

THE EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
The Divinity of Christ.....	305	One Sided Statements—H. Dickenson.....	321
What of Divinity Theories.....	306	A Few Plain words—H. Dickenson.....	322
What of His Humanity.....	308	Divine Guidance—T. S. Linscott.....	324
What about the Birth of Christ.....	310	Heresy Hunters—H. Dickenson.....	325
"The Land of Settled Questions".....	313	The Keswick Convention—E. McMahon.....	326
Christianity as Hero Worship.....	315	Our Brother—J. D. Albright.....	327
Way Notes.....	316	How to Keep Converted—B. Sherlock.....	327
The Unholy Spirit—B. Sherlock.....	318	Inbred Sin—B. Sherlock.....	329
The Truax "Heresy"—A. Truax.....	320	Index to Vol. XI.....	331

CALENDAR OF ASSOCIATION MEETINGS.

Every Tuesday, at 3 p.m., at 99 Howard St. A hearty invitation is extended to all to attend this meeting. Friends are free to come late or leave early when they are not able to remain during the whole service, which usually continues for two hours. Strangers in the city will easily find the place by taking any Sherbourne St. car as far as Howard St. and a very little enquiry at that point will suffice to find it.

Every Saturday evening, at 8 p.m., in the parlors of the W. C. T. U. building, on the north-east corner of Elm and Terauley Streets. Parties leaving the Yonge Street cars at Elm Street, by walking one block west, will find the building on the first corner on the north side. A bulletin board is usually at the front of the building.

Every Sunday, at 3 p.m., at the residence of Mrs. McMahon, 301 Parliament Street.

Otterville, at the residence of H. Titus, every Monday, at 8 p.m.

Hagersville, at the residence of Erastus Hagar, every Saturday, at 8 p.m.

Galt, at the residence of J. K. Cranston, 24 Oak Street, Sunday, 3 p.m.

London, every Sabbath, at the residence of Bro. Couke, 243 Wellington St. S. E. at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

Hamilton, at the residence of Miss Fitzpatrick, 44 Gore Street, every Friday, at 8 o'clock p.m.

Linwood, in Band Room, rear of the Methodist Church, every Saturday, at 7.30 p.m. Leader Bro. Kennedy.

Markdale, every Sabbath, at 10 a.m., and every Tuesday, at 8 p.m., at the residence of H. A. Harris.

Cross Hill, every Friday evening, at the residence of William Petch.

Bothwell, at the residence of Mrs. Kerr, Tuesday, 3 p.m.

Hawtreys, every alternate Sunday evening.

Evanston, Ill., at 19 Chicago Ave., every Tuesday at 8 p.m.

Chicago, Ill., at 361 Sixty Third Street, every Thursday, at 8 p.m.

THE SO-CALLED "GALT HERESY CASE."

THIS book, containing a full account of the trial of the Galt friends, with two remarkable letters written by an independent onlooker can be had by applying to J. K. CRANSTON, Galt, Ont. The original price, 25 cents, has now been reduced to 10 CENTS PER COPY, or \$1.00 per dozen. Reader, can you not accomplish something in this Revival by distributing some of them?

The Expositor of Holiness.

VOL. XI.

JUNE, 1893.

NO. 12.

HOW do the rivulets find their way?
How do the flowers know the day
And open their cups to catch the ray?

I see the germ to the sunlight reach,
And the nestlings know the old bird's speech;
I do not see who is there to teach.

I see the hare from danger hide,
And the stars through the trackless spaces ride,
I do not see they have a guide,

He is eyes for all, who is eyes for the mole;
All motion goes to the rightful goal,
O God! I can trust for the human soul.

—Amcs.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

IT seems to us that the time has come to write somewhat exhaustively on this subject from the standpoint of the teaching of the Association. We do so with the full expectation that our writings will be a disappointment to many, both in the Association and out of it.

It is extremely difficult to place others on the standpoint whence we look at the question, nay, it is impossible as far as we are concerned, and, as from any other point of observation, our writings cannot be understood, hence the obvious reason of this disappointment.

This point of observation is *divine guidance* as taught by the Association, to wit, that the Holy Spirit is the one and only direct, ultimate teacher of the true follower of Jesus Christ. Therefore it is that all true knowledge of, or concerning Jesus Christ, must be directly from the Holy Ghost as a *personal* revelation.

Many persons hastily accept this as true, but show the imperfect nature of their belief in the truth of it so soon as some of the legitimate deductions from their professed belief face them in practical form.

What are the necessary deductions from this basal truth of the Association

with reference to this subject in hand? Manifestly that the whole subject of the divinity of Christ Jesus, including all its details is not a *vital* question. That is, it is one on which we may differ widely and yet be His true followers.

The only fact which can possibly vitiate the foregoing statement must be, in the nature of things, that Jesus Christ Himself distinctly and clearly put some limitations on the Holy Spirit concerning this thing. But as he did not, therefore this proposition must be absolutely true if Jesus taught that the Holy Ghost was to be our *only* teacher and guide into all truth.

Not only did Jesus put no limitations upon the Spirit in this direction, but it so happens that He directed special attention to the work of the Spirit concerning this very thing: "In that day ye shall know that I am in the Father." Nothing is clearer than that this deliverance implied that we can only understand His relation to the Father through the Holy Spirit.

It is true that this simple statement of the world's Redeemer has been loaded down with a mass of theological theories which has rendered it obscure and still impedes the truth-searcher in examining the claims of the Spirit as our only guide. For example, it is implied by all Trinitarians, now-a-days, that *their* definitions and dogmas concerning the divinity of Christ are absolutely true, so true that it is a deadly heresy to doubt or question them, and therefore that when Christians are taught of the Spirit, then He, the Holy Ghost, will confirm to them these theological dogmas, and so they will simply, by this means, become more established in the truth—their truth. Woe to the party who dares to say that the Holy

Ghost teaches him differently. At once such an one is pronounced on as led of the devil.

In the days of Christ religionists made merchandise of men, but the modern religionists are more daring, for they attempt to make the Holy One their servant through whom they mount upon the superstitions of men and women to place and power.

But the question is put forward here, how can one learn of the Holy Spirit as the only teacher excepting through faith in Christ as divine after the pattern of modern teaching? Our own personal teaching and experience are brought forward to strengthen this thought. We reply that the manner of one's gaining knowledge concerning the Holy Spirit, as guide supreme, has not *necessarily* anything to do with the results of that knowledge. Arriving at this practical knowledge as a Trinitarian, Unitarian or Universalist, for example, need not, to any appreciable extent, hinder all the blessed experiences of the knowledge and acceptance of the Spirit as supreme teacher being realized. Whatever would be best in each individual case would be the certain outcome of walking in the Spirit.

But if it is true that Jesus is divine after the teaching of the extremist doctrine of Trinitarianism, would not every one who accepts the Spirit as supreme teacher know this fact, yea, be established therein? Not necessarily, unless there is some authoritative revelation which makes such presumed truth essential to salvation. And as there is no such authoritative utterance the question cannot be answered authoritatively. No one has the Heaven given right to dogmatize in any direction concerning the matter.

From all of which it is evident that, to one who accepts the Holy Spirit as absolute guide, all questions concerning this subject must be dismissed as non-essential. Granted the truth of this one fact, viz., the Holy Spirit as our one and only guide,

then it would not cease to be a fact if one should believe that Jesus, from the cradle to the grave, was consciously engaged with the Father in regulating the Universe. Nor would this central truth be necessarily destroyed though one in his study of Christ should come to the conclusion that in all respects He was, from cradle to grave, an ordinary man, the only difference between Him and His co-temporaries being that He alone amongst them walked in the Spirit in the absolute sense, and the only difference between him and those who, since Pentecost, walked in the Spirit, was His being *first* amongst many brethren. That is, the *only* essential fact in Christianity is the walk in the Spirit.

WHAT OF DIVINITY THEORIES.

WE maintain that no one can truthfully discount the spiritual walk of another because said party holds tenaciously any one of these theories as true. What if he proves to himself to a demonstration that Jesus was consciously Almighty, having no beginning and no end, and that there was no break in his conscious knowledge thereof even when he walked this earth as man, would such a result of theological investigation necessarily change for him the glorious fact of Pentecost? We trow not. Nay, if the Father Himself had taken any conceivable or inconceivable shape and called the attention of man to the Spirit's dispensation and its glorious possibilities to us as individuals, still would this blissful fact of facts be ours.

Had one of the mediæval Alchemists learned the secret of how to change the baser metals into gold, to him it would have been a non-essential as to how he learned it, whether through dreams, experiments or accident. The fact of having learned the secret would have been to him the only essential truth concerning the whole matter. So of us who have discovered the mystery hid and then hid again in the ages. So we can study the divinity

side of this question with restful nerves and complacency of spirit.

Bro. Truax, in his recent articles, has shown how utterly useless to us would be the life of Christ as an example if the least trace of the divine entered into the make up of Jesus provided He should have been made conscious of it after some manner unknown to us.

But then one asks, could we not get on without the example of Christ? Certainly, we reply, at least that is our opinion. Could Jesus not have imparted, we ask, these secrets of Pentecost to His disciples and then let them be our examples? To some minds, it is true, the legitimate results of such teaching concerning Christ would be astringing of absurdities. But what of that? To other minds, constituted somewhat differently, these absurdities might not appear.

Hence it must be evident to all that he who has arrived at the conclusion that any or all the modern theories or definitions of the divinity of Christ are not proved, and at the same time would teach this, his conclusion as essential truth, in that fact he would make evident to all that he himself did not illustrate the walk in the Spirit.

Apply this general truth to particular individuals and its value will at once be apprehended. Two writers in the pages of the EXPOSITOR have taken *apparently* widely different positions on the question. One brings to the fore the divinity of Christ and pours a very hail of questions, in logical sequence, on those holding the ordinary orthodox notions concerning His divinity.

Now, granted that this writer walks in the Spirit after the pattern of the teaching of the Association, then it follows as a certainty that he cannot discount the professed walk in the Spirit of the other writer, one iota, because of his different conclusions concerning the same subject. Nay, if he even should teach that these so called orthodox views concerning the divinity of Christ must necessarily hamper

or impede his walk in the Spirit, this contention on the part of the first writer alluded to, cannot but discount his own professed spiritual walk. The very right he demands to investigate fully and independently, to be a proper demand includes the right of the other to arrive at conclusions entirely different from his own, without in the slightest degree interfering with his personal walk with God.

But the converse of this proposition is also true, viz., that the latter writer in establishing to his satisfaction his theory or definition of the divinity of Christ, however it may differ from that of the first writer, cannot, as one of the results of his investigations, discount the professed walk in the Spirit of the other because of differing conclusions on this question, without in that act proving to all onlookers that he himself fails to exemplify the true walk in the Spirit. Nay, if he, too, even teaches that the other would succeed better in his spiritual walk by adopting his, the latter's views on the divinity question, even this thought entertained by him would discount his own professed experience in the minds of all.

Behold then how harmless the fact of different writers in the EXPOSITOR arriving at different conclusions on the divinity question whilst at the same time both profess to walk in the Spirit!

But possibly neither of these writers, or only one of them really walks in the Spirit. What then? Why, if these, their writings, shall help in any way to make the truth come out as it exists concerning themselves, then will the EXPOSITOR, in publishing the writings of both, prove the friend of all. Much more if both make good their claims concerning the spiritual walk will the good of all be conserved.

We are aware that many are looking for our personal views on the subject in hand, hoping for some dogmatic pronouncements, as if that would tend to calm the stormy waters of controversy. Such we trust will ever look in vain for such foolish

act on our part. For the very fact that such desire has place in their minds is proof to us, as it ought to be to them, that after all they are hero worshippers, and have not learned to worship God in spirit and in truth. These are the parties we would rather do what we may to keep unsettled, until they find their settlement in God alone.

