

Now, one serious charge made by Dr. Dewart is that Mr. Burns "disparages the value and authority of Scripture." Convincing proof of the truth of this charge will be found in Mr. Burns' book, "Divine Guidance." In general, the author of this book appeals everywhere to the Bible in support of the doctrine taught. He insists that it is a Bible doctrine, taught even in the Old Testament, and cites numerous examples. He further insists that the New Testament is saturated with it, and especially that the words of Jesus touching guidance by the Spirit are wonderfully clear and explicit.

But to come to particulars—on page 40 we read, "But manifestly the words of the last teacher of ultimate truth, the man Christ Jesus must measure the importance and extent of the doctrine of guidance through the Holy Ghost." What shameful disparagement of the words of Jesus. The clearest proof of this charge, however, is found on page 57. It reads, "*We take our strongly intrenched position that the BIBLE ALONE can establish or disprove the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as guide into all truth.*" If further evidence is necessary, I need only refer to the well-known fact that Mr. Burns does not accept Paul's views concerning celibacy and the status of women in the church. I know it may be urged that Dr. Dewart believes or practises the same as Mr. Burns in this matter, but that proves nothing against him (Dr. Dewart), for he is a Methodist minister and the editor of the *Guardian*, while Mr. Burns is only a Methodist minister and editor of the *EXPOSITOR*. The odds is the difference. Another statement is that Mr. Burns' teaching "raises those who hold this notion above the power of argument or truth."

That it raises them above the power of a great many arguments—so-called—may be safely taken for granted. That it raises them above the power of truth the most cursory reader of Mr. Burns' writings can easily see. It stands out on every page and is seen in nearly every paragraph. Does not Mr. Burns clearly teach that the Holy Spirit is given for the express purpose of guiding the believer into *all truth*? And will

not the logical result of *finding* or *knowing* the truth be to raise the finder above its power? And worse than all, Mr. Burns plainly teaches that a passionate love of the truth must characterize him who would walk in the Spirit. He must love it so much, indeed, as to be quite ready and willing to sell all he holds dear in order to obtain this pearl of priceless value. Nay, he must give his own life, if need be, in witnessing to and defending the truth. Of course, such an one would naturally come to regard the truth for which he had sacrificed everything as of little worth. It could have no power over him. It is further charged that this teaching tends to supersede "reason, common-sense, observation and Scripture teaching." Mr. Burns undoubtedly teaches that all the faculties and powers of the mind are to be under divine control and direction, and as an illustration cites the relation of a pupil to his teachers, pointing out that the best teacher would be he who simply guided the pupil in his studies and investigations, making him think and learn for himself, but so managing him that he might make the best possible use of his faculties, albeit, he must at times take the bare word of the teacher. Such Mr. Burns declared in a late number of the *EXPOSITOR* to be the method of divine guidance. Let any one judge whether this would not set aside reason, common-sense, observation, etc. Does the man who follows an infallible guide need to exercise his reasoning powers? No more than the boy learning *long division* when he is guided by a teacher who is practically infallible, so far as that subject is concerned. Some people are foolish enough to think that the fact of their being divinely guided in reading the Bible is to them the surest of all tokens that they will read it with the greater delight and profit. Strange, is it not? But the charge to which the good Doctor returns most frequently is that this dangerous teaching makes those who accept it *oracles* and *infallible*.

Now, it is true these are dreadful looking words—especially when you see them in print. The very sight of them frightens timid people. For has not in-