

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

11:10
1893
Apr.

EMMANUEL

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR. POSTAGE PAID BY PUBLISHER.

APRIL, 1893.



Expositor



HOLINESS



Toronto:

Published under the Auspices of the Canada Holiness Association.

W. S. JOHNSTON & CO., THE ART PRINTERS, 67 ADELAIDE STREET WEST, TORO-TO.

THE EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Poetry—"Choose Thou for Me".....	249	Conversion	260
The Expositor and the <i>Guardian</i>	249	Letter to <i>Guardian</i> on "The Reply of the Editor to My Letter".....	261
Mr. Burns and His Critics	251	Sermon by Rev. B. Sherlock.....	264
Mr. Burns on His Defence	253	The Secret of Jesus' Life—A. Truax	268
Zinzendorfism.....	254	The Divinity of Christ—B. Sherlock	270
Why not Leave the Church.....	255	Correspondence.....	273-275
Diversity of Opinion—H. Dickenson.....	256	Incidents by the Way—H. Dickenson.....	276
The Apostles and the Fathers—A. Truax..	258		

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., 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.
- Hawtreay, 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.

APRIL, 1893.

NO. 10.

CHOOSE THOU FOR ME.

THU will not mine, dear Lord, I pray,
For I could never choose aright;
My future way I cannot see,
With this my dim and earthly sight.
Plan thou for me, I humbly ask,
Whatever seemeth good to thee :
And let me simply rest in faith,
As trusting as a child should be.
I know right well I should select
The greenest path and bluest sky ;
And miss thy presence in the storms,
Proclaiming, " Fear not ; It is I."
Yes, Lord, my heart would vainly seek
A life with out a single care ;
And I should lose the soothing balm
Those only know who live by prayer.
A life without one cloud to dim
The brightnest of its radiant sky,
Would be like scorching summer heat,
And every tender grace would die.
Choose thou, since thou dost know it all,
Thy heart is kind, thy way is best ;
With joy I'll take the pleasant things,
And trust thy help to bear the rest.
—*The Defence*

THE EXPOSITOR AND THE GUARDIAN.

WE DEEM it best to bring a bit of history, of recent date, in connection with these two periodicals, before our readers.

Our purpose for so doing is in harmony with our platform, for we think it will tend to clear away some more of the obstructions to the spread of the gospel which we preach.

It is well known to most of our readers that it has not been an unusual thing to read or hear of articles written in the *Christian Guardian*, both by the editor and correspondents, which were decidedly hostile to us.

Sometimes we have sent in short replies, and sometimes not. The treatment we have received at the hands of the editor from the beginning of our special work, has been of such a character as to require us to write very cautiously and carefully if with any hope of obtaining even a partial hearing.

Hence the most we attempted to do was to skim the surface of things, and call for thorough investigation on the part of critics.

And indeed we had fully anticipated such unfair dealings, from the nature of the contest which we were instrumental in bringing on.

For as we came to realize the true inwardness of the creed life as contrasted with the walk in the Spirit, we well knew that the truth of Christ's teaching would be exemplified in this contest. "The time cometh when he that killeth you will think that he doeth God service." We are fully aware that the spirit of this extreme statement must be exhibited in every conflict between spirituality and loyalty, till the end of time.

This our contention has been made good with respect to the Holiness creed movement, as we have abundantly shown in object lesson form.

But this same spirit will be evinced towards us by the churches generally, and can only be kept dormant by lack of aggressive work on our part.

It is a part of our legitimate work to impress this fact upon the consciousness of all who would live godly, for two reasons, first, it will enable those who desire to live

this life to count the cost ere beginning.

That this is of great value to beginners Christ Himself hath fully shown, in the parables concerning the man who would build a tower, or the general who would fight an enemy without counting the cost before commencing.

And we remark further that concerning this thing it requires an immense amount, of teaching ere men will admit as a fact that which they think all but impossible to be a fact, viz.: that the most pious in all the churches, including preachers of holiness and evangelists who reckon their converts by the thousands, will, as a rule, be the fiercest and most unscrupulous in their antagonism to this movement. Hence it is that many who commenced this life whilst still clinging to the opposite belief have gone down before the surprise temptations which have assailed them, and many more will imitate them in this foolish course.

He who would walk in this Pentecostal way must first sit down and count the cost, else will he of necessity imitate the foolish men as illustrated in the parables of Christ. So it is needful in behalf of all those who would live godly, to prove the presence of this all but universal antagonism so fully that there may be no excuse for such sad termination of attempted walk in the Spirit.

In the second place, and as a still more serious matter, it is desirable to make evident to all who would live spiritual lives that it is utterly foolish for them to even hope to get assistance in that walk from the churches; that whilst they are not of necessity called out of the churches, after the teaching of come outers, that nevertheless they are to be diverse from all others in the churches, and so their only mission to them is that of helpfulness, not of being helped.

Such are the salt of the earth. Now salt gives out preserving qualities, but asks not them back from any. This thought, however, cannot be fully brought out in one article, but will doubtless characterize

much of the future writings of the EXPOSITOR.

Now, in alluding to the attitude of the *Guardian* towards this movement, we by no means undertake to prove that it is an exceptionally bad paper, as compared with its confreres, or that its editor is a black sheep amongst them. Our practical knowledge of the character of other denominational organs is not as extensive as is our knowledge of holiness periodicals, and yet we venture the opinion that the *Christian Guardian* will compare favorably with all others, both in literary ability and so called spirituality, moreover we would look upon any other denominational paper in pursuing a less antagonistic or even unscrupulous course as exceptional amongst the rest. In short, we expect that, as a rule, the same kind of justice will, in the end, be meted out to us by them all.

At the last general Conference, we cast about in our mind to see what would be the probable results as concerning our movements if any of the other talked of candidates should edit the *Guardian*, and came to the conclusion that we had nothing better to hope from any one of them.

Whilst the battle was in progress with the holiness creed movement the *Guardian* and *Presbyterian Review* did not imitate the other church organs in keeping silent, simply and only because they were brought into closer contact with the movement.

In the contest brought on by the publishing of "Danger ahead" by Dr. Steele the *Guardian* was rather made use of by the holiness creed movement as an ally on their side. For this same *Guardian* had shown long before, its hostility to even the holiness creed movement, after the pattern of such opposition in similar denominational organs.

But now that this contest with the holiness creed movement is virtually over—not, we say, as far as fierce, bitter hostility on their part is concerned, but as to any further show of argumentative opposition

—and the way is opening up for the great coming controversy with the churches proper, it is but natural that the *Guardian* should lead, seeing it is in the midst of the movement and has to receive the brunt of the first conflict.

The *Expositor*, *Divine Guidance* and *How to Keep Converted*, have been chiefly circulated amongst the readers of the *Guardian*. The bulk of the membership of the Association is still in the Methodist church of Canada. A fierce combined attack has been but recently made on the movement in the *Guardian*. We have taken up our pen, for the first time, to meet these critics after an exhaustive manner, intending, if permitted, to meet all in full explanations, or after any manner that might help onlookers to judge righteous judgement concerning the whole matter.

Accordingly we sent a lengthy reply to two of the *Guardian* critics. We sent our letter in, in full time to be published in the next issue of the paper following the one which contained the dual attack. But the editor champion of *fair* dealing deliberately delayed its publication to the week following, and thus trampled on our personal rights in the controversy. The next week he published the letter, but came to the rescue of our critics with his editorials.

We immediately replied by letter, and again in time to have our reply appear in the following week. But, after waiting several days, we received a letter from the editor stating that he declined to publish it and thus this controversy, as far as the *Christian Guardian* is concerned is brought to an abrupt and final conclusion. Not that the editor and numerous correspondents will cease to caricature the movement we represent as a whole or to hurl epithets at its individual members. But all reply from us is cut off as far as the *Guardian* is concerned and so, henceforth, the vast majority of the readers of the *Guardian* will see but one side of the question.

Even if we were permitted to reply to any future critics who, as correspondents, may write to the *Guardian*, it must be with the understanding that the editor is to side with them, twist and distort our writings, and bring forth foundationless charges against us, and then refuse to be corrected in the columns of his paper.

To write for the *Guardian* under such absurd conditions would be to forfeit our self respect as well as to spend our strength for naught. Hence will be seen why we consider the first part of the conflict practically over. We cannot imagine ourselves again writing for the *Guardian*, unless common justice were guaranteed, and this, of course, implying that such justice has been thus far refused.

As many of the readers of the *Expositor* do not see the *Guardian*, we reproduce for their benefit our letter which was published in the *Guardian*, and the writings of the editor concerning it. We will also add the letter which we sent in reply to these editorials, but which was refused insertion, that all may have as intelligent a view of the situation as possible.

MR. BURNS AND HIS CRITICS.

DEAR SIR,—Personal defence, although generally so, is not always an unmixed evil. The evils, or, if you will, unpleasantnesses, necessarily connected therewith, however, are somewhat alleviated when those having it in their power give ungrudgingly a fair opportunity for defence. Hitherto, whether wittingly or otherwise, this opportunity, in my opinion, has been denied me. I say, *in my opinion*; and I here remark that in holding this opinion I can still respect a brother who differs from me in this matter. However, so strong has this opinion been held that it has materially influenced me in replying to personal criticisms in the *GUARDIAN*; for I have felt that I had to write rather what might *possibly* be published than what constituted suitable replies to my critics. But I have now concluded to write as meeting my critics on a fair field, with no special favor shown to either side, leaving the responsibility of unjust treatment where it may belong.

In my last brief letter I made the clear, unmistakable assertion that I was in harmony with Methodist standards. Two writers in the last issue of the *GUARDIAN* assert the contrary. Assertions prove nothing. Here they simply indicate the fact of diverse opinions, and may

be equally honest, although contradictory. And so Christian character is not necessarily impeached by either dogmatist in emphasizing his diverse opinion.

In one of the short editorials of the GUARDIAN there seemed to be implied the charge of intentional dishonesty on my part, hence I hastened to reply to it. As the charge was not reiterated in clear unmistakable language, I felt I was not called to any further defence of my Christian character at that time. But in the two letters in the last GUARDIAN this charge is distinctly preferred against me, and hence this reply. I have met so many sincere men in the Church, and even in the ministry, who are absolute in their belief that they in their opinions, represent Methodism, and, of course, Christianity, that it would not startle me to learn of many others besides these two pronouncing on me as un-Methodistic and untrue to the teachings of the Bible because of not being in full harmony with them.

All this I could easily pass by as not calling for a vigorous defence. We are all dogmatists to a certain degree. Indeed, there is not a proper foundation for growth in knowledge unless we dogmatize concerning what we already do know. But when character is openly attacked it is a very different matter; and yet it is quite possible that these writers may not intend all that their language legitimately implies. It may mean simply and only that if I saw the discrepancy between my acts on the one hand and Methodism and Christianity on the other as they see it, or think they see it, I ought to resign my place in the Methodist Church. Now, in this thought I am fully at one with them, and hence I can promise them, and all others, that so soon as I see as they do I will act along the line of their directions. I have no hope, however, of making all believe it to be possible for another to see things from a standpoint different from theirs. Still, there are many unprejudiced onlookers who do not wish to condemn on one-sided evidence. It is for their sakes I write.