The personal views of Bro's Woodsworth, Dickenson, Sherlock or Truax on the question of the divinity of Christ do not weigh one hair in our estimate of their spirituality. Certainly we do dogmatize on the fact that if they do not share this thought with us that then their spirituality may well be called in question. Moreover we hesitate not to say that the fact of such a lack on their part, if it exists, will not be long in declaring itself to every member of the Association who is spiritual. Not that it shall declare itself in some subtle form that only the spiritual can discover it, but also in such form as will make it manifest to all when viewed from the standpoint of common honesty.

When discussing the subject of the atonement we gave forth the only, to us, thinkable way to make the modern definitions concerning Christ's divinity harmonize with his life as a genuine, healthy example for us all. This was, that whatever knowledge He obtained concerning His divinity must have come to him as a distinct, personal revelation, after precisely the same pattern that the prophets before Him received their revelations and His followers after Him receive our revelations. This thought is in harmony with any conceivable definition of divinity, as far as power or equality with the Father is concerned, provided always that He, Jesus, was shut up absolutely to the walk in the Spirit just as we are.

But this restriction on His part we maintain is particularly taught by Himself where He declares that He always did the will of the Father. Do we stand or fall by any particular definition of His divinity

at this point? We certainly do not, for the best of all reasons, to wit, ignorance. And yet we claim to be a follower of Jesus Christ in the complete sense of the expression. Should we now be placed side by side with Peter and John in their following of Him in the days of His flesh, we would yield ourselves up absolutely to be guided and taught by Him just as we do now to be taught by the Holy Ghost. There is no reserve in our consecration to Christ, and this loyalty to Him we show by our obedience to the Holy Ghost to whom He has committed us in His Gospel, nor can we imagine this our attitude to Him being changed in the slightest degree by the establishment or destruction, on paper or in the brain of man, of any of the many definitions of His divinity which now abound.

WHAT OF HIS HUMANITY.

QUON this part of the subject but little need be said, seeing that all are, in creed at least, agreed that He was really and truly a man. Of course there are differing shades of meaning given to the thought by differing theologians, but thus far no one has raised the heresy cry against any for being extreme in teaching the fact of the perfect humanity of the founder of Christianity.

However, even this side of the subject could easily be pursued far enough to raise the cry of alarm did we deem it necessary. For example, would it entirely destroy His example for us if, before he was baptized of John in Jordan and therefore before the Holy Ghost came upon Him, He had entertained doubts as to His Messiahship, and then learned obedience to the heavenly call by the things which he suffered because of these doubts or even possibly acts of disobedience. For we remark that doubt and disobedience are classed alike in the Bible. And we might further ask, How could He learn obedi-

ence through suffering if never doubting or disobedient? This Bible statement is utterly beyond our comprehension unless interpreted by the above thought.

As the child learns to dread the fire through the suffering caused by disobedience to the laws of mother, so we learn obedience to God by the suffering caused by disobedience to the voice divine. Did Christ thus learn obedience to the voice of the Spirit? Who can dogmatize in his answer, and at the same time give a proper reason for such dogmatism?

But is it right, one may ask, to thus throw out a suggestion on such a serious subject, serious because of the traditional teaching of past ages? Our reply is, that he who walks in the Spirit is forever emancipated from the thralldom of tradition and superstition, and dreads not to ask any questions, yes, and examine into it without the awe and agitation of the superstitious.

Now, whilst we have no answer to these questions, founded on known facts nevertheless, we hesitate not to say that there is no compelling necessity upon us to answer in the negative. Even if Jesus arrived at perfect obedience to the Holy Ghost after many a failure, His character would not thereby be in the slightest degree marred, nor His example impaired. Even such a question as this must be looked on as a non-essential, and treated as such by all the spiritual in our examination thereof, else will we suffer ourselves to come under bondage to some other law than that of the Spirit.

The great fact of all facts in the life of Christ is that during the last three years thereof he walked uninterruptedly in the Spirit, i.e., He always during that time did the will of the Father, and hence could throw out the public challenge, which of you convicteth me of sin?

Granted this is true, then He is an example of the possibility of a man doing the will of God perfectly, by the year. From our standpoint it would but enhance

the value of this example if it was the outcome, in part at least, of legitimate suffering through previous failures. However, we press not this view of the subject, for obvious reasons, especially seeing it is speculation concerning the historically unknown and unknowable.

We are perfectly aware that even venturing thus far may give a shuddering feeling to some who fondly hoped that they were established in the walk in the Spirit, whilst in outsiders it will act as did the profanation of the Holy Land by the Saracens, on the crusaders of olden times—they will feel like rushing to the defence of their *sacred* things with sword and torch.

However we shelter *ourselves* under the free liberty our master gave to Thomas to handle with all needful familiarity and see for *ourselves* concerning all these matters, being assured that, like as with the prince of doubters of old, familiarity with Christ's life and person, in place of breeding contempt, ever prompts the exclamation, "My Lord and My God."

To us Christ, as a man, is all attractive, and His example is of inestimable value. We narrowly scan His life, in His obedient walk in the Spirit, as if looking upon our other self, our elder brother, and our admiration grows as we learn more and more of its perfect symmetry both as a whole and in its various details. But it would cease to have this charm to us if there entered into His conflict with doubt concerning the calls of God any other element than that with which we are familiar by actual experience. Hence as we learn that He was tempted in all respects exactly like *ourselves*, we not only love Him with the full power of our being, but also honor Him as the procuring cause of our ability to thus walk even as He walked. He lived and died for us. Through Him we have all the blessings of the New Covenant.

WHAT ABOUT THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

THIS, too, we have proved to be, as a subject for creed belief, non-essential. But is there not a dogmatic utterance concerning this matter in the creeds of all Protestant churches, including the Methodist? Certainly there is. Then is it not necessary for a member of any of these churches to give his unqualified assent to this dogmatic statement of creed if he honestly remains in said church?

This is a bigger question than the asker, mayhap, imagines. No leading church to-day expects a blind, thoughtless subscription to every part of its creed. Just now the various heresy trials in the churches emphasize the fact of differing views on some parts of their creeds, not only by refusing to anathematize some who differ, but by the fact also that where some are condemned for this difference it is by no means by a unanimous vote. Now if differing views on these parts of the creed were not to a certain extent winked at, then those who compose the minority vote at such trials would be dealt with.

In our own church when the late Dr. Ryerson strove to change its creed concerning class meetings as a test of membership he failed to get a majority vote. But no one hinted that he and the minority at his back should step down and out because they were not slavishly loyal to that part of their churches' creed, so to-day many are considered to be in harmony with Methodism who yet are well known to be disloyal to this one of its creed forms.

Again, no one part of the creed of Methodism was more emphasized by Wesley and his earlier successors than the doctrine of holiness as taught by himself. And yet, to-day, the fact that very many, not only amongst the membership but even of the ministry either ignore this doctrine or teach at complete variance with it, is fully known to all who care to turn their attention to the matter.

Hence it would not follow that a disposition to re-examine into the dogmatic teaching concerning the birth of Jesus and hesitancy to accept a traditionary foundation for this teaching as sufficient, might not appear to some as a sufficient cause for severing their connection with the denomination, at all events until the matter should be pronounced upon with all due formality.

But why look into the subject at all? Why not let sleeping dogs lie? We answer, because this subject amongst others is used in the interest of Antinomianism. God hath called us to be preachers of righteousness, and hence whatever makes for, or condones, unrighteousness we are called on to examine minutely and publicly for the good of all.

Whilst no deliverance concerning the birth of Jesus militates necessarily against righteousness, and whilst it is true that we may not dogmatize to any who profess to walk in the Spirit as to what their belief should be concerning this subject, still it is a fact that the dogma of the immaculate conception is used largely in the interest of those who wish to condone sin, and even teach that sin is acceptable to God, and therefore may be caressed and dandled on the lap of His saints.

It is by the aid of this dogma that we are taught that we must sin in thought, word and deed continually, in some churches, and in others that it is impossible so to live and please God as not to be under the necessity of making constant confession of sin to Him.

The teachings of Christ calls on us to do the will of God as it is done in Heaven, or as Jesus did it upon earth, but this teaching declares all this to be impossible, and tries thereby to nullify and destroy the teaching of Christ Jesus. This we give as our ample excuse for opening this subject and dwelling upon it even exhaustively.

But is the doctrine of the immaculate conception true or false, one asks? Now

to these questions we do not find it necessary to give a decided yes or no answer. For, we remark, we do not deem it necessary to have positive views concerning the matter ourselves, or press them upon others. But we do propose to examine both sides of the question to see if the foundation of this deliverance is so solid that it ought to be trusted to hold up safely the mighty structure which has been built with its aid.

Upon what then does its truthfulness as a doctrine rest? Let us minutely examine, believing that he who would put the slightest obstacle in the way of such honest and truth loving examination must be in that act simply prompted by superstition or bigotry, or both.

Instinctively we turn to the Bible for proof. And we find all the proof known in the first parts of the two gospels, Matthew and Luke. In these two places it is distinctly and clearly stated as true to facts. Now, granted the absolute truthfulness of every word or even every paragraph in the New Testament Scriptures, and the proof must be satisfactory to all.

But upon what does the truthfulness of these beginnings of the two gospels depend? This is a question which few will face long enough to investigate. A very superficial glance at these two productions will separate the parts which tell of the life of Christ before His baptism from those parts which refer to his life then and afterwards.

In the case of Matthew, admitting the truthfulness of the tradition which makes him the author of the whole gospel, still it is evident that, whilst in the bulk of his gospel, he tells what he saw and knew by personal contact with Christ, concerning the other part he necessarily tells what he heard from others. That there is an important distinction to be noted here all must admit. Hence we maintain on the strength of this fact, that proving the unreliability of the first part would not necessarily discount the rest.

In a recent article we referred to

the history of the wars of Cæsar in Gaul as written by himself, and showed that what he wrote about the animals of Germany, from hear say, does not make incorrect what he wrote as an eye witness. It so happens that some of his hear-say stories are not true to facts. But then it is also true that what he wrote as the outcome of personal observation is, in the main, true to facts. The same criticism, if applied to Matthew, may have a similar result, viz., discredit the hear-say story and establish that which was known to him from personal observation.

And the same may be said concerning Luke's gospel. However, with respect to this latter historian, we draw attention to the fact that the hear-say part and that which he had much greater opportunity to verify are separated very distinctly the one from the other. In fact, it will be noticed that there are two distinct commencements to his gospel, a fact which might easily awaken the suspicion that he was not the writer of both parts. Moreover, in this connection, we would also draw attention to his reference in the books of the Acts, to this, his Gospel. His words are "The former treatise have I made O Theophilus concerning all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was received up." This reference certainly better characterizes his Gospel from the second beginning, than the whole as it now stands, and tends to strengthen the suspicion, that, like the last paragraph of Mark's Gospel, it is an interpolation.

Again, both Matthew and Luke, in the possibly apocryphal parts, are made to trace the genealogy of Jesus to Joseph, the husband of Mary, and yet at the same time declare that Jesus was not the son of Joseph.

As an offset to this, however, it is asserted by some that one genealogy is made to include Mary and the other Joseph. But, even granted this, nevertheless, one may well criticise the manner by which it

is done, and after all there remains the fact that neither evangelist alludes to Mary in this connection but both allude to Joseph and to him alone as connecting Jesus with this genealogical tree. Ought not, we suggest; such a fact to weaken somewhat the credibility of the whole account?

