

the past whilst we continue to walk in the Spirit as the one and only law of life.

But to those who have examined into the figurative language of the Scriptures until they have recognized its true import we say, that no surgical operation, according to their thought, has taken place. The change simply and only exists in the fact that in place of continuing the endless efforts after suppression of evil, or trying to believe that carnality is gone, because the blood cleanseth, we have turned aside completely from these fruitless devices, and have accepted the invisible Holy Ghost in His sublime offer to be to us the only supreme law or guide and teacher in life, and now we obey Him with a momentary, a yearly obedience. There is no real change in us as to body, mind or spirit, as far as the composition of those entities are concerned; the only change is in the object of obedience, we having now substituted the spirit for the letter, and in so doing we find obedience both complete and easy.

In this sense it is a new creation, for behold all old things have passed away and all things have become new. The only fault we find with even the strong expressions and figures of Scripture, descriptive of our state, is that they are not strong enough, for our peace is past understanding, our joy is unspeakable, our love is perfected and our lives are only faintly described as "always abounding in the work of the Lord."

### CLAIMING PROMISES.

Is it right to claim promises? We reply yes and no, according to the meaning put into the expression.

Generally the act of claiming is an admission that the truth of the apostolic statement, "all things are yours," is doubted, and that, therefore, faith towards God is not perfect.

What would we think of a father who was ever and anon *claiming* some piece of furniture in his home or some article of food on his table. Would it not suggest to the stranger that hitherto they

did not belong to him, or that his actions indicated unsoundness of mind?

What would we think of the millionaire who spent a large part of his time in *claiming* one after another of his pieces of property, occasionally varying the occupation by extracting a bank note from his pocket and going through the formality of *claiming* the promise to pay written or printed upon it? Would it not be pronounced on as a much more satisfactory employment if he should rather spend his time in using his promises to pay in obliging others.

But the children of this world are wiser in their generation than many professed Christians, and hence give the latter a monopoly of this work of *claiming* promises.

Do we condemn this kind of pantomimic performance altogether? By no means. If the man of means cannot be persuaded to use his money without going through the formality of *claiming* it, better let him retain this amiable weakness undisturbed. Who would wish to cure a man of such a habit if the result to him would be starvation or poverty?

So if Christians can only obtain a part of their heritage by *claiming* it piecemeal, God forbid that we should ever desire to rob them of their privilege.

Especially will this *claiming* process be harmless if they only claim each time just what is best and most needed, and this will be the case if they have faith in the Holy Spirit as guide into this truth.

But where such guidance is not accepted and acted out, then it is apt to become a hurtful formality.

Imagine a man, when needing food, spending much time in *claiming* one of his numerous houses—now he tries to put his arms around it, now he perches himself on one of the turrets or hugs a door-post or window-sill, again he sits in front of it, or walks about it, trying to concentrate his mind on the fact that he has the privilege of *claiming* it as his own! What the man needs at the present time is to partake of the food awaiting his acceptance on his table, instead of wasting his time *claiming* something unsuited to his present need.

Again, it is quite possible for him to