Now, even granting, for the sake of argument, that I am not in perfect agreement with the standards, is it necessarily a dishonest act to remain in the ministry? Very few thoughtful, truth-searching ministers are in harmony with those standards. When Brother Wilkinson published his letters in the GUARDIAN concerning inbred sin, at once some of his brethren pronounced on him as out of harmony with the standards, whilst in the many replies called forth I traced at least three distinct theories on the subject, or rather concerning the whole question of the Methodist doctrine of Christian perfection. Certainly they were not all in harmony with the standards after the thought of my critics. And yet no one accused them of dishonesty in not stepping down and out.

It is well known that what Wesley called Zinzendorphism and characterized as a most serious heresy (even going so far as to declare that they who held such views about Christian perfection were not Methodists), is from time to time openly advocated in our pulpits and

Church organs, and yet no one imitates John Wesley in denouncing them. I simply, by these illustrations, draw attention to the fact that it is not clear how much one has to differ from the standards to become dishonest if he fails to withdraw from the ministry.

It is boldly affirmed that the judgment of an overwhelming majority of Methodist ministers is against me. I ask for the authority of such statement. In my estimation it is a direct impeachment of the ministry of my Church. There has been no fair, two-sided public argument. The accused has scarcely been heard from. Is the Methodist ministry, as a body, deserving of such characterization? Are they so notoriously unjust that they are ready, at the simple demand of a few radicalists, to condemn, anathematize, and expel a brother minister without giving him even a chance for explanations? Verily, if this is true of them, then the dishonesty would be in choosing the company of the dishonest.

It is urged that the fact that the magazine in question is no longer printed at the Book-Room is tantamount to a decree of united Methodism. This is certainly a *new departure*. Where is this found in the standards? On my part, the publishing of the magazine there was a pure business transaction. Twice I was on the point of taking it elsewhere for financial reasons. If others choose to put some religious significance into the matter, that is their affair. I certainly do not.

But in all these matters we are dealing with one another as professedly Christian brethren. Cannot we all go on with the understanding that our practice is in harmony with the precepts of Christ's teaching until, at all events, one or more is proved guilty of wrong doing? Even the weakest and obscurest brother in Church fellowship deserves consideration enough to ensure him justice in our dealings with him; how much more when the parties directly and indirectly accused have for many years sustained unblemished Christian characters in the blazing light of yearly District and Conferential examinations, should the utmost consideration be shown in handling their public and private characters.

The question now at issue is, can a Methodist minister, in publishing a non-denominational magazine, permit one who apparently holds Unitarian views, to write articles for it, said articles seemingly permeated with this Unitarian flavor? I know of no law or deliverance in the Methodist Church against which I sin in so doing. I presume, however, that it is possible for a law to be enacted in that direction. Why not, then, take the proper course for such action, or, at all events, test the constitutional powers of the Church in that direction? John Wesley himself actually published and circulated amongst his people the memoirs of a Unitarian minister. Does not that act of the father of Methodism imply some latitude in this and other directions?

But I maintain that the real object of the writer of those seemingly Unitarian articles, as also that of the editor of the *Expositor* in pub-

lishing them, has not, as yet, been understood by my critics. Of course, I cannot here ask for sufficient space to explain, but explanations will be forthcoming at the proper time.

Like John Wesley, I demand to be judged by the work being accomplished, not by incidents occurring in the methods used. That result is righteous lives. As Wesley could triumphantly point to such results in his day, so I put forth the same challenge. If the challenge was not accepted in his day outside the movement which he represented, I suppose I need not be surprised if I meet with like treatment. However, like him, I ask all for an impartial and exhaustive examination, even if I should ask in vain, and suggest, in the meantime, that at least the basal law of common justice, that which is respected even in secular matters—viz., that the accused should be treated as innocent till proved guilty—should not be ignored in the professed Church of Christ. Pending any official investigation that may be called for, I am prepared, in the interests of truth, to write lengthily in the *GUARDIAN* in answer to all questions asked, or in explanation of any matters that are not fully understood by all parties concerned, provided equal space be given me with my critics, and thus even handed justice be meted out to all.

N. BURNS.

MR. BURNS ON HIS DEFENCE.

"We print in another column a letter from Rev. Nelson Burns, in reply to recent correspondence which condemned his published teaching, as un-scriptural and un-Methodistic. The reply is characteristically weak, and evasive. One would not get from Mr. Burns' letter a correct conception of the objections which he pretends to answer. Those who reject Mr. Burns' peculiar theory, are not opposed to Scriptural holiness, or to the guidance of the Spirit. We can only briefly state the chief things to which objection has been taken. They are in substance as follows :

A true believer is infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit in all things temporal and spiritual, small and great. This is so taught as to place special revelations to the individual above the teaching of the Scriptures, and lift those who believe these notions above argument and reason. In order to make room for and magnify this dogma, the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, as a rule of faith and practice, is disparaged—if not actually denied. Nothing equal to this is claimed for the Pope of Rome.

In a recent issue of Mr. Burns' magazine, a member of the Holiness Association, and a regular contributor, made statements respecting Christ's character lower and grosser than the better class of Unitarians would endorse. He said : "We believe his divinity, outside the Holy Ghost coming upon him, when he went to be baptized of John in the river Jordan, to be a mere myth. . . . In no sense did Jesus' divinity surpass the divinity of those who are under law to the Spirit. . . . In the sense that he did the will of the Father

he was divine, and in no other. He had no divinity that you and I cannot possess." This, and more like it, was published and sent forth by Mr. Burns, for the edification of his readers. This called forth strong protests. But at the recent meeting of the Association, the propriety of his publishing such heresy was defended. The Rev. Mr. Linscott justified Mr. Burns, on the ground that the Holiness Association embraced Unitarians, and people of nearly all the Churches. So, of course, the magazine must be the mouthpiece of this motley membership !

On several circuits, where some people have accepted the dogma of Mr. Burns respecting divine guidance, the pretentious claims of these walking oracles have produced division and discord that have done much injury to the cause of religion. In a recent case, mentioned in the *GUARDIAN*, expulsion was found necessary. We do not think any unprejudiced person will maintain that such teachings and doings as we have mentioned are things befitting loyal Methodists, or that they can conduce to promote scriptural religion.

Now, how does Mr. Burns meet these attested facts ? Mainly by ignoring them. He complains that "the accused has scarcely been heard from," although he has printed his views fully in a good-sized volume, and published numerous monthly incubrations and defences. He insinuates that the *GUARDIAN* was not open to him, though we have published all he sent, except to reprint his published articles. He assumes that an attack has been made on his personal integrity, though he knows the complaint is respecting the unscriptural and un-Methodistic character of his published and spoken teaching. The pith of his reply may be stated in two propositions : (1) Though he has admitted it to be new, he declares his teaching to be Methodistic. (2) His magazine is undenominational, and, therefore, not amenable to any theological standard. The first of these replies consists simply in "the accused" giving himself a certificate of orthodoxy. He knows he can propagate his notions better as a Methodist minister. He thinks his doctrinal soundness is justified by the work—that is, he being the judge of the work. But even this certificate is superfluous, for he holds that everyone should be allowed to go on, till "proved guilty of wrong-doing."

The second plea implies that a Methodist minister may poison the minds of the people with Unitarianism, and other heresies and religious fads contrary to Methodist doctrine ; but so long as he does it through a so called "undenominational" publication, it is all right, and he is not accountable to the Church ! A man must feel hard pressed when he has to invent this notion of double personality, in order to meet the necessities of an indefensible position. This reminds one of the Prince-Archbishop, who, when rebuked for swearing, said he swore as a prince, and not as an archbishop.

The *GUARDIAN* has never deemed it its duty to look after the orthodoxy of what our ministers preach. That is not our business.

But when men, from the vantage ground of the office of Methodist ministers, publish to the world dogmas or theories which we believe and know to be unscriptural and dangerous, we would be recreant to our trust, if we did not unmask their erroneous teaching and frankly state our reasons for rejecting it, whatever unjust complaints of persecution this may call forth from those who want to propagate their heresies under the prestige of Methodism."

During the long term that the present Editor has conducted the CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN, he does not remember that it has ever been said that he has not faithfully defended Methodist doctrines and principles. It is a strange thing that this very fidelity to the faith should call forth, from any Methodists, prejudice and hostility to the paper. Yet, wherever there is a clique or section who adopt some social or religious hobby or fad, the interests of such faction become more important to them than those of the Church; and, if the GUARDIAN will not pronounce their "shibboleth," they become opponents, instead of friends. This has been the case with those who accept the theory of infallible guidance in all matters. In spite of what he recently wrote, about not canvassing Methodists for his magazine, it is true that wherever Rev. N. Burns' peculiar notions are accepted, there is hostility to the CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN. We have been credibly informed that among these people, at the time of the last General Conference, prayer was offered for the Editor—that he might be removed. It was also reported to have been divinely revealed that he would not be re-elected. But "the best laid schemes o' mice and men gang aft agley." The popularity that would be gained by pandering to questionable crotchets or theories would be too dearly bought. We must stand by the old ship, whatever squalls may blow."

We seriously question the statement, that our ministers—except it might be in some exceptional case—preach "Zinzendorfism." Though that is a good big word to fling at Somebody."—*Gaardian*.

ZINZENDORFISM.

OUR simple allusion to this subject has inspired a couple of articles in the *Christian Guardian*, and hence we refer to the matter.

Those who are in any way familiar with what is called *holiness literature* know that the use of this word, in such connection, does not imply all the views and teachings of Count Zinzendorf, but simply and only his teaching concerning inbred sin.

Wesley taught that at conversion inbred sin still remains in the child of God

until death or the obtainment of entire sanctification. The Count maintained that at conversion the child of God was as holy as could be in this life.

This deliverance is given as a reply to a direct question from Wesley: "At the same moment one is justified, he is entirely sanctified. After that he can be neither more holy nor less holy till death."—(Wesley's Journals, vol. 1 p. 335).

Wesley in his sermon on *sin in believers* gives Zinzendorf's views on this subject, in these words, "All true believers are not only saved from the *dominion of sin* but from the being of inward as well as outward sin, so that it no longer remains in them."—(Wesley's works, vol. 5. p. 145). The italics are Wesley's.

It is true that he also held other views obnoxious to John Wesley, views which the latter combatted strenuously. But we maintain that his name amongst Methodists of to-day is almost exclusively connected with his denial of the need of a second blessing, just as the name of Arminius is considered synonymous with the doctrine of the freedom of the will, and that of Calvin, with the doctrine of predestination.