But it is replied that the doctrine of inspiration settles the whole matter. These two historians of the birth of Jesus it is affirmed, wrote the accounts as they were given them from the mouth of God, and therefore they must be true to facts, that is, perfectly true in all their details.

This demand on the part of Christendom makes it necessary to examine into the foundation of this dogma of inspiration in connection with this subject. As we have written lengthily on the inspiration question in a former number of the EXPOSITOR we will only mention the arguments as they apply to the case in hand. Neither Matthew nor Luke claim such origin of their knowledge. Jesus made no statement concerning it. None of the early Christians looked upon these writings after this thought. Hence it must be evident to all that this claim of their having received their knowledge of the facts, or presumed facts, which they relate directly from God, rests entirely on a tradition which originated after their death.

We do not say that these facts make the inspiration thought in this connection absolutely impossible, but we do say that it excuses somewhat those who refuse to give it their unqualified endorsement. Besides, Luke was not even one of the twelve apostles, and therefore there is not the slightest evidence that he was any more inspired to write his Gospel, than was Luther or Wesley to publish their writings, save only in the tradition which started after Luke's death and has grown in strength during the centuries intervening between us and him.

Again, note well the fact that as Jesus is no where reported as having claimed an

exceptional nature by birth, He does not, either directly or indirectly, even allude to this dogma. And the same must be said of all the after writing of the New Testament. Not the slightest allusion to this subject can any where be found. And in this connection note the fact that John, according to his own testimony, had the care of Mary the mother of Jesus from the time of the crucifixion to her death. And, moreover, as it is allowed by all critics of his Gospel that his main object was to establish the divinity of Jesus Christ, is it not passing strange that he of all others should pass by this powerful argument, if he was aware of its truthfulness. It was no small matter that John should utterly ignore the whole subject, in all his writings, when he had the best possible opportunity for knowing all about it, and in addition had the most urgent need of utilizing publicly this knowledge, if really possessed.

Such then are the arguments, on both sides, concerning the birth of Jesus.

On the one side are the two circumstantially detailed accounts of the two evangelists, Matthew and Luke, backed by the doctrine of inspiration. It is true that some bring in an expression in one of the prophets as having a bearing on the question, but it will scarcely be used by any who sit down to real investigation.

On the other side are: The hear-say character of the evidence on which the account must have been given; the contradictory nature of the story as evidenced by both tracing the genealogy of Joseph in place of that of Mary; the double beginning of Luke's Gospel; his statement in the Acts that His Gospel began at the public ministry of Christ; the fact that John who had the best means of knowing all about the matter, and had the strongest inducement for referring to it, says nothing about it; Christ is no where reported as alluding to the subject; and, finally, that it is not mentioned in any other part of the New Testament Scripture.

Now, as we said in the commencement of this article, it is not our purpose to pronounce oracularly upon these proofs as to which are conclusive. Our work is done when we show conclusively that the question has these two sides, and that therefore no one is justified in pronouncing on his brother for taking one side or the other.

Christ proclaimed his Gospel without incorporating this doctrine of the immaculate conception in it as a necessary part, and his immediate followers built up the structure without the slightest allusion to the subject, therefore, we contend that, whether true to facts or not, it is no essential part of Christianity, Christ and His apostles being witnesses. Hence, different persons take different sides of the question as a harmless act, and one cannot anathematize the other without sinning against the Spirit of the teaching of the great founder of Christianity.

In this article we have given the facts on both sides as we have learned them. If there are any which have escaped our notice, especially on the affirmative side, we shall be happy to insert them in some future article should we at any time learn of them.

Now this is the very same conclusion at which we arrived in treating of all the burning questions which one after another have agitated the Association viz., that the scriptural arguments are too weak to found a doctrine on, especially one which would tend to fetter the Holy Spirit as Guide into all truth. And like all the former conclusions it brings additional proof to the perfect consistency of the teaching of Jesus with reference to the Holy Ghost.—Jesus did not fetter Him in any direction, but left His individual followers in His, the Spirit's hands, to be taught, absolutely, concerning all things. Thus He gave proof to the world of his perfect confidence in the Holy Ghost. And so it must ever be with us, if we are complete imitators of our Master, we too will leave our brother,

without prejudice in the hands of the great and only ultimate Teacher, by Him to be led into all truth.

“THE LAND OF SETTLED QUESTIONS.”

W E QUOTE an epigrammatic expression often used by the Treasurer of the Association, as the heading of this article. Our friend seems to regard the experience wrapped up in this sentence as that which commended itself to him as one of the most important if not the most important result of the Pentecostal life, and in this we fully sympathise with him. To reach this land of settled questions is like escaping from the stormy sea into a safe harbor.

The present experience of many of the friends and even members of the Association can be readily utilized, in object lesson form, to illustrate the value of this harbor of refuge.

To find out that in spite of our fancied security, the discussion of such a question as the divinity of Jesus Christ causes the anchor to drag and presently the harbor shores to recede and be replaced by deep sea is unpleasant in the extreme, whilst such experience cannot but prompt the prayer, O for a land of settled questions!

But can we reach such a place of habitation? Does it not seem one of the necessities of our being, that ever and anon new questions will be sprung upon us, involving all the puzzling uncertainties and perplexities of former ones? This looks reasonable, and yet, in the face of its apparent reasonableness, we hesitate not to affirm that it is possible to get into the land of settled questions, and stay there. Moreover, it is quite possible to know that we are there to *stay*, and this consciousness of being settled is not to be the outcome of dogged determination to stick to one set of opinions and refuse to examine any others, but is compatible with perfect freedom to fully examine into and decide concerning any and all questions

which may meet us at any turn in life.

The law of the Spirit makes us free from all possible perplexity to-day, to-morrow—for all time, and, we presume, for all eternity.

The story is told of the Duke of Wellington, that when troubled by the persistent calls of one who professed to have invented a bullet proof coat, that he ordered his body guard to fire with ball at the inventor himself when clad with his invention, but his troublesome caller soon took himself off and so avoided this common sense test. Not so, however, the one who has reached the land of settled questions, he hesitates not to endure any and every legitimate test, and thus make good his profession, and thereby glorify God.

To him the discussion of the divinity of Christ was fraught with no more serious consequences than that of electric motors. For why? He is a truth lover, and so it matters not to him what form truth may take, whether old notions or new notions concerning this or any other question shall prove to be true. So long as he has learned to walk with God it matters not how he was led into that experience, whether by Jesus in his thought as a man, pure and simple, or as "very God of very God," or whether his former views concerning the matter must be changed or confirmed. And so of all other questions which may and will arise. What appears to him as truth concerning them all he will continue to accept, and what appears false he will reject with perfect indifference as to the consequences to all concerned.

Should he be called on to re-examine his old beliefs concerning the resurrection, eternal punishment, eternal blessedness, eternal probation, the possible failure of Paul or any other of the early Christians in fully illustrating the walk in the Spirit, or any other question which has been considered *settled* by Christendom, he will experience no sense of alarm or soul tremble even if there be a prospect of the result of such investigation completely changing

his views on any or all of them. Even should his investigations inject doubt into his mind concerning his personal immortality, still will he rest contented and settled in the knowledge that, at the worst, he has secured the very best possible existence for himself.

Behold what trepidation of spirit is manifest in those who have not reached this land, when doubt is hinted at concerning the accuracy of some part of the New Testament Scriptures! For at once they realize that their hope is not in God but in the Bible, or at all events in the dogma of the inspiration of the Bible. Therefore it is that for them to entertain doubt concerning any one part is to shake the whole foundation of their soul rest.

Hence it is that at once they are driven to the devices of the special pleader, and so forsake the transparent honesty of the genuine truth searcher, in their public acts concerning the matter. Why? Simply because they are defending their very spiritual life, their only hope and trust. To them it is a *necessity* to prove the genuineness of the passage in question, because of what they believe is at stake in the matter. Hence, all their arguments are to be taken with a grain of salt, and a large one at that.

Very often their arguments and assertions are chiefly the outcome of their desires. They are like those of the prisoner on his defence, or his advocate. Before they can be accepted they should be met by the advocate on the part of the crown, should be dissected by the judge and then pronounced upon by an impartial jury. We hesitate not to say that no one who fancies that any one part of the New Testament Scriptures *must* be established as true to facts is or can be thoroughly furnished for the correct examination of those Scriptures.

Hence, he, who takes his stand on the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, and maintains, that to admit them to be apocryphal destroys Christianity, thereby rules

himself out of the company of real truth searchers, yes, of truth lovers. Such an one cannot possibly be led of God in his investigations. This our contention is fully endorsed by Jesus, for he declared that he that loveth the truth hears His voice, and it is not straining His words to make them say that no other persons can hear and so be led of God into truth.

What are the proofs which they who take such an ultra position offer? They are in every case assumptions. Not one of them can be traced back to Christ. He did not tell the world that His revelation of God must stand or fall on the accuracy of his historians.

Julius Cæsar in his history of his wars in France (then called Gallia), tells of a species of stag which had no joints in its legs. Its custom was to sleep leaning against a tree. The natives when they found out their sleeping places, cut the trees nearly through so that the weight of the stags would break them off and let the animals fall to the ground. They were then easily captured because of their inability to rise to their feet when once down. Now, who will throw a doubt on the accuracy of Cæsar's history, as a whole, because of this apocryphal part? With just as much reason he would act who affected to doubt the accuracy of Luke's account of the day of Pentecost, if the first chapters of his Gospel were proved to be unreliable.

This absurd postulate is the outcome of trying to establish some cast iron dogma concerning the inspiration of the Bible, and had its origin long after Pentecostal days, when the universal dethronement of the Holy Ghost had been accomplished. No, each individual part of the Scriptures must stand or fall by itself. There is, there can be no necessary connection between their different parts. It is as legitimate a matter, to-day to question the propriety of admitting the canonicity of the first part of Luke's Gospel as it was in the second century to hesitate to accept

the apocrypha as canonical, or the book of Hebrews as the production of St. Paul.

Hence is seen, in all allusions to these, to most Christians, burning questions, how desirable to be settled in our attitude to them all. To the passenger in the vessel at sea, it is a matter of serious consequence how the wind blows and what tempests are abroad, for his foundation of trust—the ship—may be tempest tossed. Not so, however, to the one who has landed and is thus sheltered from the storms on the deep. He can look on with calm indifference, as far as he himself is concerned, although the waves be mountains high and hurricanes sweep the sea. Blessed are they who have reached the land of settled questions.

CHRISTIANITY AS HERO WORSHIP.

THE sentence which we make the heading of this article is the true description of the Christianity of to-day. Buddhism, Confucianism, and Mohammedanism are but the worship of the heroes, after which these respective systems of religion are named. Judaism in the days of Christ had become simply hero worship with Moses as the hero. So, to day, Christianity has largely become another religion after these patterns with Christ the hero.

Examine more closely into the subject and this our contention will be seen to be true to facts. Buddhism on examination is Buddha deified and his precepts made the rule of life. The same may be said of all the others. There may be a difference in the heroes as to the extent of their deification, but as to the acceptance of their precepts as the rule of life, as so many laws to be obeyed after the pattern of the obedience to the laws of Moses exacted by the Pharisees in the days of Christ, they all are similar.

Now, we ask, if we put Christ in the place of Buddha, or Mohammed, or Confucius, or Moses, will there not be a simi-

larity between them all at once seen? In modern Christianity Christ is deified at the expense of his humanity and his precepts with the additions of those of some of His followers, especially His more immediate ones, are taught as the only rule of life, after precisely the same manner that the teachings of the other deified heroes are accepted.

That this was not the intention of Christ with respect to his teachings we have in all our writings undertaken to show. Indeed, we hesitate not to say that in this very thing it has fallen far below the sublime standard He set up. There is something foundationally wrong in Christianity as simple hero worship.

