

a rigid, fixed and invariable meaning, and, therefore, need no explanation or interpretation. Strange, indeed, for a nineteenth-century editor. His readers must know very well that words are a very imperfect medium for conveying thoughts. Indeed, so imperfect are they that, whilst attempting to convey spiritual truth by their means, we are sure to be misunderstood, more or less, by the majority of those who listen, no matter how skilful we may be in the use of language. Was it not so with the Saviour, the greatest who ever taught through the medium of words? How very few of His hearers understood His words, and even the little company who followed Him closely, and plied Him with all manner of questions concerning His teaching, failed to get anything like a clear conception of the truth as taught by Christ, until the coming of the "Comforter Divine," who could enlighten their minds and instruct their understanding without the clumsy medium of words, either spoken or written. That same "Comforter" as guide is necessary to-day, else why should He "abide forever?" If persons wish to know the truth concerning divine guidance, they must inquire as earnestly, as patiently, as diligently, and submit just as fully and absolutely to be taught of the Spirit as the apostles did in learning of Christ, or they will never know. There is no royal road into this spiritual kingdom. King and subject, millionaire and pauper, wise editor and little child, must enter in at the same gate.

Dr. Dewart may claim that he understands the teaching of the association, but, as a matter of fact, he either does not understand it, or he deliberately misrepresents its teaching. Some of the most level-headed men and women in the different churches, who have attended nearly all the public gatherings of the association, being judges, and they are better qualified to pass judgment than Dr. Dewart, or any other editor who has not attended such meetings.

So, the *Guardian* is a "defender of the truth." Very strange, indeed. How can it defend the truth when it does not know the truth? But the editor does know the truth. Surely not; for if that

were so he would be just like Mr. Burns or any member of the Association. That is *infallible*, for I am in a position to know that no members of the Association claim to know more than the truth, or the will of God concerning them. Of course, when a member of the Association claims to know and teach the truth, he is at once dubbed *oracle* and *infallible*. But, when Dr. Dewart knows, defends, and teaches truth, he is—well, what in the name of common-sense is he, any way?

In closing, I must call attention to a few inaccuracies in the Doctor's editorial. A brother minister, on reading the article, involuntarily called them lies. But he spoke hastily. Inaccuracy is the term used in diplomatic circles and in high society.

Inaccuracy No. 1.—"The last issue of Rev. N. Burns' magazine contains two singularly weak and unreasonable articles." The articles were neither weak nor unreasonable. The best proof of this is in the fact that Dr. Dewart attempted to answer them. All editors know that the best answer to "weak and unreasonable articles" is silence. Editorial space is valuable, or ought to be.

Inaccuracy No. 2.—"The *Guardian* . . . had shown the unscriptural and dangerous character of teaching, that sets the authority of individual claims to special revelations of the Holy Spirit above the plain teaching of the Word of God." This is both a misrepresentation and an inaccuracy. There is no teaching connected with the "Association" which "sets the authority of individual claims, etc., above the plain teaching of (any) Word of God."

Inaccuracy No. 3.—"We had also shown that those who claimed to be infallibly guided in all matters of thought and action by direct revelation of the Holy Spirit, by such assumption place themselves above the need of studying the Bible in order to know the will of God." Dr. Dewart *stated* something like the above, he *proved* or showed nothing. I clearly showed that a person divinely guided would be no more raised above the need of reading the Bible than a boy with a first-class mathematical