No one would dream of finding fault with one's nomenclature if a minister was said to preach Calvinism when he had only preached on the doctrine of election approvingly, or another Arminianism when he had simply affirmed the freedom of the will.

Moreover, amongst "holiness writers" the formidable four-syllabled word Zinzendorfism is as freely used as its five-syllabled brother Arminianism, and is as frequently convenient as the other to express in one word what would otherwise need several.

In our use of the word we had reference in a general way, to the teaching which denies the need of a second blessing to prepare the believer for Heaven. And we contend that it is not being obscure to use the word in such connection. This

teaching, which we neither here nor in our published letter criticised, we maintain has again and again appeared in the pages of the *Guardian* as well as been preached from many of our Methodist pulpits.

But even if, for the sake of argument, we were to refer to the other chief point in the creed of Zinzendorf, viz., the imputed righteousness of Christ, he would be a reckless writer who would deny that it does not occasionally appear in Methodist pulpit talk.

We may be mistaken, but we think the editor of the *Guardian* heard the following sentiment once uttered in his presence from one of our leading pulpits, and by a Methodist preacher. At all events it was by one who was his pastor at the time :

"If you charge me with living a defective life, full of shortcomings and regrettable imperfections such as ought not to exist in it, I acknowledge the truthfulness of your accusation. I stand condemned before your truthful judgment; but if I take you with me, past the stars, into the presence chamber of God, you dare not charge me there with these same defects, for the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, by virtue of His atonement, covers over my guilt, and I am acquitted before Him. In the language of Paul, I challenge you and all others: Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth."

This might be also correctly named Zinzendorfism. And further, whilst the sentiment contained in the above extract is seldom brought out so distinctly, nevertheless, he is not a close observer who has not often heard it in a more disguised form taught from both pulpit and press in the Methodist church.

Now, in alluding to these matters, we are not heresy hunting, for we make no serious charges against any, but are in all this simply justifying our statement in the *Guardian*, which statement, the editor saw

fit to criticise after he had barricaded himself against possible correction.

HE GUARDETH THEE.

SPARROW, He guardeth thee.
Never a flight but thy wings He upholdeth
Never a night but thy rest He enfoldeth,
Safely He guardeth thee.

Lily, He robeth thee,
Though thou must fade by the summer bemoaned
Thou art arrayed, fair as a monarch enthroned,
Spotless, He robeth thee.

Heard, thou of little faith,
Sparrow and lily are soulless and dying;
Deathless art thou, will He slight thy faint cry?
Trust thou of little faith.

—Robert Gilbert Welsh.

WHY NOT LEAVE THE CHURCH ?

OUR answer, as usual, is two-fold. To the spiritual we say, and are fully understood when we say, that thus far we follow where the Master leads, and we expect to continue so to act.

But to all others our reply must be in their language, and so to them we say, that we see abundant reasons why we should not do so. We were brought up in the church to which we belong. When we began to think for ourself concerning this thing it seemed to us that our convictions still harmonized with our surroundings, as they yet do. We have ever been loyal to the churches' highest interests, and still are. We have no quarrel with her. The most that can be truthfully said against us, is that we have thus far devoted our life for her spiritual welfare.

It was said by the late Rev. J. E. Betts, when recommending us at District meeting to be received as a preacher on probation, that he expected that our influence on the ministry would be elevating in its tendency, at all events such was the report of his words brought us by a brother probationer. In looking back over our past ministerial life, we hesitate not to say, that in view of the number of brother ministers

who have testified publicly or privately to us personally, concerning real definite spiritual profit derived from our public and private labors, that our first superintendent must have spoken in the spirit of prophesy.

We still are laboring for the spiritual welfare of the church to which we belong, and are doing so to the best of our ability, and according to the methods we conscientiously think to be the best.

What though some of the brethren think differently, we think they are wrong in their estimate of our work, as honestly as they think we are wrong.

If the number of these should become the majority, and by some vote or edict sever our connection with the church, then we will have to adapt ourself to these altered circumstances. But it will be time for such action on our part when the presumed circumstances exist. Meanwhile we act in all good faith to all. Should some such result be attained by injustice, it will be our part to make that injustice manifest to all, for the good of all concerned. But having secured such publicity there the matter we presume, will drop as far as we are concerned.

As yet whilst anticipating intensest antagonism from the majority of the representative men in the church,—we refer now to office as representative—we cling to the hope that so large a section of the members are really in love with righteous living that they will be able to prevent this movement, so fraught with blessing for all, being denied the privilege of helping to raise the life of the church higher in the scale of spirituality than it at present is.

However, concerning the details of the future we know nothing definite, and so we go on our way rejoicing, confident that, as we have now for nearly twelve years preached both by lip and pen this Pentecostal gospel with marvellous blessing to ourself and others, the same Divine blessing will attend us in all our future labors in its behalf, and also that as hitherto, so

also in time to come, every weapon formed against us will only not prosper but will be forced to do service in the continued spread of the kingdom of Heaven on the earth.

DIVERSITY IN BELIEF

IF CHRISTENDOM is composed of those who hold different opinions as to what is truth, and this will be generally admitted, it naturally becomes a subject of enquiry, what latitude of opinion can be claimed and given and yet orthodoxy maintained and heaven secured.

We assume that no person is orthodox who does not do what he knows to be the whole will of God; and this doing of the will is a separate matter from the holding of an opinion about some doctrine, creed or form of worship. There may be gradation in knowledge about what the will of God is. To some, it may be the will of God to live without sin. To some, it may be the will of God that they may possibly only in some imaginary sense, sin in thought, word and deed daily. Others may live a sinning and repenting life, and yet their knowledge of what God's will is be so limited as that they may not know the better way. We are not prepared to draw any line here. We are not even prepared to dogmatize, and declare that the Hindoo mother who throws her child into the Ganges may not be doing, up to the light and knowledge she may have, the whole will of God.

The doing of the will must have some relation to the knowledge of what that will is. Men and women of the different forms of religion, not only Protestant and Roman Catholic, but what are popularly denominated heathen religions, have certain standards. The living up to these standards constitutes to them the doing of the will of God. The Episcopalian joins his church by confirmation—the Baptist by immersion—the Presbyterian by a confession of faith—the Methodist by a laying on of

hands or receiving the right hand of fellowship. These things constitute the will of God to each of these sects in the matter of joining the Church.

The very fact of each sect having a different form for joining the Church, necessitates a difference of belief in this matter. If any difference of belief is admitted at all, who is to say how much difference there can be, and yet, as we said before, orthodoxy be maintained.

If difference of opinion be admitted at all within the household of faith, we maintain that there can be no limit—no one can limit the Holy One of Israel in His teaching of the individual. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty to have and hold any, and every form of belief under the sun as long as that form is directly sanctioned by the Holy Ghost the present teacher of what the will of God is to the individual.

We maintain that no individual or combination of individuals has any right to dictate what belief or opinion is essential to Christianity; . They may suggest.

No one has the right to question for instance, the orthodoxy of the individual or the sect who believes and teaches that, "the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent." If we are as Christ was then the converse must be true, Christ was, as we are. We are human. Then if Christ was human of necessity He must have been the "seed of the woman," and this "prophecy" must be true, that is if any Scripture is true. But we maintain that Christianity, or the religion which Christ introduced into the world, does not depend for its existence upon Scripture at all as popularly believed. It certainly has some relation to historical facts. We must depend upon some kind of history, either what has been characterized as sacred or profane, for our knowledge of Christ's existence on the earth. Then history must chronicle for us what He did.

It is within the province of every one to whom the knowledge of the historic Christ

has come to prove experimentally whether He was ever crucified or not. All they have to do is to live as He lived—to say as He said, "I came not to do mine own will but the will of Him that sent me," and they will soon realize that the friendship of the world is very likely to be enmity to God—that they that live as He lived—godly—shall suffer persecution. Have you ever stopped to enquire how much persecution you suffer? If looked into properly it is a legitimate subject for study.

Ungodly persons can easily procure for themselves persecution, so that persecution is no criterion of a godly life. Godly living secures persecution inevitably. Have you secured it? If not something is wrong certainly. It is not your being persecuted that pleases God. It is godly living that pleases God. Persecution is only an effect of a cause. There can be more causes than godly living which will produce the effect, persecution. Godly living is godly living, whether in Canada or Hindostan. Godly living has nothing to do with the multifarious beliefs of so called Christendom, and yet Christendom may have an infinite number of times these multifarious forms of belief and all these forms of belief and action be proper as long as God is the author. God is certainly the author of growth in knowledge in these matters.

And what should be the attitude of Christians, to whom much knowledge has been given, towards those to whom little knowledge has been given? Must they necessarily anathematize and denounce those who possess a limited amount of knowledge about *Divine things*?

Jesus said "whoso *doeth* the will, the same is my brother." Do the advanced and well taught Trinitarians act in a brotherly manner towards their Unitarian brother who does the will as far as he has knowledge? Do those who believe in the immaculate conception of Jesus, make their charity cover a multitude of sins in

those who cannot grasp the mystery but whose belief in the Universal Fatherhood of God is as advanced as the most pronounced Trinitarian? Is it the custom of the Christian who believes in a "Divinely born Jesus," to obey Jesu's command, and "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," especially to his brother who believes in the humanity of Jesus, who has only got the length in knowledge of believing that Jesus was the "first born among many brethren?" My experience for the past few months has been, that as I took for the time being the place of the unorthodox in this matter, I could easily imagine that the world was turned upside down in some respects. The contumely and hissing, the denunciation and cold shouldering I have received on this account has been to me quite a revelation. I have been compelled to ask again and again is such treatment the product of a real or a spurious christianity? I have been compelled to fall back upon the words of Jesus, "bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you," more times in the last few months than ever before in my life.

If God be good and allows His sun to shine on the evil as well as on the good, and Christ be God, and we are His followers, we certainly should allow the sun of our righteous lives to shine on the evil as well as on the good in our generation, and thus fulfil Christ's word "let your lights so shine that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is, in Heaven," that is always providing that our lives are righteous.

H. DICKENSON:

THERE is no way or place where God leads but preparation has been made before for our coming.

It is easy to live in the world after the world's opinion. It is easy to live in solitude after our own. But the great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of his character.

—R. W. Emerson.

THE APOSTLES AND THE FATHERS.

THE following question appears in the "Notes and Queries" column of the Christmas number of the *Christian Union*:—

"There seems to be a great letting down from the high attainments of the primitive church the Fathers as St. Clement, St. Polycarp, etc. Can you tell me of some book that shows how the great chasm between these two bodies of people is bridged over?"