And yet even in this its comparatively fallen state, its superiority to every other form of hero worship is so great that every nation which adopts it in preference to all others is vastly improved by the change. So that, even from this standpoint, all missionary operations which tend to displace the older hero worship by the newer one are in the interests of humanity, and so have our unqualified God speed.

Like as with all other forms of hero worship, Christianity grows better as you near its beginning, and by beginning we refer to the commencement of Christianity as hero worship; which commencement we are inclined to place somewhere in the second century. So also every reformation in this hero worship is best as we near the beginnings of those reformations. We refer to those initiated by Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Fox, Booth and others.

TRUST Him when dark clouds assail thee,
Trust Him when thy strength is small;
Trust Him when to simply trust Him
Seems the hardest thing of all.

Trust Him! He is ever faithful;
Trust Him! for His will is best;
Trust Him; for the heart of Jesus
Is the only place of rest.

Trust Him, then, through cloud and sunshine,

All thy cares upon Him cast;
Till the storm of life is over.
And the trusting days are past.

WAY NOTES.

WE HAVE no wonderful stories to relate concerning mighty gatherings and astonishing results as to numbers who have professed to obtain the Pentecostal blessing, and, moreover, we have no apology for any who may evince disappointment because of the absence of such sensational stories from our *Way Notes*.

Indeed we had no such ideal before us connected with our Heaven appointed visit to this country. Our first week after getting settled in London, England, we devoted to writing articles for the EXPOSITOR and letters to friends.

When this was accomplished the way was opened to attend a tea meeting in Liverpool Road chapel. We went alone, and produced no credentials, and yet we were received most cordially, given a free supper, and then required to pay for it by opening the meeting with prayer and at the close, speaking a few sentences in seconding one of the final resolutions or vote of thanks. We enjoyed the meeting right well. The speaking was good, especially that of the chairman, who had just come red hot from a parliamentary debate—he is an M.P. His speech was still further improved by some public ex-ception taken to his sentiments by one of the principal officers of the Sabbath school, in whose interests the gathering was held. The heartiness evinced by both speakers and listeners captured us completely, and so we abandoned ourself without let or hindrance to the humors of the hour.

The next Friday evening we attended a holiness meeting in the same church, led by an evangelist belonging to the church. He readily recognized us because of our presence at the tea meeting and invited us to lead it, which we did with much comfort and profit to ourself, at least. We visited the same meeting two weeks later when the leader treated us after a similar manner, notwithstanding the fact that he had had the opportunity

in the meantime of reading the pamphlet "How to keep converted." If we have a public convention ere returning, we expect part of the congregation will come from this chapel.

We also had lengthened converse with the pastor, of a very interesting and satisfactory nature, leading us to believe that his interest in the subject was deep and likely to be lasting. At his parsonage we began the distribution of association literature.

One Sabbath we listened with great interest and pleasure to Rev. Hugh Price Hughes. The following Sabbath we had the pleasure of drinking tea with him and many of his friends, at one of the several homes which he has originated. At the tea table we had the opportunity, brought about by himself, to give a somewhat lengthened account of the work of the association, backed, of course, by our personal experience. We also had some private conversation with him and one of his right hand ministers. We gave them "How to keep converted," offering to see them again and bring "Divine Guidance" if they desired it and notified us concerning the time and place which would be convenient for them.

Now the above with a few private conversations and table talks, which by the way sometimes virtually become association meetings, are all we can apparently show for our month's work in England.

However we have turned our proximity to the great, world renowned libraries to good account, and so have spent many hours, like a veritable book worm, deep in the study of the writings of the great eastern sages of hoary antiquity, and we expect that the grand reading room of the British Museum will witness us there many future hours.

We are wondering if the Master will send us reinforcements, and as it was plainly His will that we should write to Bro. Linscott offering to remain over June and even part of July if he would come

and join forces for that month, we should not be surprised if our stay here be protracted some weeks beyond our original thought. But of this we know nothing definitely as yet.

We have been invited to preach in one of the city Wesleyan chapels at a future date, and accepted, when the invitation was repeated after we had fully explained to the pastor that we did not rank high among our brethren as a preacher and that the taint of heresy was being attempted to be affixed to us. This our explanation, moreover, was pretty well understood as he had already read "How to keep converted."

We are thus particular in defining fully and frankly our status at home, lest some of our *watchful* friends over the waters should raise the cry that we are attempting to sail under false colors.

The work we are engaged in demands that every door of usefulness should be thrown wide open, and by the Master Himself. This has been our history in the past, without exception, and we anticipate no change in the future. Like our Master, we speak openly to the people and in secret we say nothing. Our commission thus far is simply to preach the Pentecostal Gospel by lip and pen, but we have little or nothing to do with making the opportunities.

In leaving home we had no care of *the churches* placed upon our shoulders as to appointing or even suggesting leaders, not even were we required to give any exhortations to the members of the Association as to carefulness in selecting their leaders and in being obedient to them when found. We are certain that the whole subject did not occupy five minutes of our time. We took it for granted that the Holy Spirit, although both going before and accompanying us during this mission, would also remain in Canada to regulate everything according to His good pleasure. If He makes any mistakes concerning this matter, or proves Himself unequal to

the task we would advise any and all who have clear, unmistakable evidence of the fact not only to falter in their loyalty to Him, but even to refuse in the future to be led by Him into all truth.

THE UNHOLY SPIRIT.

WHAT we may know about the Devil and his relation to man is the subject of this article.

1. He is not an abstraction or a personification of the principle of evil, but a real personality. In the book of Job his objective personality is as distinctly assumed as is that of Job and his friends. He speaks intelligently, and God replies to what he says and gives him a limited and specific permission to afflict Job. It is generally believed, largely on the basis of a passage in the Apocalypse, that the serpent that spoke to Eve in Eden, was an incarnation of the devil. He conversed with Eve and God spoke words of malediction and retribution to him. The accounts given by Matthew and Luke of Christ's interview with him in the wilderness shew him to be a real personality.

2. He is the enemy of God, and exhibits his enmity principally in the form of enmity to man, who is made in the image of God. When man successfully exhibits harmony with God in his life, the devil is likely to assail him earnestly. This explains his attack on the first pair in Eden, on Job, and on Jesus Christ.

3. His power to annoy and injure man is bounded and limited by God's definite permission. The poet who writes, "In vain doth Satan rage his hour, beyond his chain he cannot go," is thoroughly correct. To hear some religious people speak of him and his power one would be led to suppose that man can never be sure of being fully armed and defended against his malice.

4. He is called by Jesus the prince of this world, and by Paul the prince of the power of the air. Perhaps it is by working in the air that he did the mischief in

the case of Job, and somewhat got possession of so many human organizations about the time when our Lord Jesus was in this world. When the disciples that the Lord sent out to preach and cast out devils, came back to him and reported success, he said, "I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven." Jesus was the most pure and spiritual of all "seers," and when the devil was so defeated as he was by those disciples, he knew, although miles away in many cases, what had happened in the spiritual arena. "Falling from heaven" probably indicates Satan's descent from some place in the upper air, from whence he issued his orders and spread his influences, or sent forth his subordinates.

5. As an enemy of God's children, he is to be distinguished from "the world," and "the flesh." For these three are not compounded, the one with the other two in the New Testament, as they seem often to be in the religious thought of many. "The world" considered as a force opposed to the holiness of God's children, is simply the influence of the majority of mankind who have not accepted the Holy Ghost so as to be brought into harmony with God. Living in society, as we do, we come in contact frequently with the unspiritual, who manifest the character that is theirs. Reading the literature composed by the unspiritual, surrounded by institutions that are the work of unspiritual generations of men and women; we are like men among icebergs, we need very efficient protection from such all surrounding evil, even if we are pure within ourselves. It is true that the evil that is in the world is the result of the primal sin in Eden, which is generally supposed to have resulted from the suggestion of the devil. Yet nevertheless, the author and his work are not to be confounded together, so as to attribute to a present personal enemy, the weak and cowardly yielding to the opinions and fashions of worldly society, which in so many cases destroys the distinction between the church and the world, and en-

tirely annihilates the power of the church for good. "The flesh" represents the evil that exists in every unspiritual individual, which Robinson Crusoe, if such a man ever existed, would have to grapple with in his desolate island, where there was no human society. "The works of the flesh are manifest" "which are these," says Paul in Galatians, and gives a list of various forms of sin. They are mostly covered by the words pride, covetousness, malice and animal sensuality. The idolatry in the list, which seems not to be so covered, will come as the inevitable result of that complete estrangement from the true God which indulgence in the other vices will produce. And as before, we may say just here, that although all that is evil in "the flesh" is the consequence of Adam's sin, which sin was the consequence of the suggestion of the devil, yet the author and his work are not to be confounded together. Let us recognize the distinctions that Christ and His apostles put before us, for right living depends very largely, if not altogether, on right thinking.

What is left for the devil to do now, after you have separated him from so much of the evil that we have to contend with? From our survey of what is recorded of him, we see that his work is briefly, but precisely, described by the title that Jesus Christ gives him, the father of lies. "The flesh" will pull one back and down from the Christian race-path; "the world" will draw one over the fence into by-path meadow, but the devil will meet one like Apollyon, directly filling up the whole breadth of the pathway with his lies, that you may die spiritually on the spot, or turn decidedly back to join those who "crucify their Lord and put him to an open shame." Or when walking through the valley and shadow of some great calamity, he may suggest thoughts that if consented to become blasphemy; thoughts that are not sensual, nor ambitious, nor malicious, but infidel thoughts that tend not so much towards the consumption of

morals as to the overthrow of that faith in God, which is the one thing that a child of God possesses, which the devil specially hates. Look intensely at the temptations with which he assailed Jesus, and you will see that the ultimate object at which he aimed, was the destruction of Christ's confidence in God. That was how he succeeded in Eden. His special work now seems to be the invention and propagation of lies. As the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of Truth, primarily and pre-eminently, so the devil is the spirit of untruth primarily and pre-eminently. The Holy Ghost is the comforter of the brethren; the devil is the acuser of the brethren. Let slanderers of God's children consider what family likeness is revealed in their physiognomy.

Though the devil is not to be identified with the flesh, yet it appears that by yielding to the flesh, the door is opened through which the devil enters. The devil put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot to betray Jesus, after he had given away to the flesh in the form of covetousness.

So also in the case of Ananias and Sapphira to whom Peter said: "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" Why? because covetousness had opened the door for his entrance, and then a terrible lie was the consequence. There is an intimation in 1 Cor. 7, 5, that if we go too far in asceticism we will make room for his temptations. That accounts for much of the wickedness developed within the pale of the Romish Church. 2 Cor. 2, 11. shows that if the church should not forgive as Jesus required and exemplified Satan would gain advantage over them. Paul prophesies in 1 Thess. 2, 8, of "the lawless one whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and all deceit of unrighteousness." This characterizing corresponds exactly with Christ's calling him the father of lies.

6. From the examples of Judas, Ananias Elymas on the one hand, showing how

the devil enters the human spirit, and from the fact that true believers are filled with the Holy Spirit we see how he can be kept at safe distance at all times. James says in his decisive way, "resist the devil and he will flee from you." Now the person who by being filled with the Spirit is united to the living vine, and is in Christ and Christ in him, is so filled with him who is the truth, that lies will not deceive him, so filled with moral power, that he is more than a match for all his enemies. If it is only by first giving way to the flesh, that satan can get any advantage, and being filled with the Spirit, is to have the flesh completely conquered by its antagonistic conquerer, where is the room for fear? Paul says, "walk in the Spirit and ye shall not obey the lusts of the flesh," and to say that notwithstanding our union with Christ, the devil has such access to our spirit as that unknown to our consciousness we may be under his influence, is to destroy the possibility of holiness. The master said, "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me." We are His brethren sharing in and fully participating in all his moral victories. The Master has bruised him, we trample on his bruise fragments of power. The Holy Spirit in us is omnipotent, the unholy spirit, who is without us, is only a creature whose power is limited. So we are *more* than conquerors!

