

experience, voiced the desire of his true followers in the following lines.

I want the witness Lord
That all I do is right,
According to thy will and word
Well pleasing in thy sight.

But never perfectly solved the problem.

DO WE GO BEYOND WESLEY ?

In one sense we do. In another sense we do not. Mr. Wesley emphasized the necessity of the witness of the spirit. Taught that men must have the Spirit's direct witness to pardon and regeneration. So far he was firm and clear, and it is only fair to say, that Methodism has done much to win the Christian church to this view. But why limit the witness of the Spirit to the single fact or experience of regeneration? Can any one point out Scriptural authority for such limitation? Is there any reason in the nature of things why the Holy Spirit should be so limited? Manifestly not. The witness of the Spirit to pardon is simply an assurance from the Holy Ghost that the attitude and relation of the individual to God is such that God is pleased with him. In other words there is a sense of oneness, of harmony between that soul and God. Now the only sense in which we can be said to be out of harmony with Wesleyan teaching is this: We do not limit the witness of the Spirit to the single fact or experience of conversion but insist that it is His pleasure and will to witness to all the acts and deeds of life in the same manner in which He witnesses to regeneration. In this sense we go beyond Wesley, but is it a crime, is it heresy so to do? Is it so that we are to believe and preach all our doctrines, but *not* to extend any old principle nor learn any new truth? Did Mr. Wesley know everything that can be learned from the Bible or that can be taught us by the Holy Spirit? Is theology such a dry, dead, or fixed science that there is to be no progress made in its study: or is the church determined to do in the future as it has done in the

past, ostracise and cast out from her communion all who dare to think or investigate for themselves, and so compel them to form new sects in order to teach new truths, or even to enlarge or extend a well-known principle? Alas, it seems that such is her policy at present and there is small hope that she will change in the near future.

INFALLIBILITY AGAIN.

"He claims to know the will of God by direct revelation of the Spirit as well as Christ or the Apostles." This is the awful indictment of charge III. Substitutive "the witness of the Spirit" or "the guidance of the Spirit" for "direct revelation of the Spirit," and I plead guilty to the charge. The witness of the Spirit to the acts of life is both *direct* and *indirect* as it is in the case of regeneration. Now if any one knows the will of God at all he must know it for certain, and if he knows it for certain he knows it as well as any one else possibly could, be that other an apostle or even Jesus Christ. This truth is certainly axiomatic enough. But the cry is raised all the same. It is fanaticism, dangerous teaching, infallibility. So it is if the witness of the Spirit is a dangerous fanatical doctrine of infallibility, not otherwise. The fact is the doctrine of Divine Guidance is the *only* cure for the Papal idea of infallibility. Without strict adherence to the Holy Spirit as the *only final* teacher of absolute truth, all churches will gradually swing around to the position of the church of Rome and demand of the people that they shall accept what the church chooses to teach as absolute truth, and excommunicate them the moment they attempt to think for themselves. Indeed, let anyone in the Methodist church now call in question the decision of the Niagara Conference in my own case, and he will see at once that practical infallibility is claimed for the Conference. Protestants applaud those who followed Luther after his teaching was pronounced heretical by the church, but let Methodists