This is the answer given by one of the editors: "*No: the difference between the apostles and the fathers is easily explained by the fact that the former had been the companions of Jesus.*"

What is to be thought of this answer to a plain though important question? If any modern religious paper is capable of giving an answer to such a question, surely that paper is the *Christian Union*. It claims to be liberal and yet reasonably orthodox. Its editorial staff is of the first quality. Its treatment of most questions is broad and liberal as well as practical and spiritual. It claims also to speak in the name and in the spirit of advanced nineteenth century scholarship, and yet despite all these advantages of freedom, of liberality, of scholarship, the *Christian Union* cannot explain the cause of "the great letting down from the high attainments of the primitive church to the Fathers," because as we believe, the *Christian Union* as well as the Christian church has lost the secret of the high attainments of the primitive Christians. That the attainments of the first Christians were high and those of the Fathers comparatively low, the *Christian Union* freely grants with all who know anything about the records. The facts are generally agreed to by all, but the explanation of the facts, who can give? "Can you tell me of some book that shows how the great chasm between these two bodies of people is bridged over?" The editor answers "No," and what Christian editor could have answered otherwise? No one, we believe, unless he had come across "*Divine Guidance*"

by Rev. Nelson Burns, B.A., of Toronto, Canada."

This editor further implies that no such book is needed. The answer is too apparent, too simple. "The great difference between the attainments of the apostles and the Fathers is easily explained by the fact that the former were companions of Jesus." This explains the whole secret and we venture the opinion that the answer of the *Christian Union* is practically the answer of the Christian church. Companionship with Jesus in the flesh explains the high attainments of the apostles, and the want of such companionship is the cause of the low attainments of the Fathers and of course of modern Christians.

Now look at this answer in the light of common sense and see what it implies. It implies first of all that Jesus is an impossible example to all save to those who knew Him in the flesh. It implies also that the apostles and first Christians are impossible examples to their followers. If the Fathers could not successfully imitate the apostles how can we do so?

But this is not all. This teaching flatly contradicts all that Jesus taught concerning His great mission and work. Jesus not only taught that he would leave a successor in the person of the Holy Spirit but that it would be *better* for His followers to have this successor than to have Himself *in the flesh*. "Greater works than these (which I perform) shall ye do because I go to the Father." Did the apostles receive power by coming into personal contact with Jesus? Certainly not, but "Ye shall receive power, the Holy Ghost coming upon you." Did Jesus in person teach them the deepest spiritual lessons? He could not, for—"I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now (that is hear or understand them) but when He the Spirit of Truth is come *He shall teach you all things*." And not new things alone but He the Spirit should also interpret what the Master had already said—which sayings were largely riddles to them until the coming of the Comforter. "He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever

I have said unto you."

This answer of the *Christian Union* illustrates the important truth that Pentecost and Pentecost alone can explain the phenomena of the early as well as the later church. On all questions of a speculative or merely scholarly nature the *Christian Union* will give admirable deliverances, but the moment a question arises requiring pentecostal light and penetration, immediately the paper is widely astray, and will mumble traditional nonsense and orthodox twaddle on a level with that of her next door neighbor.

Looking at this question from the point of view of Pentecost, how easy to explain the difference between the first Christians and the Fathers. Jesus taught and illustrated the walk in the Spirit. He spake not but the Spirit of His Father which dwelt in Him. He was led of the Spirit into the wilderness, etc., etc. He also taught His followers that their *power, wisdom and success* would come through their obedience to the Holy Ghost. The "*High Attainments*" of the first Christians in spiritual things was the direct result of their walk in the Spirit; and this Spirit was as *freely offered to the Fathers* as to the Apostles. As witness Peter's address on the day of Pentecost—"The promise is unto you and to your children, etc." The Fathers failed of "*High Attainments*" simply because they failed to take the Holy Spirit as their only guide and teacher and for no other reason whatever. Paul did not seem to fail of "high attainments" because he did not see Jesus in the flesh.

Trinitarian theologians have so taught the Divinity of Jesus as to deprive us of the hope of *being able to follow his example*. And now the *Christian Union* would also rob us of the example of the apostles and first Christians and, by inference, also of the Fathers, because though they did not see Jesus they doubtless possessed traditional teaching of His which would be of advantage to them but lost to us.

One wonders how all this can be made to harmonize with the "*Evolution of Christianity*" as taught by Dr. Lyman

Abbott, one of the editors of the *Christian Union*, according to which Christianity has been progressing from lower to "higher attainments" instead of retrograding from the "high attainments" of the apostles to the low attainments of their successors.

A. TRUAX.

Courtland, Ont.

CONVERSION.

FURTHER REMARKS.

THE vast majority of modern converts in our churches backslide. This is a truism every where recognized. Hence it is that in all revival work the majority of those who are enrolled as converts have been so called one or more times before. This is a well known fact to all who have had much experience in revival work.

We had occasion to visit a good deal of the ground gone over by the first revival work connected with the evangelistic bands, which were headed and originated by Rev. D. Savage, and examined carefully the history of that wonderful movement, one year after its inauguration.

To say that at least fifty per cent. of the converts had by that time back-slidden would be to put the figures very favorably indeed for the revival.

The falling off even after that short time had been very marked indeed and yet we felt that as a revival it compared very well with revival work in general. Indeed, the remnants of local bands tended to keep the converts together much better than the ordinary church services, for ever and anon raids were made on outlying hamlets and with a measure of success. This success reacted favorably on the rest, and so the appearance of life was kept up longer than otherwise it would have been.

Instances have come under our notice where one convert out of twenty-five

might be looked for in vain after less than a year's time, and these things have been noted by others, and spoken of without rebuke or correction, in very many instances.

We have known men of responsible positions in the churches deliberately publish as a fact the following, viz., that comparing the spiritual status of churches before extensive revivals which are the outcome of evangelists with its status a year or two after and the latter state is worse than the first.

Now we do not parade these facts as the whole question. Manifestly they constitute but one side of it. The other side is that the great mass of members, especially in what may be called revival churches, are the products of revival effort. Hence it is evident that after making all proper allowances for the backsliding of multitudes a vast number still remain in the churches as members.

He therefore who would speak one word against revivals because of this defection would be running in the face of every legitimate inference. It is said of Joseph Cook that once when addressing a very large audience he requested as a personal favor all in the gathering who were church members to stand up, and then that all who had not been brought into that membership as the direct outcome of revivals to sit down, when it became evident by the number remaining standing that the vast majority had been the outcome of revival work.

But it may be remarked that during revivals a large proportion, if not a majority of the membership, will take occasion to place themselves in the attitude of back-sliders, showing that the defection from the professed experiences obtained during revivals is by no means confined to those who wander off into open indifference.

From all of which it will be readily seen that the wholesale backsliding after revival work is a serious question for consideration, and he who addresses himself to the task of finding out or proposing a remedy should not, because of such efforts, be banded as a pessimist or even an alarmist.

Thus far in this article we are looking at this question from the standpoint of enthusiastic workers in the churches, including aggressive pastors and evangelists. Indeed, the above thoughts have been freely canvassed, in former years, with successful workers in the churches, those who know her chance would refuse even to seriously consider our methods for more permanent results.

What then is our object in reproducing these facts? It is to justify our action in devoting ourselves exclusively to the work of striving to get men converted to the Holy Ghost rather than to a creed.

But is it not best to throw our whole influence and labors into the efforts now in vogue to get people converted, and then, afterwards, strive to get these converts as well as all professed christians converted to the Holy Ghost? This looks plausible, and in the earlier stages of this movement many of us presumed that such would be the manner of our evangelistic labors. We know of some prominent evangelists who had some hopes in this direction. But to us the evidence is all convincing that such is not to be our method of church work. And, further, we have to say that, because of its not being after this pattern, there will not only be disappointment felt in many quarters but in many instances it is probable that our evangelistic labors will be openly and definitely discriminated against.

“Cast your cares upon Him for he careth for you.”—1 Peter, v : 7.

THE REPLY OF THE EDITOR TO MY LETTER.

DEAR SIR—The editorial criticism, in the last *Guardian*, on my letter, states that my “reply is characteristically weak and evasive.” He tells us that “he pretends” to answer objections. He calls the members of the association a “motley membership.” He speaks concerning some of these presumed members as “the pretentious claims of these walking oracles.” He asserts that they do and teach things not “befitting loyal Methodists” He further writes with reference to myself: “He knows he can propagate his notions better as a Methodist minister.” Further, “a man must feel hard pressed when he has to invent this notion of double personality.”

I ask any and every truth lover who reads these epithets from the pen of an editor of a Christian paper, and that the organ of a body of people who fly before the world *Holiness to the Lord* as their motto, if this editor truly represents his church, are not some additional appliances needed to purge it?

These writings are put before the world as Methodistic and therefore characteristic of Christianity. Even Unitarians and infidels have a right to judge of them as the legitimate offspring of Methodism. For the party who thus writes has long been and still is a true representative of Canadian Methodism, by majority votes.

I do not simply insinuate, I openly proclaim such conduct to be out of harmony with the character and precepts of Christ Jesus.

And further, I do not hesitate to say that to be even tainted with any of the heresies he condemns, is a less sin than the one he illustrates. Therefore, it is that in propagating the gospel of righteous living, I expect but little fair dealings from those who substitute fancied orthodoxy in doctrine for Christian character.

But not satisfied with such arguments

he apparently undertakes to twist my sentences to make them take a meaning which is not in them. I say *apparently*, advisedly, for it is just possible that my critic did not gather the drift of my meaning. For example, I said "the accused has scarcely been heard from." Now I submit that any reader with ordinary intelligence would understand that this, taken together with its context, meant, scarcely heard from in the *Guardian*. But this writer makes it refer to all my writings. Of course if he did not get the meaning of my remark then he was guilty of no intentional duplicity. But what about the strength of intellect of a reader who would fail to gain my meaning in so simple a matter.

In alluding to the space I was permitted to have in his paper he refers evidently to the fact that I was not permitted to reply to the abstract of Mr. Irvine and his backers. The editor in this explanation is like one who would boast of being lenient towards another because he only cut off the head of his opponent when he might have cut off his legs and arms too.

My critic further writes, "Now, how does Mr. Burns meet these attested facts? Mainly by ignoring them." Again I am forced to decide between mental weakness and conscious deliberate wrong doing, and the reader who turns to my letter to see in it that I distinctly decline to make full explanation because of the space needed for such writing, but promise to do so at the call of any parties concerned, can scarcely fail to be in the same quandry with myself in this matter.

My critic asserts that the teachings represented by myself everywhere cause trouble, hostility to the *Guardian*, and, in one instance, ended in a party being expelled from the church.

Well, even granting all this to be true to facts, even as my teaching has awakened his opposition. If that opposition is the outcome of the spirit shown by himself, what wonder! Those who imitate his

tactics will naturally cause trouble when righteousness is preached and illustrated.

And yet how loose and reckless this his remark is may be gathered from the fact that all I, or any member of the association know of the party reported expelled from the church, is, that several years ago some of us met him in a kind of district convention, but have heard nothing of him as to life or teachings since. I do not think he ever attended an annual association meeting or that his name was ever on the books of the association. In this I am neither condemning nor upholding him, for I know nothing of the matter further than the short report thereof that appeared in the *Guardian*. Is it right to use such an incident against myself or the association? By a similar kind of reasoning I could credit him with all the vagaries of individual Methodists who have commenced their religious lives as the result of Methodist teaching.