B. SHERLOCK.

THE TRUAX "HERESY."

CHARGES have been laid, the form of a trial had, and a verdict of guilty found against myself within a few short weeks. It all seems so strange that I scarcely know how to write even a brief note about it to the EXPOSITOR. Heresy! what a dread thing it has been in the past—how it has been used as a lash, a thumbscrew, a torturing instrument, to force men into conformity with the mighty (Carlyle would say *brutal*) majority. How

men otherwise strong have quailed before this threatened charge, this stigma, this odium. And yet what a veritable bogie it is, what a mere scarecrow, when one dares to look it squarely in the face. When I look at the daily press and see how seriously they—and the public I presume—look upon this term in this closing decade of the nineteenth century, I marvel indeed, and wonder how much longer the world is to continue this child's play, one half its inhabitants hurling the epithet *heretic* at the other, and the other half returning the same epithet with interest. Amusing truly, but also tragic in its effects, especially in the past. Happy are we that men have no longer the power to torture and burn, for the spirit of the legalist and creedist is precisely the same in this day as it was in the past. I have only this word to say as to the merits of the case. The Methodist church has really been on trial in this case and it has practically decided that according to its standard it is heresy for a man to teach that we can *know* and *do* right. This is the head and front of my offending as was brought out clearly in the trial. Personally the term *heretic* has no more terrors for me than the term *Prince*. Saturday, the closing day, of the trial or debate, at the conference at St. Catharines, was one of the most tranquil and peaceful of my life. So far from believing that either suspension or expulsion can impair my usefulness or hinder my work, it will simply open a wider door to a more extensive field. My call to the ministry is just as valid without parchments as with them. I am neither a hero nor a martyr, but a very plain man with a plain work to do, and so long as God lives and I obey Him, neither men nor devils can hinder that work.

A. TRUAX.

Courtland, Ont., June, 1893.

"Those love truth best who to themselves are
true,
And what they dare to dream of, dare to do."

ONE SIDED STATEMENTS.

The following letter was refused insertion in the *Guardian*. One sided statements is all they apparently wish their readers to see.—H.D.

To the Editor of the *Guardian*:—

AS YOU in a leading editorial in today's *Guardian* use extracts from articles written by me to condemn the editor of the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS for "erroneous published teaching," permit me the use of your columns to say a few words by way of defence.

All that I called in question in said articles was the "immaculate conception" of Christ. Are you prepared to stake your hope for eternity on the immaculate conception being the pillar that both Roman Catholic and Protestant Christianity hold and have held it to be? Because I question the immaculate conception must I be read out of Christendom? Because Mr. Burns fearlessly publishes what I have to say regarding this matter, must his magazine become a foot ball to be kicked by denominational publishing houses at their pleasure?

You charge me with attacking the character of Christ and quote four extracts in proof thereof. In the first extract our statement summarized is that the divinity of the man Christ Jesus may depend upon the Holy Ghost "coming upon Him" at His baptism instead of, as generally believed at His birth.

The second extract simply emphasizes a scriptural statement that "As He is so are we in this world." In third extract which you quote I say that "in the sense that He did the will of the Father He was Divine and in no other." This is simply reiterating my repudiation of the immaculate conception. And in the fourth as to His "having no divinity that you and I cannot possess," I make Jesus what the Scriptures make Him, viz., the first born among many brethren. In what way do these four extracts affect the "character of Jesus Christ?" I affirm His character was faultless during the three years of His

ministry. He did the will of the Father.

Let me give you another extract or two from the same articles. "He was the first man who discovered the secret of how to do the will of God continuously." "We believe Jesus was the first man who fought out to the end the spiritual conflict without flinching." "There is a divinity attributed to Jesus that is full of mysticism." "We believe Jesus had for His spiritual Father the Holy Ghost." "He was born of the Spirit." "Jesus' brethren must be conformed to the image of God's Son, the complete image, just what that image was on earth, no imaginary image, no unreality, no creedist's idealistic myth." "Conformed to be one with God, even as Jesus and the Father are one, one in aim, one in desire, one in thought, one in action, not one in substance." I further said "it will be in order for dogmatic theologians of a past and present age to give their pronouncements as to what constitutes the difference between the divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost. We went on to question if it was not possible that the immaculate conception may have been an error. We question the possibility of the writers of the New Testament interpolating the heathenish idea that all Gods must be immaculately conceived. I stated that it was as easy for tradition to creep into the New Testament as error into our secular histories. I know this is severe on verbal inspiration. I further stated that the misty gauzy thing called Christ's Divinity of birth was used as another of the many substitutes for the Holy Ghost.

And here let me correct the erroneous impression you seek to create when you state I am a Unitarian. Unitarians as their name implies, believe only in one person in the Godhead. I believe in the personality of the Holy Ghost, coequal with and omnipotent as the Father, and I place no limit upon the omnipotence of the "man Christ Jesus." When Jesus says "I and the Father are one," I believe this statement, not possibly as you may be-

lieve it, but my belief is as positive as yours. You attribute to His immaculate birth what I attribute to the baptism of the Spirit. Where is the attack on Christ's character? If you had said that I was attacking a filmy, misty infidel creating doctrine that possibly has no Scriptural warrant for its existence, you might have been nearer the mark. How high can man rise in this world? What are the "greater things that Jesus did" that we are to do that Jesus spoke about? Is growth in grace limited? What did the apostle mean when he said "as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God?" If sons of God in what sense do they differ from the "first born among many brethren"—the one of whom God said "this is my beloved Son, hear ye Him?" If we choose to hear Him when He says the Holy Ghost shall take of the things of Jesus and reveal them, who is there to gainsay? Must I take everything that the Holy Ghost reveals about Jesus through the sieve of denominationalism, must I be charged with "grossness," because I refuse to accept the "grossness" of the immaculate conception preferring rather to believe that Jesus was the carpenter's Son—that He was a possible descendant of David as genealogically traced in the 1st chapter of Matthew, that when he said my Father is greater than I, He said what we can say, and what too many too easily say.

I unhesitatingly take my place as a "joint heir with Christ," rejoicingly, yet sorrowfully, willing to suffer with Him, as Paul said was necessary.

I magnify Christ by my life, not by my beliefs, and for five years my life has pleased God. Christ's character has not suffered from my acts, however, much orthodox Christianity of the 19th century may be wrenched by my beliefs. I share with Bro. Burns the obloquy you seek in your columns to heap upon him and am quite willing to accept but never to seek martyrdom in the cause of truth. We

stated that with many people Jesus was simply a hero to be worshipped. But when it comes to being bone of our bone, when it comes to being his brother in suffering as He was our brother, when it comes to being scoffed at and jeered at as He was for us, when it comes to Gethsamane and the crucifixion on our part as He was crucified for us, when it comes to walking as He walked, how much of Christendom that does not shrink?

We think a correct understanding of our position necessitates the publication in the *Guardian* of the foregoing extracts in addition to the four statements which you stripped of their context and pitchforked into your editorial columns. If you are willing that your readers should have a proper understanding of the matter at issue you will unhesitatingly insert this letter.

Truly,

H. DICKENSON.

Woodstock, March 1st, 1893.

A FEW PLAIN WORDS.

THE time has come for plain speaking. War has been declared all along the lines. The Canada Holiness Association and its teaching has come under the ban of the churches. Armed neutrality is no longer the attitude of the creedists. The animosity of the sects has been aroused. They discovered that the machine rule days were numbered, so have taken time by the forelock and cries of heresy fill the air.

The great Presbyterian and Methodist churches are at it hammer and tongs and of course this thing that has turned the world upside down and that has come hither also, must be crushed and exterminated. The dogs of war have been let loose on Mr. Truax. We have again been waited upon ourselves, and summoned to appear and give an account of our doctrine before the rulers of the synagogue. A committee has been appointed to confer with Mr. Burns. Others have been sent to hard-scrabble circuits.

The matter would soon terminate if we would assume the sycophants cringing attitude. But this can scarcely be expected. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. We claim to represent the progressive liberty of Protestantism. And opposed to this, as it has always, is the old spirit of domination. Liberty of thought must be chained. Liberty of utterance must be curbed. If this liberty is persisted in, it cannot be within the pale of the churches, and so it has ever been.

When will rulers learn wisdom? Surely they know that the Lord is abroad on the earth? Have they no fear of His judgment? Truth is never advantaged by terrorism, however, hence we refrain, but we could give harrowing details of God's dealings with antagonists of this way.

Professors of righteous living run no danger. It is the practicers whose blood is being sought after. And what can the descendants of the crucifiers hope to gain by this fresh onslaught? Do they expect to stop the onward march of Gospel truth? The task is a hopeless one. The "beast that cometh up out of the abyss" may triumph the professed "three days and a half." They may even "rejoice and make merry and send their gifts one to another." But the result is invariably the same. God's truth, from the ashes of persecution will rise, clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners.

And what has created this furore? We can only speak for ourselves. We have been attacked because in the natural order of things we have taken the liberty of looking into and comparing what the Scriptures say about the birth of Christ.

We have looked at that 'Scripture' where the angel is recorded as saying to Joseph, "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."—And to Mary, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God." We have compared these two Scriptures with the hundreds of other passages bearing on Christ's birth, and comparing Scripture with Scripture have been unable to arrive at

any positive conclusion. And because of our utter ignorance, because of our, for the time being, isolation from the great procession, because we can't fill up the measure of truth, as it has been and is being filled with the "orthodox" on this matter, resentment is manifested at our examination. We should at least have held our peace and not published our ignorance to the world; not made public our doubts to the great injury of evangelical Christianity.

If evangelical Christianity is built on so fragile and so flimsy a foundation that it can be shaken because of our inability to understand the mystery of the immaculate conception—of our inability to harmonize the two passages that teach one thing, with those that seem to teach the reverse, the sooner it is known the better. But seriously where does the Protestants right to liberty of conscience end. We know where it has its beginning, and we rather think its end will also be in God.

What liberty can be taken by the Protestant with the utterances of the Bible? Is the interpretation of every passage therein contained a foregone conclusion? Are there certain passages that must have a uniform interpretation by all the sects, and others that a sectarian interpretation of, is allowed?

Here is the opinion of a Roman Catholic to be found in the *Review of Reviews* for June. This editor of the "Civilita Catholica" asks: "must we bow to the teaching church that condemned the teaching of Gallileo as false and heretical." "Does the teaching church or does it not recognize the facts that have been brought out in modern research?" He says, "I and many loyal Catholics with me hold and will continue to hold and confess that Moses did not write or dictate any of the books commonly ascribed to him by our theologians—that the section of Isaiah which treats of Babylon and its destruction cannot have been composed by Isaiah, in whose time there was no Babylonish empire; that the Jews could not have been actually languishing in exile when Isaiah was written; that there is no reasonable doubt in the mind of any un-biassed thinker who has carefully sifted

the evidence that Daniel could not have been written in the sixth century B.C., but in the second century; that the Psalms, most of which we commonly ascribe to David are compositions of a very late date; that Esther and Job are not historical writings but religious works of fiction while the narratives of some of the most ancient books are myths."

