

away and the effort is made to recall them for use in hard, prosaic life, they ever prove to be a downright failure; and so, at the next gathering, like Jack in the box, the question is up again for consideration and for *temporary* settlement.

Now, this unsatisfactory, inconsequential result, must and ever will attend all such efforts to settle this vexed question. And why? Simply because it is a direct departure from the Bible method of procedure.

Jesus Christ taught most distinctly, that this question was to be handed over absolutely to the Holy Ghost, when He came as His substitute to guide and teach. When He is come, said He, He will convince of sin and righteousness; and, mark the words, He told of no other guide concerning the sin question. They, then, who go to him for individual knowledge, have the question settled satisfactorily—so completely settled, that they never after take the seat of the learner to ask questions of the self-constituted oracles who figure at Christian gatherings and in editorial chairs.

He, who is taught of God concerning this thing, has that kind of knowledge which gives perfect, continuous peace concerning it. He who is not thus taught, but tries to follow Wesley, Luther, Augustine, or any other teacher, however great and worthy in himself, walks in darkness, having not the light of life to pour its rays upon this intricate matter.

But, do we not play Sir oracle concerning this thing? Certainly we do, but our oracular response differs from all others with which we are acquainted, in this thing, viz.: That we proclaim it to be a Bible fact that no one can gain satisfactory knowledge concerning the infirmity, the mistake question, unless he obtains it as a direct, personal revelation from the Holy Ghost. And further, we assert that the way is open for every one to obtain this knowledge, and we hesitate not to back up this our proclamation by personal testimony.

HAVE thy tools ready—God will find thee work.—*Kingley.*

DR. DEWART AGAIN.

On first reading Dr. Dewart's editorial, in the *Guardian* of August 19th, I had no intention whatever of making a reply, but, on glancing over the same article again, yesterday, I thought perhaps a few lines might not be out of place.

And first, I may say, I am glad that, whilst Dr. Dewart has not attempted to answer the real arguments advanced in my letter—for the best of reasons—he has published just the particular paragraph which I would like the readers of the *Guardian* to see. For, how a Christian, living a few doors from a fellow-Christian, attending the same church, sitting at the same Lord's table, brushing against him in social gatherings, uniting with him in praise and prayer to God, meeting him face to face, and shaking hands, and yet not think it a duty or privilege to have a few words in private concerning supposed erroneous teaching or practice, before pitching into him in public, few of the readers of the *Guardian* will be able to understand, unless, indeed, the Sermon on the Mount be a dead letter, and the precepts of Christ too old and effete for the guidance of nineteenth-century editors.

While Dr. Dewart, as an editor, has undoubted public duties to perform, he has, at the same time, private Christian and brotherly duties, no less binding and no less important.

The Doctor says "he is not concerned about Mr. Burns' private opinions, or with the explanation he may give as to his meaning." Quite true, no doubt. Any one who has read and properly considered the Doctor's partial and shallow caricatures of Mr. Burns' teaching would know, without being told, he had not taken much pains to arrive at the author's real meaning. He is bound, at least by every law of just criticism, to take the teaching of Mr. Burns' book as a whole, comparing one part with another, a thing which he has not attempted to do, as I pointed out in the August EXPOSITOR. What havoc could be made of the Bible if treated in the same manner as Dr. Dewart has treated "Divine Guidance!"

The Doctor seems to think words have