Now in alluding to and condemning his writings as both un-Methodistic and un-Christian, I do not imply by these terms all that is usually included in them. These acts are, I maintain, the legitimate fruits of the religion which exalts the letter and ignores practically the Spirit. And, moreover, I have no doubt that the writer thinks he is doing God service in so sinning against the gentlemanly and spiritual instincts within him. I maintain also in spite of what he may think to the contrary, that I do not call attention to these glaring breaches of Bible rules as giving a *Roland for an Oliver*, but as calling attention, in object lesson from, to the real issue between us.

The movement, which he condemns, condemns these things and illustrates their opposites, and in so doing calls attention to the fact that it is the practical ignoring of the Holy Spirit as guide and teacher for the individual that makes possible such conduct in the name of Christianity.

I do not presume to take sufficient space in this letter to even allude to all the

details of his indictment, simply pronouncing upon all of them, without exception, as outside of my personal knowledge, or as highly colored, to say the least of them, and therefore, I maintain that for any reader to take any one of them at par value, with this my distinct arraignment of them; is to imitate him in being content with but one side of the matters he writes about.

I cannot, however, conclude this part of the letter without alluding to his criticisms about the charge of personal dishonesty, made by the former writers in the *Guardian*. The editor, as spokesman for them, repudiates the charge, and apparently couples himself with them in this repudiation. But in his editorial he goes even beyond them in reiterating this charge when he pens the following: "He knows he can propagate his notions better as a Methodist minister." This is the party who hesitates not to pronounce upon my writings as "weak."

But as the editor formulates two objections to my writings, I briefly notice them. The first one is not true concerning any of my writings. Let my writings speak for themselves here. This writer, either through careless reading, or yielding to the insidious desire to make the wish father the thought, has seriously misinterpreted what I have written.

The other objection is fairly well stated, but no plainer than in my letter. But with my statement of it I coupled the promise to throw some further light upon this matter should the columns of the *Guardian* be open to such explanations. But as these explanations must be somewhat lengthy I reserve them for a future letter.

I wish to say that with reference to my book, "Divine Guidance," and also the recent tract, "How to Keep Converted," I hesitate not to state that they are before the world for its criticism, for they were written, like Wesley's sermons, "*ad populum*," to the people. By them I stand or

fall to my church. But as to some of the writings in the EXPOSITOR I have to say that they are liable to be misunderstood by onlookers when isolated numbers only are read. Their chief mission has been thus far to the members of the movement which it represents. Hence I do ask, and think that even gentlemanly courtesy, let alone Christian fair dealing should grant me this request, viz., suspension of judgment in the meantime.

As to the hostility of members of the association to the *Guardian*, I know of but one party who gave up the paper because of this hostility, and that was because of his publishing the articles from the pen of Mr. Irvine and then refusing to insert my reply. And yet that party continued to take it for some time because of my personal request to that effect. But if they are the characters he represents them to be he would surely not expect them to pay for reading the editorials and other attacks upon themselves.

In conclusion, whilst I am fully aware that Methodism is responsible for much if not the greater part of the increased spiritual life of this and the past century, still there is much in itself that is improvable. There are sins against true manhood and Bible piety which are winked at in high positions. There are defects in the moral tone of both pulpit and pew in many directions, as witness the articles on this subject in the late number of the *Methodist Quarterly*.

Now, as the movement which the EXPOSITOR represents does and will continue to criticise these blemishes, and along with the criticisms give both by precept and example the opposites, there will in all likelihood be sensitiveness evinced in many quarters.

It is quite possible that this may even amount to a rage which will prompt not only to anathemas, but also expulsion. Nevertheless, this preaching by teaching and example must and will go on, no mat-

ter what the consequences may be to any or all concerned.

Are there not anomalies in our church which need looking into? For example, when some evangelist, with an ounce of brains in an ocean of zeal, is turned loose on the churches, why is it that he can pry the leading members of conference, to say nothing of the rank and file of the church, to a public altar as public seekers of a definite something which they do not get? Is it not because the whole teaching of our church is uncertain concerning the subject of *second* or *third* blessing.

Is this a seemly or a healthy exhibition before the church or world? Is it not better to keep investigating till something like solid ground is obtained, and we no longer be called upon to witness such puzzling spectacles; until our leading men take their proper place in revival services, and be no longer the targets for every enthusiast who gets inside the altar? More anon. N. BURNS.

SERMON BY REV. B. SHERLOCK.

JOHN XVI-7 TO 13 VERSE—TEXT.

THE necessity of Divine influence to enlighten and sanctify the minds of men, is very abundantly taught in the Bible and is generally maintained as a matter of opinion at least, in all orthodox churches. But as a matter of fact there seems to be very little available knowledge of the gospel among mankind: so little that it exerts comparatively little influence. The great ends of the gospel have hardly begun to be realized in the production of holiness on the earth. It is a grand question, whether we do need Divine Influence to attain the ends of the gospel; and if we do need it, then in what degree do we need it, and why? If our minds are unsettled on this question, we shall be unsettled on all the subjects that practically concern our sanctification.

In discoursing on our subject, I design to pursue the following order:

1. Inquire how far the reason of man, unaided by Divine Illumination, is capable of understanding the things of religion.

2. Show wherein the reason of man is defective, in regard to the capacity of gaining any available knowledge of the gospel.

3. That the Spirit of God alone can supply the illumination that is needed.

4. That every one may have the influence of the Spirit, according to his necessities.

5. The reasons why any individual fails to receive the divine aid to the extent of his necessities.

6. That men are responsible for the light which they might have, as well as for that which they actually enjoy.

First: I shall enquire how far the reason of man, unaided by Divine Illumination, is capable of apprehending the things of religion.

a. The mind of man is capable of understanding the historical facts of religion, just as it comprehends any other historical facts.

b. It is capable of understanding the doctrinal propositions of the gospel.

That is, it can understand those abstractions which make up the skeleton of the gospel; such as the being and character of God, the divine authority and inspiration of the Scriptures and other fundamental doctrines which make up the frame-work of the gospel. That is, it can understand them as propositions, and see the evidence that supports them as true, just as it can understand any proposition in science.

For instance, to enter a little into detail, a man by his reason may understand the law of God. He can understand that it requires him to exercise perfect love towards God and all other beings. He can see the ground of his obligation to do this because he is a moral being. He knows by experience what love is, for he has exercised love towards different objects. And he

can, therefore, form or comprehend the idea of love, so far as to see the reasonableness of the requirement. He can understand the foundation and the force of moral obligation, and see, in some measure, the extent of his obligation to love God.

So likewise, he can see that he is a sinner, and that he cannot be saved by his own works. He has broken the law, so that the law can never justify him. He can see, that if he is ever saved he must be justified through mere mercy by an act of pardon.

I might go through the whole circle of theology, and show that the human understanding is capable of knowing it in the abstract, as a system of propositions to be received and believed on evidence, like any other science. I do not mean to be understood as saying, that unaided reason can attain any available knowledge of the things of religion, or any such knowledge as will be effectual to produce a sanctifying change.

Second: I am to show wherein our knowledge of the things of religion is necessarily defective, without the aids of the Holy Spirit.

In other words, I am to show what our knowledge of the gospel lacks, to make it available to salvation. And here it is necessary to distinguish between knowledge which "might be" available to one that was himself disposed to love and obey God, and what will be available, in fact, to a sinner, who is wholly indisposed to holiness. It is easy to see that one who is disposed to do right would be influenced to duty by a far less amount of illumination or a far less clear and vivid view of motives, than one who is disposed to do wrong. What we are now inquiring respects the matter of fact in this world. Whether the knowledge attainable by our present faculties would be available to influence us to do right, were there no sin in the world I cannot say. As a matter of fact, the knowledge which Adam had when in a state of innocency did not avail to influence

him to do right. But we are now speaking of things as they are in this world, and to show what is the reason that man, as a sinner, can have no available knowledge of divine things; no such knowledge as will, as a matter of fact, influence him to love and serve God.

Knowledge to avail anything toward effecting its object, must be such as will influence the mind. The will must be controlled. And to do this, the mind must have such a view of things as to excite emotion, corresponding to the object in view. Mere intellect never will move the soul to act. A pure scientific abstraction of the intellect that does not touch the feelings, or excite any emotion, is wholly unavailable to move the will. It is so everywhere. It would be so in heaven. You must bring the mind under a degree of excitement to influence the will in any case. In the case of sinners; to influence sinners to love God, you must have a great degree of light, such as will powerfully excite the mind, and produce strong emotions. The reasons for obedience must be made to appear with great strength and vividness, so as to subdue their rebellious hearts, and bring them voluntarily to God. This is available knowledge. This men never have and never can have, without the Spirit of God. If men were disposed to do right, I know not how far their knowledge, attainable by unaided reason might avail. But as they are universally and totally indisposed, this knowledge will never do it. I will mention some of the reasons:

1. All the knowledge we can have here of Spiritual things, is by analogy, or comparison. Our minds are here shut up in the body, and we derive all our ideas from external objects through the senses. Now we never can of ourselves obtain knowledge of Spiritual or eternal things in this way sufficient to rightly influence our will. Our bodily powers were not created for this. All the ideas we can have of the Spiritual world is by analogy, or comparing them

with the things around us. It is easily seen that all ideas conveyed to our minds in this way must be exceedingly imperfect, and that we do not after all get the true ideas into our minds. The Jewish types were probably the most forcible means which God could then use, for giving to the Jews a correct idea of the Gospel. Considering how the eastern nations were accustomed by their education to the use of figures, and parables, and types, probably the system of types was the most impressive and happy mode that could be devised to gain a more ready access for the truth to their minds, and give them a more full idea of the plan of redemption than could be communicated in any other way. And yet it is manifest that the ideas that were communicated in this way were extremely imperfect; and that without divine illumination to make them see the reality more fully than they could by unaided reason, they never would have got any available knowledge in this way.

So words are merely signs of ideas. They are not the ideas, but the representatives of ideas. It is often very difficult, and sometimes impossible to convey ideas by word only. Take a little child, and attempt to talk with him, and how difficult it is on many subjects to get your ideas into his little mind. He must have some experience of the things you are trying to teach before you can convey ideas by words.

Suppose this congregation were all blind, and had never seen colors. Then suppose that on that wall hung a most beautiful painting and that I was a perfect master of the subject, and should undertake to describe it to you. No language that I could use would give you such an idea of the painting as to enable you to form a picture of it in your minds. Where, on any subject, we are obliged from the nature of the case to use figurative language, analogies and resemblances, the knowledge we communicate is necessarily defective and inadequate. Who of you have not heard descriptions of persons and places till you

thought you had an accurate knowledge of them: but when you come to see them you find you have no true idea of the reality?