"I adhere," he adds, "to these propositions in spite of the fact that they are incompatible with the doctrines of the teaching church," and concludes thus, "summing up the more striking anomalies of the position we find that while our church is built on an impregnable rock, we are asked to defend it by means of wretched armor plates of iron and of brass; that while proclaiming our religion to be the solid fabric of eternal truth, we are expected to prop it up with scaffolding of worm eaten timber; that while believing that the conquest of the whole world is as dust in the balance, compared with the loss of our human soul, we are to close our eyes upon the perdition of millions of Catholic souls, and open them with joy on the dusty records of diplomatic triumphs."

This Roman Catholic evidently does not believe in the infallibility of the Bible. We don't doubt but that he will be able to accept the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope. In fact he practically says so for he declares he will only continue to hold these opinions till they are condemned by "our Holy Father the Pope, or some Ecumenical Council." This is where we part company from him.

How absurd to think that if the Pope were to declare that Isaiah wrote all of the book ascribed to him, therefore it must be so. And yet as many absurdities exist in the various Protestant churches. Some question of orthodoxy comes up in some church gathering, a vote is taken, a majority pronounces a verdict of heresy, and at once all examination into that matter ceases. No further progress in knowledge can take place on the line of that decision. The majority vote has once for all settled that question, and at once members of the church hide themselves behind the decisions of the church courts, virtually hand their consciences over into

the keeping of the majority. Should the majority happen to change again, the whole mass of individual opinion at once adopts the pendulum movement and is found on the other side just as solidly.

Theoretically God is the keeper of the conscience, practically it is a case of majority rule. Protestant principle is sacrifice for uniformity. What wonder then that mediocrity is the rule in our churches.

H. DICKENSON.

DIVINE GUIDANCE.

IN ALL the dispensations God has made possible for honest men to know His will. His first method with Adam was to make known that will, as it were, by direct word of mouth. Adam got his directions direct from God and held conversation with God with all the satisfaction of two human beings conversing one with the other.

The record is so life-like that many persons imagine that God took the form of a human being in His walks and talks with Adam in the garden, and that He spoke to Adam's outward or physical ears when He conversed with him. Such, however, cannot be the fact, as God is a Spirit and gave to man, in addition to a human body, his own spirit nature, so that the Spirit-God must have addressed the Spirit-Adam and not the outward or human man. Hence, when Adam heard the voice of God he did not hear what we call sound. There were no sound waves set vibrating to strike the drum of Adam's ear and if any other person had been with him when God was talking, he would not necessarily have heard the voice of God to Adam.

When at the temptation of the devil, Adam partook of the forbidden fruit from "the tree of knowledge of good and evil" he died, that is, as I understand it, this spiritual faculty of hearing God died. His spirit nature became dead or benumbed so that he could not converse with the great Spirit as before. The tempter said "ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil." Hence the temptation was for them to have

an independent knowledge of good and evil, to have human laws for their guidance and not desire all such instruction direct from God. It was a temptation to reverse the command, "trust in the Lord with all thine heart and lean not unto thine own understanding, in all thy ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct thy paths." Adam and Eve committed the sin of desiring to be guided by common sense or reason. It was on their part a usurpation of the prerogative which God had reserved for himself. "Ye shall be as Gods," said the devil. "We would be as Gods," responded the man and woman. They were not content with resting their happiness and success in the hands of their father, God, but they must personally take their destiny into their own hands. The guidance of the Spirit-God was supplemented by the guidance of the individual for himself and trouble immediately began. They at once contracted guilt and shame by their own laws, from a circumstance which God had held to be innocent and began to load themselves down with cares and duties which they would have escaped had they remained loyal to their original guide. This great sin of sins, and the original of all sins, which seems to have been entailed on posterity and man in endeavoring to be his own law-maker and "the architect of his own fortune," has bound burdens on his own shoulders impossible to be borne and brought about an appalling state of things during all the years.

On the death of Adam's spiritual faculties God seemed to have immediately made provision to bring man back to his spiritual condition, but comparatively few avail themselves of the remedy provided. Still there have been men in all the ages who have learned God's method or remedy and have become spiritual. Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and many others in the various dispensations have had spiritual ears more or less acute to hear the voice of God. But such men have been few and far between. It must, however, have been possible at all times for individual men to find out God's will, and the fact that some have done so, at

least in part, is, with other considerations, proof of that statement.

T. S. LINSKOTT.

Brantford, Ont., May 30th, 1893.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

HERESY HUNTERS.

THIS PROPEPLY characterize or anathematize the Canada Holiness Association and its members, all the heresies of the centuries are being ransacked.

The latest research is that of the *Christian Guardian* where the charge of Socinianism is hurled.

In looking up Mosheims church history we find recorded there that the Socinians, speaking of the Holy Ghost, "plainly deny his being a divine person and represent Him as nothing more than a divine quality or virtue."

"The Holy Ghost is the energy of God." We don't think this can be considered as a fair representation of Canada Holiness Association teaching about the Holy Ghost.

Regarding the Socinian view of Jesus Christ, about which the charge was more immediately laid, Mosheim writes: "their erroneous notion regarding Christ is expressed in the following terms—Our Mediator before the throne of God is a man who was formerly promised to our fathers by the prophets and was born in the latter days of the seed of David and whom God the Father has made Lord and Christ; that is the most perfect prophet, the most holy priest and the most triumphant king, by whom He created the new world, by whom He sent peace upon earth, restored all things and reconciled them to Himself, to the end that after the supreme God we should believe in Him, adore and invoke Him, hear His voice, imitate His example and find in Him rest to our souls."

Considered in relation to the Holy Ghost this reads more like an extract from some of the modern evangelical creeds than a deliverance from Canada Holiness Association quarters.

The only creed we ever heard of at any Can-

ada Holiness Association meetings which it has been our privilege to attend is "walk in the Spirit." True, as the organization is a non-sectarian organization, there may be amongst the members those who are guilty of the offence of holding different beliefs, but we have yet to learn that this is a crime. In what organization under the sun are the members a unit in their opinions? Then, if difference of opinion be permitted in every organization in Christendom, why single out the C. H. A. for attack?

We give one more quotation from Moshier: "On one hand the Socinians deny the influence of the Divine Spirit and power upon the minds of men; and on the other they acknowledge that no mortal has such an empire over himself as to be able to suppress or extinguish his sinful propensities and corrupt desires." This Socinianism will be admitted as unlike C. H. A. teaching.

Then there is the Palagian heresy. This is one that is being revamped and foisted upon a long-suffering generation as C. H. A. doctrine.

Here are a few of the premises of the Pelagians.

1. The nature of man was uninjured by the fall.

2. Our natural powers are fully competent to render complete obedience to the law.

3. This obedience is rendered without any supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit.

The above extracts from Palagianism are from Chas. Hodge volume 3. Moshier adds, regarding this heresy, that "men are capable of repentance and amendment, and of arriving at the highest degree of purity and virtue by the use of their natural faculties and powers—that they have no need of the internal succor of the Divine Spirit." Then Moshier further adds "the opinions of this sect have been misrepresented by its enemies upon several occasions." "Such," he says, "is usually the fate of all parties in religious controversies," and he charges a number of chroniclers of this religious movement with not "treating the movement with a sufficient degree of impartiality."

Where C. H. A. belief and practice are adjudged heretical, will history record that critics and representatives of existing sects have treated it with impartiality?

However, we boldly challenge the critics to point out any heresy in any age since Pentecost that bears the slightest resemblance to this movement.

H. DICKENSON.

THE KESWICK CONVENTION.

IT was our privilege to attend throughout the convention held by these brethren in our city a few weeks since, and as on all sides we have heard their work spoken of as spiritual above the ordinary, we feel it a pleasant task to frame this article, and so wish them God speed. Indeed never before have we heard from the modern Evangelist so much that was sensible and soul inspiring, and as we listened to their recount of personal dealings with God as He had from time to time honored their faith, we were glad to rise to our feet in response, as glad the convention had come to the city.

We have been asked repeatedly if they were not much the same, or in harmony with the C. H. A., or is there some difference, and so reply: The difference between the Keswick brethren and the C. H. A. is as wide as that between the Jew and the early Christian, for while the Jew recognized the written law as final authority on all matters, the early Christians recognized Christ as their law, so the Keswick brethren simply add the New Testament to the Old and make that the man of their counsel as their settlement of perfection and other doctrinal points amply showed. While the true representative of the C. H. A. absolutely and always takes the Holy Spirit to be his guide ultimate, even to the setting

aside of Testaments New or Old. The question has been asked, how is it that they make everything so plain, more so than your people do, and we had only to reply that though perhaps unconscious of the fact, they were *usurping the Holy Spirit's place* in the matter of explanation that being his sole right as the interpreter and teacher of truth.

If to some reader the latter part of this article seems to conflict with the former let it be understood that as in the case of the few we who are spiritual must see in Abraham, David and others that spiritual nature which bows to and recognizes God, and if we have failed to be in harmony with them we would fail to be spiritual ourselves, but even as the early disciples recognized the authority of Christ to be above all other authority and still called Abraham their father, so we recognize the Keswick brethren as servants of God who have not known the law of the Spirit as the only arbiter in all matters pertaining to this age and that which is to come.

E. McMAHON.

OUR BROTHER.

QUR conversion was clear and unmistakable and having been properly taught that is that the Holy Ghost is our law we were in a good position to go on from that glad hour, walking in the Spirit. Our subsequent months were spent satisfactorily. We had great peace in doing the will of God.

But a severe ordeal was awaiting us which wrung the cry, "Lord if possible let this cup pass from me," from the heart, and Oh, how the Devil avails himself of all such trying circumstances to bring us in doubt. He said, if you are walking in the Spirit as you profess to be, how is it that you are so hemmed in that you have no visible way out?

After all are you not mistaken about this Holy Ghost leading. If you are walking in the Spirit then why are you

in such a plight? Is it necessary?

How is it my first few months were so very bright and clear that there was no mistaking my conversion and now I am so terribly assailed with temptations?

But hark I hear another voice! What is it? It is the voice of my Elder Brother (the first born among many) speaking to me and what does He say? He says, Brother I have been in all points tempted like as you are, yet without sin. Like me? Yes like you. I too had unmistakable signs that I was the Son of God. The Holy Ghost descended upon me at Jordan and a voice from Heaven said, "this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," and when I was in the wilderness and was an hungered I was tempted to doubt and the Devil said unto me, now if this is true that you are the Son of God, why do you go hungry, turn these stones into bread.

Now how could the words of Jesus be any comfort to me, if I am forced to believe that he had a power to rely on, that I have not. I am persuaded that the same Spirit that led Jesus into the wilderness is leading me and the same Devil that tempted Christ assails me. "As he was so am I in this world" and herein I realize Christ as my brother and how could he have been like I am if he were God, for being God would make it impossible to yield to temptation and if yielding was impossible then wherein was he tempted like as I am. Would he be my brother?

J. D. ALBRIGHT.

South Cayuga, Ont.

HOW TO KEEP CONVERTED.

FROM THE "CHRISTIAN WITNESS."