Suppose an individual were to visit the world from another planet, where all things are constituted on different principles from those which are adopted here. Suppose him to remain here long enough to learn our language, and that then he should undertake to give us a description of the world he had left. We should understand him according to our ideas and experience. Now if the analogy between the two worlds is very imperfect, it is plain that our knowledge of things there, from his description must be imperfect in proportion. So when we find in the Bible, descriptions of heaven and hell, or anything in the invisible world, it is plain that from mere words we can get no true idea at all adequate to the reality.

2. The wickedness of the unspiritual heart is so great as to pervert the judgment, and shut out from the mind much that might be understood of the things of religion.

When a man's mind is so perverted on any subject that he will not take up the evidence concerning it, he cannot of course, come at the knowledge of the truth on that subject. This is the case of man generally in regard to religion. Perverseness of heart so shut out the light, that the intellect does not, and from the nature of the case *cannot*, get even the ideas it might otherwise gain respecting divine things.

3. Prejudice is a great obstacle to the reception of correct knowledge concerning religion.

Take the case of the disciples of Christ. They had strong Jewish prejudices respecting the plan of Salvation,—so strong that all the instructions of Christ himself could not make them understand the truth. After teaching them personally, for three years, with all the talent, simplicity and skill he was master of, he could never get their

minas in possession of the first principles of the gospel. Up to his very death he could not make them see that he should die, and rise from the dead. Therefore he says in his last conversation, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." This was the very design of his going away from them that the Spirit of Truth might come and put them in possession of the things which he meant by the words he had used in teaching them.

The general truth is this: that without divine illumination men can understand from the Bible enough to convict and condemn them, but not enough to sanctify and save them. Some may ask, what then is the use of revelation? It is of much use. The Bible is as plain as it can be. Who doubts that our Lord Jesus Christ gave instructions to his disciples as plainly as he could? See the pains he took to illustrate his teaching; how simple his language; how he brings it down to the weakest comprehension, as a parent would be to a little child. And yet it remains true that without divine illumination the unaided reason of man never did, and never will attain any available knowledge of the gospel. The difficulty lies in the subject. The Bible contains the gospel as plain as it can be made. That is, it contains the signs of the ideas, as far as language can represent the things of religion. No language but figurative language can be used for this purpose. And this will forever be inadequate to put our minds in possession of the things themselves. The difficulty is in our ignorance and sin, and in the nature of the subject. This is the reason why we need divine illumination, to get any available knowledge of the gospel.

Third: The Spirit of God alone can give us this illumination.

The Bible says, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Now the abstract proposition of the Deity of Christ can be forced as a matter of science so as to gain assent to any unbiassed

mind to the truth that Jesus is Lord. But nothing but the Holy Ghost can so put the mind in possession of the idea of Christ as God as to fix the soul in the belief of the fact and make it available to sanctify the heart.

Again Christ said that, "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore that hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Here it is evident that the drawing spoken of is the teaching of the Holy Spirit. They must be taught of God, and learn of the Father, before they can ever have such a knowledge of the things of religion as actually to come to Christ.

Christ says, "It is expedient for you that I go away for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you." The word *Paracletos* here translated Comforter, properly means helper or teacher. "When he has come he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and judgment. Of sin because they believe not on me. Of righteousness because I go to my Father and ye see me no more. Of judgment because the prince of the world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth is come he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak of himself but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak and he will show you things to come."

So in the 14th chapter the Saviour says, "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive because it seeth him not neither knoweth him, but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you."

And again in the 26th verse, "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to

your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you."

Here you see the office of the Spirit of God is to instruct mankind in regard to the things of religion.

Now it is manifest that none but the Spirit of God can supply this defect from a single consideration. That all teaching by words, whether by Christ, or by apostles, or by any inspired or uninspired teacher, coming merely through the senses, can never put the mind in possession of the idea of Spiritual things. The kind of teaching that we need is this; we want some one to teach us the things of religion who is not obliged to depend on words, or to reach our minds through the medium of the senses. We want a teacher who can directly approach the mind itself and not through the senses; and who can exhibit the ideas of religion without being obliged to use words. This the Spirit of God can do.

The *manner* in which the Spirit of God does this, is what we may never know in this world. But the fact is undeniable that he can reach the mind without the use of words, and can put our minds in possession of the ideas themselves, of which the types, or figures, or words of the human teacher are only the signs or imperfect representatives. The human teacher can only use words to our senses, and finds it impossible to possess us of the ideas of that which we have never experienced. But the Spirit of God having direct access to the mind can, through the outward sign possess us of the actual idea of things. What Christian does not know from his own experience that the Spirit of God does often lead him instantly to see *that* in a passage of Scripture which all his study and effort of mind to know the meaning of, could never have given him in the world?

Take again the case of a painting on the wall and suppose that all the congregation were blind and I was trying to describe to them this painting. Now suppose that while I was labouring to make them

understand the various distinctions, combination of colors and they are bending their minds to understand it: all at once their eyes are opened! You would then see for yourselves the very things I was vainly trying to bring to your minds by words. Now what the Spirit of God can do, and what he alone can do, is to open the Spiritual eye and bring the things which we try to describe by analogy and signs, in all their living reality before the mind, so as to put the mind in complete possession of the thing as it is.

It is evident too that no one but the Spirit of God so knows the things of God as to be able to give us the idea of those things correctly. "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the Spirit of a man which is in him? What can a beast know of the things of a man, of a man's character, designs &c.? I can speak to your consciousness, being a man, and knowing the things of a man. But I cannot speak these things to the consciousness of a beast, neither can a beast speak of these things because he has not the Spirit of a man in him, and cannot know them. In like manner Paul says, "The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God." The Spirit of God knowing from consciousness the things of God, can give us the instruction we need and such as no other being can give.—*Fenney's Lecture to Professing Christians.*

That all may have the teaching of the Spirit is proved from John 7-38, 39, Acts 2-38, 39, 1 Corinthians 12-13, James 1-5.

THE SECRET OF JESUS' LIFE.

In our last article we insisted that the *Diety* of Jesus could not have been the secret of His life, for if so, it would destroy the force of His example for all men who were not divine in the same sense as Himself. To be a perfect example and a possible ideal for His followers, He must not only live a pure and holy life, but He must live that life, under the same *essentials*

conditions as other men. How can we give Him credit for succeeding if failure were absolutely impossible? or how can we consistently laud Him for winning in the great race of life, if He had such a tremendous advantage over all competitors? Could he possibly come to set an example for men on the condition, that he should have the assistance, not only of the finest qualities known to man, or possible to man, but in addition to these, super-human divine power and strength never possessed by any man, and not possible for man to obtain? Surely this would be mean chivalry in any being, and much meaner in the "Son of Man".

No: if He did not win on the same terms and conditions as are offered to all men, He is not the true brother of man, and had no right to masquerade in the mere clothes of humanity, when He was in reality a totally different being.

A very little common sense (if one dares to exercise such a faculty on this subject) will suffice to show, that if the example of Jesus is to be of any service to us, He must have received no aid or assistance which is denied to any one of us or which is necessarily beyond the reach of any man. Affirming this is not denying His Divinity or even Diety, but simply insisting on the self-evident truth that whilst Jesus was performing purely human functions, He had no assistance other than that freely granted to all men. His Diety meanwhile being in some way entirely unknown and perhaps unknowable to us, held in complete abeyance.

We also insisted that the humanity of Jesus could not account for his life. He no more attributed His success to His humanity than to His Divinity. He never gave the impression that he was merely a superior man or even a perfect man. When He said "not I but the Father which dwelleth in me" and "I can do nothing of myself" He denied that His secret was either in His Divinity or humanity, for if it were in either or both of these it

would be in *Himself*, which he expressly denied. Unitarianism therefore offers no solution for I believe none of them profess to live to-day as perfect a life as Jesus lived, nearly nineteen hundred years ago. The shibboleth of Unitarianism is culture, education, development. All good, but not calculated to take the place of the Holy Ghost. Possessing them to any degree or extent would never have given Jesus the place which He now holds in the hearts of men.

THE REAL SECRET.

We believe Divine guidance to have been his real secret. This interferes neither with his Divinity nor His humanity, and explains parts of his life otherwise unexplainable. It also makes His example and life a possible and practical ideal for all men. It is the only explanation of His life compatible with the constant exhortations of the new testament writers, to the effect that we are to be *as* He was and to have the mind which was also in Him: And certainly the only thing which can throw light on his statement, that His followers should do greater works than these performed by Himself in person.

That He had full confidence in the Holy Spirit as His guide, accounts for His power and independence as a teacher. The people at once saw the difference between Him and the Scribes. "For He taught as one having authority, not as the Scribes." What! did not the Scribes teach with authority. They did: but it was a borrowed, second-hand authority, depending upon interpretations of Moses and the prophets—and sometimes upon guesses at their meaning. They did not speak as the oracles of God. Jesus did not deny Moses or the prophet, nevertheless He spake independently of them in that He knew directly the mind of the Father. He did not deny the inspiration of Moses, but insisted that the same Spirit which taught Moses was with Him, and by the authority of that Spirit He could and did modify the law of Moses to suit different conditions of society

and a more highly developed humanity. The Scribes, like modern teachers with defective authority, were for shutting God up in a book. No other way of getting to God but through Moses and the prophets. Jesus stood for the rights and privileges of the individual and for the fulfilment of the prophecy, "They shall *all* be taught of God," and "Every man shall know Him from the least unto the greatest."

This theory of Divine guidance also explains—as no other does—the great crises in the Master's life. Take His great temptation in the wilderness. He did not go into the desert for reason which might seem sufficient to a great and good man, much less did he do what might be expected of a God. He simply obeyed the inward "still small voice" of His Father. "He was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness." We need to appeal neither to His divinity nor His superior humanity to explain what took place there. Divine guidance explains all. He simply would not eat without the consent of His Father, no matter if he actually died of hunger. Similar experiences all men will have who really walk in the Spirit.

Illustrations might be multiplied, but take one more, that of His escaping so easily from His enemies at one time, and giving Himself up so readily at another time. Divine guidance makes all clear and yet leaves him our perfect example. He knew His time had not yet come through the Holy Spirit, and again He knew when it had come by the same Spirit. In this we can also follow his example perfectly.

Divine guidance also explains the ignorance of Jesus, an ignorance perfectly compatible with His great mission and work. It was not necessary that He should carry with Him any superfluous knowledge. It was necessary that He should *grow* in knowledge and wisdom like the rest of us. Under Divine guidance He would grow just as rapidly as His Father wanted Him to grow, and so can we.

Divine guidance explains the suffering of Jesus. Nothing so difficult as to suffer in a right Spirit, yet Jesus succeeded. There was no asceticism about Him, no (improper) stoicism, no suppression of nature, no giving away to nature, but a perfect control of the whole man. He could sigh, weep and groan without offence, and could even come to the verge of despair without displeasing His Father. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" In all this we may perfectly follow Him by simply walking in the Spirit, which means, taking the Holy Ghost as absolute guide and teacher and obeying Him at any cost.

A. TRUAX.

Courtland, Ont.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST, IS IT A MYTH?

A MYTH is a theory, notion or belief which in the form in which it is believed is not true, but which is based upon, or has grown out of, something which was true in the past and the myth is an exaggeration of that which was true in the past. The cause of the formation of a myth may be found in the tendency to hero-worship which in a greater or less degree exists among all people. Few if any myths are now in formation in any country where education is general; for there are so many who with watchful eye observe, and with ready tongue and pen expose, any attempts to greatly exaggerate the lovely or the hateful qualities of persons or things. From the word myth, comes the derivative, mythology, which is the name given to what has been written or believed concerning the Idol-gods of ancient Rome, Greece, Egypt, and other pagan peoples. It is believed by many that in far past ages, before written history existed among these people, certain men lived and achieved such superiority to their cotemporaries, that through the general desire for the sensational and wonderful, stories of im-

mense physical strength, great swiftness of foot, and extraordinary forms of human achievement were attached to the names of these, and told from generation to generation until these men of the past were in imagination lifted above humanity, and in the absence of true teaching concerning the true God, they became the deities of the people. Strauss, the German theologian started in the earlier years of this century a theory of that kind to account for the high place that Jesus Christ has held in the estimation of his Church and the populations of Christendom.

To say that the divinity of Christ is a myth, is to say that he probably was a man so remarkable for saying and doing things very much better than other men did, that he became a wonder, and that generally those that believed in him came to believe that he was God. Now nothing can be more contrary to the facts in the case than such a notion, that is, if the narratives of the four men who wrote his life, and who (at least two of them), were his cotemporaries and companions, are accepted as trustworthy documents. John especially, one of the chosen twelve and one of the select three from among the twelve, and the select one of those three, writes his biography with the evident design to assent and prove his true Divinity. "In the beginning was the Word, and the word was God," his first utterances, show his central thought and the burden of his testimony. And there can be no mistaking who he means when he says, "and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." Let these first verses of John's gospel be read with candour, and it will be seen that the celebrated Coleridge, who was brought up to disbelieve the divinity of Christ, was not far wrong when he said of those who interpreted those verses so as to sustain that disbelief, that "if a lawyer would interpret the statutes of the British Parliament as they interpret these verses, he would be promptly expelled from any British Court," John's gospel

brings to the front those discourses and events which prove and illustrate either the divinity of Christ directly, or those attributes and powers of his, which require divinity for their existence. To do justice to his testimony would require many times the space which it is just now proper to occupy. Look however, at his fifth chapter. Read from verse 17 to 38. See how evidently the point of the case lay in Christ's having used language which the Jews understood as an assumption of equality with God. And so far from his making any attempt to disabuse their minds of a mistaken impression, he reasserts his claim in language more striking and less capable of being misunderstood; language which, if it were not meant to affirm an identity of nature and dignity with God, was the most ill-timed and dangerous that can be imagined, if not absolutely impious. Look again at the tenth chapter from the 24th to the 38th verse. In this section occurs the declaration, "I and my Father are one." It is objected, that when Jesus spoke to his Father as recorded in the seventeenth chapter, concerning believers he said, "that they all may be one as thou Father art in me and I in thee," but the subject about which the oneness becomes a fact is very different indeed in the one case from the other. I and Queen Victoria are one in the possession of human nature, and in the fact that the English is her vernacular as well as it is mine. But she is monarch of the greatest of all mundane empires, and I, well I need not describe what I am in comparison. I and the Governor-General of this Dominion are one, in that both of us are British subjects. But how much greater his power in the State is than mine. But if William of Orange who reigned over Britain conjointly with his Queen Mary in 1690 should have said, "I and my queen wife are one," the oneness would possess a wonderful different and much higher signification. It would mean, we are one not only as man and wife are said to be one, but one in regal dignity and

power. The Jews on that occasion likewise, did not mistake his meaning for they took up stones to stone him, saying, "For a good work we stone thee not but for blasphemy, because that thou being a man makest thyself God." Christ's reply as in the former case does not attempt to correct a mistaken impression, but he rather blames them for calling him a blasphemer.

That he calls himself the Son of Man so frequently proves nothing against his true divinity. One notable instance in which he calls himself the Son of Man is found in Matthew 18-13 to 17, when he inquires of his disciples, Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am? And again, Whom say ye that I am? "Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." Then Jesus said, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee but my Father which is in heaven, and on this rock will I build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." He gave to Peter the very highest endorsement to the higher title, Son of God as applied to himself. We know that he speaks of himself in his momentous interview with Nicodemus as the Only begotten Son of God: and that when the high priest on the night before his crucifixion challenged him saying, "I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ the Son of God," his answer was understood by the high priest as blasphemy. And in all those places in which he receives the title, Son of God, or claims it, it always has the meaning that he was "*The*" Son of God, Son in a sense higher than the sense in which the term is applied to any other whatever. So the writers of the Epistles speak of him. So the Revelation in the Apocalypse always gives him divine honour. Paul to the Colossians says, "by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, and he is before all things and by him all things consist, and he is the head of the body of the church."

Fancy Paul saying those things of himself or of any prophet or apostle! The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us in his first sentences, that, "God has spoken unto us of his Son by whom also he made the worlds and when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." From such central and basal assertions he goes on in the grand arguments of his essay to show the essential and the official superiority of this Son of God to all angels and all men.

What is given above is but a tithe of the evidence easily collected from the pages of the New Testament showing the conviction that was in the minds of those who knew most about the Person, whom they with one consent believed to be in a true and peculiar sense Divine.

But Brother Dickenson, whose contributions have been printed in this magazine, seems to have so little confidence in the trustworthiness of the biographers of Jesus as to suggest that they may have had their ideas and facts concerning the most important events connected with the Incarnation of the word, "*mixed*," so that the Incarnation itself may be doubted. If their testimony is shaky, then we have no anchorage ground whatever, for if Matthew and Luke are unreliable, then John is unreliable for certain; for a greater number of scholars have doubted the authenticity of John than have doubted the authenticity of Matthew and Luke.

And it is on the testimony of John in his gospel and of Luke in the Acts, that the distinguishing testimony of the Canada Holiness Association largely, I may say principally, rests. The President of the Association, who is author of Divine Guidance, and editor of this magazine, has distinctly declared that he arrived at the conviction that immediately led to his (at the time) unique experience, through the study of the Bible. The same is true of the writer of this article. And as far as my knowledge goes, all of those who are now


walking in the Spirit, as we understand the matter, were led into that life, either in that way, or else by the teaching of those who themselves have owed their illumination to the study of the words of those men who it is told us may possibly have got things "mixed." The same John whose record of Christ's words, and one observation of his own forms the dogmatic basis of our association is he who said, "The Word was God, and the word was made flesh and dwelt among us." If the Evangelists are unreliable, if the divinity of Christ is a myth, then are we the most presumptuous of fanatics. To say that Jesus Christ was the Son of Joseph and not as to his human nature conceived or begotten by the Holy Ghost, would be called blasphemy by the orthodox, if uttered by Robert Ingersoll. When it is asserted or hinted as a possibility by a member of our association what is it?

The secret of how to keep converted has been a lost art apparently since a date somewhere inside of two centuries after Pentecost, as it appears that no representative teachers or examples of it have left their testimony to the church. Since therefore there is no tradition or personal succession to be the source of our faith and experience, we are shut up to the documents that compose the New Testament. To me it is a beautiful and blessed illustration of the fatherly providence of our God, that just about the same time when the supremacy of the Holy Spirit ceased to be a fact in the lives of professing Christians, he so arranged that the writings which contain the testimony of Christ and his friends to this crowning fact in Christian experience, were selected from among many, and so endorsed by the church as to become the acknowledged documentary standard of faith and directory of life. And these documents, do abundantly sustain us. And the victorious and satisfactory life that results, demonstrates in our consciousness that these documents express the mind of God. And he who speaks slightly of

them, and at the same time professes to live by faith in him who inspired these writers, appears to me to be like the proverbial "ill bird that fouls his own nest."

B. SHERLOCK.

CORRESPONDENCE.

E HAVE received since the advent of the EXPOSITOR a great many letters from individuals who were in perplexity concerning their Christian experience. We have always found time for replies, many of them quite lengthy. We could fill a volume with this correspondence had we preserved it. Once in a while, however, we do not destroy these letters; that is, when we fancy we see in them something which might be helpful to others. To this class we think the following belongs, and as our reply to it might also be of benefit to others in similar case we had it returned by the party to whom it was sent, that it might thus do more general service. Of course we suppress the name of our correspondent and all possible clue to his identification.

MAR. 13, 1893.

REV. N. BURNS,

Dear Sir.—I thank you for the sample copy of the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS for last November sent me about a week ago. I would have liked to have seen it much earlier, as it is on a subject about which my own mind has been much exercised, viz., that of knowing and obeying the divine will all the time and in all things, so as to have the divine approval constantly.

There are two offers of Divine Guidance in this number, one with EXPOSITOR for twelve months for \$1. This may be too late for the other, that on receipt of \$1.10, two copies will be sent to any address post-paid. I think I will send the \$1.10 to you in case it is too late to get D. G. and one year's EXPOSITOR. If it is too late, would thank you to get me two D.G.'s. for \$1.10, but if not too late, would prefer the other offer of D. G. and one year's EXPOSITOR and in this case, would like to begin with the next number to this sample copy for Nov. 1892, i.e. with Dec. 1892.

It was not because I disapproved of the periodical that I gave up taking the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS, but because I failed to

accomplish the object for which I took it, which was to spread it far and near. In this I signally failed with both clergy and laity; though I tried with both.

I am now too far advanced in years to do much at anything, being in my eighty-fourth year, and power of both body and mind greatly decreased, and natural force much abated. With this sinking of nature I have experienced much spiritual trouble, on account of which I have wished above all things to know and obey the will of God in all things and all the time. This Nov. 1892 number of the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS therefore, is on a subject of much interest to me, although I have much longed and prayed for it for a long time, I have never come up to the experience therein described, *i.e.*, that of being so filled and kept filled with the Holy Spirit, as always to know and obey the divine will in all things.

Moreover I have been and felt so low both naturally and spiritually, as to fear that my profession of religion about sixty years ago might have been a delusion, and that, although a lay preacher, I might never have been regenerated or truly and really converted to God from His enemies and mine, and now perhaps never may be, but at death may hear the bitter word, "depart," and sink lower than the grave to rise no more! Now you may suppose that I must have some confidence in you and in your teaching and experience or I should not write thus, for it is what I would not say or write to one in thousands or millions. Yea I have no one to whom I could speak of it save the Lord Jesus and He has hidden His face from me for the most part, instead of answering me to the joy and rejoicing of my heart, and telling me that He is mine and I am His, and so I have had to lie down and rise in darkness day after day not knowing what awaited me. This is a sad experience and quite the opposite to yours, and I had to feel to say, How sad our stately nature is! Our sin how deep it stains! and Satan, etc., and although the next verse says, But there's a voice of sovereign grace saying come and trust upon the Lord, and although my soul obeys the almighty call and runs to this relief, yet I don't get full relief, pardon, healing, etc. Now you can make what use you please of this experience of mine, so you do not give the least clue as to whom it belongs, as this I think might do harm. Therefore I here write it in strictest confidence. Wishing you all prosperity in your soul, family, work, etc., I remain dear Sir as ever yours.