THE LOST art is at last found and made public by Rev. N. Burns, of Canada, whose vagaries we have had occasion at different times to notice in these columns. He has issued a pamphlet in which he claims to have discovered the lost art of "keeping converted." The secret has never been known in the church since the apostolic age, until recently discovered by this latter day seer. This is very remarkable if it be true. It would seem that the saintly Fletcher failed to

keep converted though no one has been able to discover where the backsliding came in after a given period in his life. Mr. Bramwell after twenty-six years of rejoicing in holy liberty, says, "It is now twenty-six years ago and I have walked in this liberty ever since." Yet he knew not the secret of keeping converted. Bishop Taylor says, "I have not made a break with God for more than forty years," and yet he has not discovered Mr. Burns' secret of keeping converted. No one has ever discovered this art since the days of the apostles until Mr. Burns appeared. Every converted soul has backslidden and been reclaimed, it may be, "a thousand times day,"—a big strain on one's credulity, but he has never kept converted. And what makes it more remarkable, Mr. Burns has discovered the lost art of keeping converted without the use of public or private prayer, without reading the Scriptures or fasting, without the use of the Lord's supper or the observance of the Sabbath except as pleasure, and to so live as never to make a break in commission or omission, judged by the perfect law of God, and never to have occasion to regret an act done unwittingly or by mistake. Mr. Burns takes to task our friends Dr. Douglas Clark, Dr. Steele, Dr. Sowrey, Bro. Pepper and especially ourself, for having failed to keep converted. We cannot speak for our brethren, but as for ourself, we must humbly confess that we are not up to Mr. Burns' standard of conversion and never expect to be in this life; nor do we believe he is notwithstanding all he says. He has an association now in Canada which he advertises clear cut on this line, and yet he confesses that they do not all stand, but they are obliged to expel them for their wickedness. We hope no one will mistake these people for holiness fanatics. They have long since become Zinzendorfians, believing the work completed at conversion. They scout the second blessing theory. We turn them and all such over to J. M. Boland & Co., and hope they will look after their children. We have watched this movement from its beginning, and while we accord to Mr. Burns honesty of purpose, we are firmly persuaded that in theory it is the wildest fanaticism and must result in disaster."

REMARKS.

The above is from the *Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness*, of May 4th. This is one of the leading holiness papers in the United States, and is edited by Rev. W. McDonald, the President of the Nation-

al Holiness Association. It may be accepted therefore as representative of that movement. I note that,

(1) What is said about Fletcher, Bramwell and Bishop Taylor hurts not the pamphlet criticised, nor the association that it represents. The continuous walk with God which these good men achieved shows, (1st), that such constant and unbroken holiness is possible, which it is the aim of the pamphlet criticised to show. (2nd), That these men lived much better lives than the critic has lived, as acknowledged by his own confession and proved by the facts narrated in the pamphlet, which it does not attempt to deny. (3rd), The article shows plainly that the writer is not disposed to believe Mr. Burns' word concerning himself, although Mr. B. accepts Mr. McD's words at their full face value. Mr. McD says, "We do not believe that he does (live a holy life) notwithstanding all he says." People who are not willing to be taught of God in all things, lest haply they might have to drop some cherished notions, and whose experience is shaped by a traditional creed, are not willing to believe that any ordinary cotemporary lives better than they do themselves. But if the man is dead and has got a grand apotheosis by some admiring biographer, and has been canonized a saint by thousands of readers, or if he shines out before the eye of the religious public in unique moral heroism as Bishop Taylor does, his holiness may be believed in without discount for he becomes a hero, almost a demi-god. And to say that such a one lived a blameless life for many years, hurts no one's self-complacency.

The years of unbroken Christian experience those men enjoyed were the result of unbroken obedience to the will of God, and to say that is to emphasise the testimony of the Canada Holiness Association. But it is evident that they have not so fully apprehended the secret of unbroken, continuous holiness for *everybody*, as to permanently enrich the church with clear teaching on the subject, a fact that the pamphlet criticised assents, a fact the critic does not deny.

(2) The paragraph which contains the expression, "a thousand times a day" teaches no such idea as this editor would have his readers believe it does. Mr. B. asks what is the doctrine of Scripture on a certain point, and to make his idea plain and vivid, he simply does what even Bible writers have done; he supposes an extreme

case. But he does *not* teach that "every converted soul has backslidden and been reclaimed, it may be a thousand times a day." The inwardness of misrepresentation we do not presume to know, but we know that any one who misrepresents another deliberately in print is either mentally incapable or morally culpable.

(3) The writer says that the association were "obliged to expel some for their wickedness." Immoral acts performed and proved against members, and a vote of expulsion to put the perpetrators away, is the impression naturally received from his words. Nothing in the pamphlet justifies the holiness editor in the use of this misleading language. The word is, "weeded out," and the statement is that these persons had exhibited what in the eyes of *onlookers*, was "extravagant and unquestionable conduct." This is another misrepresentation of the record, and an assumption to know the facts independent of the record and an untrue version of what did take place, which is, that these persons separated themselves of their own free choice.

(4) No attempt is made to deny the charges made in the pamphlet or to invalidate its reasonings. That is the most commendable fact in the matter for there is nothing in the pamphlet that can be disproved, and that a veteran writer should betake himself to sneers and misrepresentations in order to relieve the mind of the uneasiness which the reading of the pamphlet must have produced, is the best proof of the truth of its matter, and of the ability with which that truth is set forth. He expects that the teaching of the association will "result in disaster." It has already resulted in sweeping disaster to the reign of unbelief and legalism over many lives. He turns us over to Boland & Co. Boland is in no sense our father; entirely unknown to most of the members of the association. What is to be thought of a holiness that does not keep its most prominent representative and exponent holy? Why should there be an association within a church for the professed purpose of promoting a distinctly higher type of religious life than what is common experience in that church; with its apparatus of camp meetings and distinctive literature, existing now for some twenty years or more, and as a result its President confesses himself a failure? For if this holiness that he makes his livelihood by promoting does not keep its possessors from doing what they ought not to do, it is not a whit better kind of religion than what may

be found in any of the churches or even outside of them.

B. SHERLOCK.

INBRED SIN.

A FRIEND has requested me to write my thoughts on the above subject for the *EXPOSITOR*. He says in his note to me, "I question if such a thing has any real existence in fact, only as in its connection with the creeds."

The words "inbred sin" are not found in the Bible. But in the seventh chapter of Romans, at the fifth verse, and also in the famous and hotly controverted passage beginning at the seventh and continuing to the end of the chapter, are several expressions which evidently mean the same thing or state which is intended to be described as inbred sin. Indeed, in the twentieth verse we find the expression, "sin which dwelleth in me." The Psalmist, Ps. 51-5, says, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me;" and Paul writing to the Ephesians says in the second chapter and the third verse, "We also all once lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were *by nature* children of wrath even as the rest." The fact that in order to be a true Christian Christ insists on the necessity of a new nature, a being born anew, born from above, born of God, born of the Spirit, shows that the first nature is so thoroughly wrong that mending or development will not remedy the mischief, nothing short of such a change as will not admit of any less radical an expression than "born again" to set forth, justifies the thought that human sinfulness is not superinduced by circumstances, the altering of which might produce holiness, but an innate tendency, something like the tendency of wolves and certain dogs to worry sheep, and of swine to do mischief.

We know that sin was not a part of the original make-up of the first pair in Eden, and that the evil nature of man is felt, as William Arthur put it, to be an unnatural nature, but that does not prove its non-existence, and does little if anything to expel the curse. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, for that all have sinned," expresses a fact that can only be ignored by one that resolutely shuts his eyes from the recognition of what is everywhere evident.

The history of our race as given in the Bible, shows that although there is in man's nature an element or elements that

intensely approve of that goodness which is the condition of those who harmonize with God, yet it is found difficult to make men good, even with the assistance of that internal ally. The holy walk and Divine translation of Enoch, with the hundred and twenty years of faithful preaching by Noah, did not seriously check the downward trend of the Antidiluvian population. The terrible warning of the deluge, followed by the bow in the cloud and the lesson of the Babel confusion, did not prevent the sad culmination of wickedness which brought down the fires on Sodom and Gomorrah. The plagues of Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, the giving of the law in so impressive a manner, the constant miracles of the pillar of cloud and the manna, the frequent miracles of deliverance and of retribution with which Jehovah gave sanction and emphasis to his own law, did not thoroughly cure the nation of Israel of the tendency to sin. And although those arguments for holiness increased and accumulated from generation to generation, yet still, that people who were under the closest supervision by God, and who were favored by him above all the nations of the world, were ever backsliding from their occasional reformations to such an extent as to prove, if proof was needed, that the tendency to sinning was so constant and so powerful, that it can only be accounted for and explained by assuming the truth of Jeremiah's complaint, "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately sick, who can know it."

The impulsion towards righteousness was certainly as strong in the nature of Paul as in the average nature of men, and very probably much stronger. Yet see the picture of his struggles with his lower self so vividly painted in the seventh chapter of Romans which has been quoted from above. It ends with a wail of despair, "O wretched man that I am ;" wretched because always defeated, because he found a law in his members, bringing him into captivity to sin continually. And every one who essays that warfare with the furnishing that he then had, will realize a similar experience. To attempt holiness according to the standards which Christ has set up in the absence of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, is always to invite defeat, for it is an attempt to reverse nature by the force of a resolution which emanates from the nature that needs reform and renewal. It is like the effort of a leper to become healthy by the hiding of his sores without external or internal medication. It is, to use a Bible figure, like the

effort of an Ethiopian to change the color of his own skin.

But, as inbred sin has come into humanity by yielding to the unholy spirit, so its expulsion or cure comes from yielding to the Holy Spirit. Pentecost brought the cure of this constitutional disease to man, when those who were obedient to God's teaching which was uttered by the mouth of Jesus, were all filled with the Holy Ghost. Then was fulfilled the prophecy written by Ezekiel, chap. 36, 25 to 28 verse: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean ; from all your filthiness and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new spirit will I put within you : and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put *My spirit within you*, and cause you to walk in *My statutes*, and ye shall keep *My judgments* and do them." God's spirit within man, makes his perfect loyalty possible, and when that perfect loyalty is the character of his life, inbred sin is as Paul puts it in the sixth of Romans, "done away," R.V.—or "destroyed" as it is in the authorized version. And to all this agrees the brief but emphatic description given in the Acts, of the Pentecostal church, for the murmuring that led to the appointment of the seven deacons was perfectly just and legitimate. And when Peter made his explanatory defence at the council of Jerusalem, he declared that the reception of the Holy Ghost "purified the hearts" of the Gentile believers ; cured the intense deceitfulness and desperate sickness complained of by Jeremiah.

But what about Ananias and Saphira, and Simon of Samana ? If the Holy Ghost thoroughly cures inbred sin, how do you account for their depravities ? Just as we account for the fall of the devil and his angels, just as we account for the fall of Adam and Eve, just as we understand the warnings and encouragements found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, just as we read the messages from Christ and the Spirit to the seven churches. Just as Paul puts the matter in Romans, 11, 19, "Well : by their unbelief they were broken off and *thou standest by thy faith*." There is no blessing that may not be lost by unbelief, there is no gaining of God's favor or indwelling, but by faith.

B. SHERLOCK.

For God in man brings man to God through
faith and love and sorrow,
And toil and strife that set the world up
toward a brighter morrow.

INDEX TO VOL. XI.