P.S.—A reply by return would much oblige for special reasons.

99 Howard St., Toronto, Mar. 16, 1899.

Dear Brother.—Your letter reached me this morning, also the enclosed \$1.10 for which I will forward *Divine Guidance* and the EXPOSITOR in accordance with your wishes.

With reference to your Christian experience I would say that at your time of life the *great important matter is to hold on to the facts upon which your hopes rest.*

These facts are, that God is love as clearly manifested and proved in the life of Christ; that whosoever follows God, that is, *turns to Him with full purpose of heart this moment—any moment—is that moment accepted of Him.*

Now it does not matter what has been the *past history*, whether good, bad, or indifferent, the result is. *the same and only the same.*

So *this moment* you are saved if *this moment* you simply elect to follow Him whithersoever He leadeth.

If now, *this moment*, this is your attitude towards Him, then *now, this moment*, (if you have confidence in His character and word) you may reckon yourself as *His property*, as accepted in the beloved.

Do you do so *this moment*, without reserve and without reference to the *past or the future*? If so, then you can proceed with safety to examine the *past or future*, not otherwise.

I suspect your trouble has been just at *this point.*

You, mayhap, have been trying to crowd into the act of glad acceptance other thoughts, such as thoughts about the mercy of God in Christ, that is, some atonement theory, your own past history or some sections of it, or some ideal religious state, so as to include it in your faith act.

Now anything like the above will perplex either young or old, and the result must be more or less darkness of soul.

What simpler fact than your acceptance of the word of the Lord, that as you honestly present yourself to Him so you are accepted of Him.

Your rest of soul concerning the reality of the transaction is not the outcome of your feelings or even holy life, but simply and only the result of your confidence in the truthfulness of God.

If now you have settled this point so that you are sure you will never need to

reconsider it, you are prepared to examine the past.

But I protest that if there is the least trace of lack of soul rest about this simple experience, then it is perilous for you to examine into any other experiences till this is settled and settled forever.

So that no matter if you should get into difficulty a hundred times per day, that in an instant, any moment, you would or could take your position as accepted fully of God, simply and only because you are honest towards Him, and because His word and character guarantees your acceptance.

You see, brother, you need not, with this faith, backslide more than for one moment at a time, or if for longer space of time, one moment is always sufficient for the return.

And I hesitate not to say that if one should backslide a hundred times a day, God would be better pleased with him if he only consumed a hundred moments in his returns to Him than if he should spend hours in tearful regrets and supplicating prayers.

Having settled this all important point, it is safe and even profitable to review the past.

But, brother, don't you think that the Holy Spirit could teach you its nature better than you can think it out or be helped by another?

I certainly think so, and indeed, as you now realize the glad fact that no matter what the past may have been, no matter what the perplexities which have come from traditional teaching about holiness, and no matter what your fears about your past experience, that, after all, it is a matter of little importance.

So long as you are right with God, now, what about the past as a disturbing element in this life!

So I would not tease God about the subject. Give Him all the time He requires to manage the whole business.

As to how you will keep in this attitude of glad acceptance I think you had better let the Holy Ghost teach you, with perfect willingness on your part, to be content with the present knowledge that you now are one with God!

Even in your case the effort to grasp the why and wherefore of the fact may not be needed. God has placed no conditions of doctrine about the matter. I would not either if I were you.

However, if God tells you anything, accept it gladly. Shut yourself up to knowledge from Him alone, as the all important matter for you!

I find myself confined to the one subject in writing to you so I will here close. Hoping and trusting that you will fight the good fight of faith at this point with ease and tranquility of soul. Will be glad to hear from you again at anytime.

Yours in the glad acceptance of God's favor.

N. BURNS.

March 20th 1893.

Rev. N. Burns.

Dear Sir.—I wish to write a few sentences from a sermon preached by Rev. J. E. Starr, in Elm Street Church, a few weeks ago, and which have been in my thoughts a great many times since.

The text was John 7 and 17. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrines,

After quoting several passages to prove that Christ's mission to earth was to "save" men from their sins, and to cleanse from "all" unrighteousness, and enable them to live "pure" lives, he said: "Some people do not believe in the divinity of Christ; others do not believe there ever was a Christ, and a host of beliefs there are abroad. Now, friends, I speak it reverently, God does not care a button for your beliefs. He does not care any more for what is in your head, than He cares for what is on your head. Do the "will" and you will know of the doctrine, and your belief will be all right. Anyone here may begin to do the will to-night, and go right on doing it.

After the regular service, a short prayer meeting was held, Testimony along the line of doing the "will" was called for when one lady testified to being able to do the will by the year. Then Mr. Starr announced that he would hold meetings every night during the following week, along the same line, and said: "I do not ask any of you to come, but if the Holy Spirit prompts any of you to come, stay away if you dare!"

Mr. Starr being my Spiritual father, I was unusually interested in his sermon.

LIZZIE L. GRAHAM.

When home is ruled according to God's word angels might be asked to stay at night with us and they would not find themselves out of their sphere.—Spurgeon.

How patiently God works to teach us! How long he waits for us to learn the lesson!

INCIDENTS BY THE WAY.

AS MR. BURNS referred last month to his prospective departure for England, and probable stay for a few days in New York en-route, and as it was in God's order of things that we should accompany him as far as New York, permit us in a few brief sentences to outline the journey this side of the Atlantic. Your readers will doubtless hear regarding the other side of the Atlantic from Mr. Burns' pen later.

On the morning of the 27th we left the Union Station, Toronto, Mrs. Burns' Rev. P. Flint, Mr. and Mrs. Graham accompanying us as far as Parkdale. At Hamilton we were joined by Mr. Isaac Anderson, the Honorary Treasurer of the Canada Holiness Association and the one to whom the Lord entrusted the duty of financing for Mr. Burns' trip. He left us at St. Catharines with an apostolic benediction. At Niagara Falls we discovered we had on board with us another old acquaintance—Rev. Anna Shaw. We found in conversation that Dr. Shaw had been selected as the preacher at the Woman's Auxiliary of the World's Fair Congress of religions. She declared she could not get out of her mind this text, "the truth shall make you free," and inclined to the opinion that that would be her text at the World's Fair opening meeting. She declared her inability to define the truth in its latitudinarian sense, but would leave that part of her subject for the great teacher of the individual.

As far as Rochester, where she had to leave the train to fill an appointment, we discussed and compared notes about the deep things of God. We enjoyed this incident of the journey.

At Rochester we boarded a Wagner palace car as far as Utica, as the originator of the financing of the trip had stipulated that from a health standpoint mainly, Pullman cars and First Cabin Ocean passage should be conditions of the journey. At Utica an interlude was made, by a 30 mile trip to Fort Plain, when we rested for the night. Like our Master who was the friend of publicans, and sinners, we were met at the station by one who, while claiming to be a skeptic, nevertheless appeared to act towards us after a thoroughly Christian sort. In fact we are not prepared to say that he could not truthfully lay claim to the Christian reward for a "Cup of Cold Water," notwithstanding his harassing perplexities. He escorted us to the home of one of the saints planted here and there, but more plentifully in Canada, who believe it is possible to do the will of God as Christ and the Angels are doing in heaven. Our hostess is a member of the Methodist persuasion, a reader of the EXPOSITOR, a firm believer in "Divine guidance" and one who bids fair to become what the Lord Jesus Christ said all Christians should be, viz., "cities set on a hill that cannot be hid."

The next day we took the "fastest train in the world" and a few hours run landed us in New York. A little incident here to illustrate the mistake question. On our way from Fort Plain to Albany the Pullman car conductor informed us that if we wished we could change

cars at Albany and thus reach New York an hour earlier. We had already telegraphed that we expected to reach there at "7 to-night" but on arrival we found that the operator had omitted the "7" either at Fort Plain or New York so that the message read "to-night" only. Result of operators' mistake,—our entertainers met the fast train instead of us having to wait an hour for them. "All things work together for good to those who love God." It would however have been best for all concerned had we had to wait till "seven."

In a few minutes after our arrival in New York we were enjoying the hospitality of one whom neither of us ever saw—one whom neither of us saw during the three days of our stay. According to the general rule of all things working together for good, the fact of Rev. Stephen Merritt being in Florida on the occasion of our visit to New York at his invitation, would be generally conceded to be an unfortunate, "all things." Not so, however. We found that while not being at home himself, he had competent deputies. His home was under the admirable control of Mrs. Stephen Merritt junior during his absence and his work was under the management of Rev. Ross Taylor, so that between the two we spent the three days in New York doing the will satisfactorily. Unlike Jesus with Zacheus we made no come home or come down demands upon "one Stephen Merritt."

Among the interviews were one with Dr. Wilson, a former acquaintance and a Canadian. This interview was satisfactory. It is needless to go into details. Another was with Louis Klopsot, publisher for Dr. Talmage of the Christian Herald, and son-in-law of Stephen Merritt our host.

We were also invited to attend a holiness meeting, 30 miles up the Hudson at the home of Rev. Ross Taylor, son of the African Bishop of that name. Here we had the glad privilege of ringing out testimony on lines of righteous living, with some possible difference in phraseology. The effects of our visit to New York will be far-reaching. The weather was Association weather. Mr. Burns boarded his boat the night before. At 5.30 a. m. we saw him off and in bidding him adieu we realized more joy than sorrow. And as the Cunard Greyhound *Etruria* was swept out of New York harbor by the high tide, we knew from personal experience the benefit of the high tide gospel which Rev. Nelson Burns, President of the Canada Holiness Association and Editor of the EXPOSITOR thereof, was the bearer of from the New World to the old—a gospel with even a fuller Pentacost for the old than the Pilgrim Fathers gave the new.

Readers of the EXPOSITOR will doubtless here more anon in this connection, or it may be that more than one Apostolic journey may be needed. We expect marching orders ourselves before long. It may be soon, it may be long, and Philip could not more willingly join himself to the Ethiopian at command of the Spirit than we would hasten to the uttermost parts of the earth, but we have been with Jesus when he entered into the reality of "not my will but Thine be done," O God. H. DICKENSON.

We direct all interested parties to the advertisement of Kent Bros. on the fourth page of the cover. It is often a great convenience to those not living in the city to be able to purchase *safely* such supplies as are there advertised, without the expense of a journey to the city.

We have made arrangements whereby 15 per cent. off the catalogue prices is allowed to all who negotiate through this office. Parties, then, who forward their orders through this office, can do so with confidence as to quality and price of the articles required.

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.

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.

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.

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.