	PAGE.
A	
A part of Experience often Misunderstood	3
A truth re-stated	10
Association hymnal	25
All and many things—by H. Dickenson	39
Are we mistaken	44
An adventurous life—by E. O. Harris	52
A hymn study	55
Association convention	57
A public statement of creed concerning the atonement	67
As others see us	95
A Pentecostal service	98
Answer to a correspondent	100
A touching incident	112
A sketch of this distinct movement	130
An experience of the times of the Wesleys	132
Abide satisfied	301
Approaching nearer and nearer	152
A newspaper paragraph—by H. Dickenson	186
A tit-bit	206
As others see us	245
A few plain words—by H. Dickenson	322
B	
Bishop Taylor	51
But how can God be just and the justifier	66
Baptism of the Holy Ghost	101
But are they false	222
Brethren of Jesus	295
C	
Correspondence—by Lizzie L. Graham	275
Choose Thou for me	249
Contented	1
Consolidation of this movement	29
Concerning some recent writers—by B. Sherlock	78
Christian experience—by D. Borland	176
Camp meeting memories	92
Current unbelief	96
Correspondence—by Annie Cromie	101
Christ's Method	125
Confucius	139
Crosshill—by Wm. Petch	159
Conversion	164, 193, 260
Concerning H. Dickenson's articles	179
Correct words, Guides and guidances—by B. Sherlock	181
Creed making in Japan	215
Christ's method	223
Correct	246
Christianity as hero worship	315
D	
Does Spirit witness depend upon	15
Death of Dr. Cullis	41
Divinity of Christ—by H. Dickenson	139, 291
December and November Nos. compared	157
Diversity in Belief—by H. Dickenson	256
Divinity of Christ—by B. Sherlock	270
Did Jesus give His secret to the world—by A. Truax	288
Divine Guidance—by T. S. Linscott	324
E	
Experience	16
Extracts from Briggs' "Bible, church and reason"—by H. Dickenson	17
External life—by Wm. L. Rye	20
Expulsion for heresy	150
Extracts from Dr. Briggs' defense—by H. Dickenson	211
Exposition	281
F	
For Sunday meditation	22
Feeling after God	22
Fanaticism and fanatical acts founded on Scripture and not on Divine Guidance	88
G	
Getting nearer to God	13
Getting to the end of self	14
God's way concerning missions—by B. Sherlock	47
God guiding—by Wm. L. Rye	56
God still speaks	110
God's Son—by H. Dickenson	297
H	
Holiness unto the Lord—by A. B. Cranston	210
Higher criticism and heresy trials—by H. Dickenson	205
Hunting an honest man	53
He leadeth me	85
How to keep converted	113
How do we know that we will be raised from the dead	140
How account for the difference	167
Heresy hunters—by H. Dickenson	325
How to keep converted—by B. Sherlock	327
I	
Incidents by the way	16
Ignaty Lichtenstein	49
Is this the best that objectors can do	104
Items of interest	161
If this is Methodism, is it Christianity	194
Is this the teaching of Christ	221
Is this a truism	230
Incidents by the way—by H. Dickenson	276
In harmony with our teaching	283
Inbred sin—by B. Sherlock	329
K	
Keeping converted	114
L	
Lonely ones	34
Leaving the church	154
M	
Methodist doctrine—by B. Sherlock	70
Moral standards—by B. Sherlock	87
May not both be slightly astray	105
Must be straight in doctrine	145
Modern variations of conversion	169
Mr. Burns and his critics	251
Mr. Burns on his defence	253
Motley membership—by A. Truax	296
N	
Not a sect	31
News items	31, 106, 215, 246
O	
One of the outcomes of these mighty faith battles	36
Our lives for Jesus—by F. R. Havergal	109
Objections to complete guidance in small things	172
Our relation to truth	226
Orthodox but fair minded	232

On what authority are the New Testament Scriptures accepted as inspired or truthful.....	277	The emotional in religion—by H. Dickenson.....	153
One sided statements—by H. Dickenson.....	325	The present issue—by H. Dickenson.....	155
Our brother—by J. D. Albright.....	326	The pamphlet.....	160
P		The pam of growth.....	164
Paul believed God.....	12	The simplicity of conversion as emphasized.....	171
Peter saved properly.....	23	The humanity of the Holy Ghost—by H. Dickenson.....	174
Principal Grant.....	96	They walked no more with Him—by H. Dickenson.....	177
Personal experience.....	129	Treading the wine press alone—by H. Dickenson.....	184
Plank road convention—by T. Bousfield.....	247	The Keswick convention.....	187
R		The Son of Man—by H. Dickenson.....	198
Rev. Dr. Cavan's inaugural sermon.....	89	The Holy Ghost as the interpreter of Bible.....	199
Remarkable instances in spiritual guidance.....	109	The church as supreme authority.....	202
Remarks—by B. Sherlock.....	304	The Holiness creed battle in the south.....	203
Rev.—by H. Dickenson.....	11	The Spanish Inquisition—by H. Dickenson.....	214
Rejected in the spirit.....	24	The secret of Jesus' life—by A. Truax.....	224, 268
Regime of the foregoing articles.....	37	The old baths.....	231
Revivals—by H. Dickenson.....	83	These sifting times.....	240
Right and wrong—by H. Dickenson.....	88	The Brahma Somaj of India—by A. Truax.....	242
S		The Holy Spirit not an influence.....	248
Some sweet morn—by J. Gallaway.....	6	The light that is felt.....	248
Standing alone.....	7	The EXPOSITOR and the <i>Guardian</i>	249
Seventeen hymns.....	25, 26, 27, 28	The apostles and the fathers—by A. Truax.....	258
Signal answer to prayer.....	54	The reply of the editor of <i>Guardian</i> —by N. Burns.....	261
Sects—by H. Dickenson.....	74	The divinity of Christ, is it a myth—by B. Sherlock.....	270
Speculations on Planet Mars.....	86	The old and new dispensations—by H. Dickenson.....	300
Socrates.....	138	The divinity of Christ.....	305
Sermon—by B. Sherlock.....	241, 264	The land of settled questions.....	313
Sunday meditation—by Mary Shields.....	150	The unholy spiiit—by B. Sherlock.....	318
Schism and heresy.....	162	The Truax heresy—by A. Truax.....	320
Simplicity in apostolic days.....	166	The Keswick convention—by E. McMahon.....	326
Secret of Jesus' life—bv A. Truax.....	224, 268	U	
Should Christians follow Jesus or worship Him—by H. Dickenson.....	234	Unfit for service.....	56
Sketch of H. Dickenson's life.....	236	Unitarianism.....	282
Shut in.....	277	V	
T		Volume eleven.....	1
The annual convention.....	137, 217	W	
The word—by H. Dickenson.....	8	What is the teaching of association?.....	2
Taking a cold.....	21	What is the atonement?.....	61
The atmosphere.....	24	What of redemption schemes?.....	63
The spirit and the bride say "Come".....	29	Where the subject proves a serious injury.....	64
Tendency to improper independence must be checked.....	32	Whatsoever He saith unto you do it—by H. Dickenson.....	81
The Bible—by H. Dickenson.....	38	Waiting for daily guidance.....	111
The Holy Spirit and influence.....	39	Wesleyan Methodism.....	112
The word of God—by H. Dickenson.....	42	What is conversion.....	113
The camp meeting.....	45	Woodstock convention.....	158
The guiding hand.....	51	What is speculation concerning religious truth.....	213
The atonement.....	58	What advantage has the Diciples over us.....	213
The foundation of atonement theories.....	59	Who knows best.....	227
The rest of faith.....	73	What should be written—by H. Dickenson.....	228
The man with a message—by J. Gallaway.....	76	Why not leave the church.....	255
The inspiration question in the pulpit.....	78	Way notes.....	285
The coming pamphlet.....	85	What of divinity theories.....	306
The Holy Spirit and prayer—by B. Sherlock.....	90	What of His humanity.....	308
The Holy Ghost and Jesus—by H. Dickenson.....	93	What about the birth of Christ.....	310
The Bible answer.....	113	Way Notes.....	316
The true method.....	122	Z	
The usual method.....	124	Zinzendorfism.....	254
To the church.....	135		
Trust.....	137		
The divinity of Christ—by H. Dickenson.....	139, 291		
The humanity of Christ—by H. Dickenson.....	146		
The teachings of Moses.....	149		

IMPORTANT.

BACK NUMBERS.

One dozen back numbers, mixed, for thirty cents. Good also for distribution. Contain 384 pages of selections from the best writers, with original matter. Postage included. Fractions of a dollar can be sent in postage stamps; not necessary to register; send at our risk.

TO PARTIES WISHING TO HAVE THE EXPOSITOR DISCONTINUED.

The best way is to drop a post card stating the fact, being sure to mention both the Name and the Post Office to which the Expositor is addressed.

Sending back the last magazine received will do if the Post Office to which it is addressed is written on it, not otherwise.

ARREARS.

Look at the date on the magazine and see how your account stands, and if there is anything due arrange about a settlement before sending it back.

As a general rule we continue to send the Expositor to all subscribers until notified to the contrary. This course seems to meet the wishes of most, judging by the correspondence we receive concerning it.

MISSING COPIES REPLACED.

If through mischance any number should fail to reach a subscriber, we will send another copy if we are notified by post-card. We mail regularly to all subscribers from this office, but notwithstanding, we find that there are occasional irregularities in their delivery.

SPECIMEN COPIES.

Specimen copies sent free to any one sending a request for one by card.

DATES ON THE MAGAZINES.

The dates on the magazines represent the time up to which the magazine has been paid for.

RECEIPTS.

Changing date on magazine may be taken as equivalent to a receipt. If the change is not made the next number, it is not always a sign that a letter has miscarried, but if the second number does not show a change then something has gone wrong, when a card of inquiry is in order.

In all communications, subscribers will please to mention the Post Office address to which the Expositor is sent.

Address all communications to **REV. N. BURNS, B.A., 99 Howard St., Toronto.**

DELSARTE
COLLEGE
OF ORATORY

ELOCUTION AND DRAMATIC ART.

The Largest and Most Advanced School of Oratory

IN CANADA.

FRANCIS J. BROWN, President.

Formerly Professor of Elocution in the State Normal School, West Va.

The method is based on the DELSARTE PHILOSOPHY, and embodies the latest and most advanced principles taught in the science and art of elocution. *Course Thorough and Scientific. Degrees Conferred.*

Large Art Catalogue FREE on application to the President,

FRANCIS J. BROWN,

Y. M. C. A. BUILDING,

TORONTO.

MADAME IRELAND'S

Herbal Toilet Soap.

A PLEASANT SOAP

For GENERAL TOILET PURPOSES making the skin beautifully soft and smooth. It is at the same time a SANITARY SOAP, can be used with advantage in all cutaneous affections and is highly recommended for such purposes.

PRICE—25c. PER TABLET; IN BOXES OF THREE. 60c.

HERBAL SHAVING SOAP

10 CENTS PER BAR.

The only Medicinal Shaving Soap on the Market.

Good lather. Easy shaving. Cooling and healing. No irritation. No bay rum or other lotion necessary.

FOR SALE AT ALL LEADING DRUGGISTS OR AT OFFICE

3 KING ST. EAST, TORONTO.

WATCHES

Gentlemen's Solid 14k Gold Hunting or Open Face Stem-winding Watches with Kent Bros.' Special American Movement, only \$60.

Gentlemen's Solid 10k Gold Hunting or Open Face Stem-winding Watches with Kent Bros.' Special American Movement, only \$40.

Ladies' Solid 14k Gold Hunting or Open Face Stem-winding Watches with Kent Bros.' Special Movement, only \$35.

Ladies' Solid 10k Gold Hunting or Open Face Stem-winding Watches with Kent Bros.' Special Movement, only \$25.

THE ABOVE ARE GUARANTEED AS TO QUALITY OF CASE AND ACCURACY OF TIME.

A FULL LINE OF ALL GRADES IN

Watches, Diamonds, Jewelry, Clocks, Silverware, Novelties, Etc.

SEND FOR CATALOGUE.

**KENT BROS., WHOLESALE AND RETAIL JEWELLERS,
168 YONGE ST., TORONTO.**

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is Good."—1 Thess. v. 21.

THE

Expositor of Holiness

A CANADIAN MONTHLY MAGAZINE PUBLISHED UNDER THE
AUSPICES OF

THE CANADA HOLINESS ASSOCIATION.

ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

OUR PLATFORM.

*Catholic in Spirit—Loyal to Truth—Not Sectarian—Hence suitable to Lovers of
Holiness in every Denomination.*

Clubs of four or more subscribers receive the Magazine at 75 cents each. The usual discount to agents.

Specimen copies sent free to any address. Send for one. Address all communications to

REV. N. BURNS, B. A.,

99 HOWARD STREET,

TORONTO, ONT.