

the Holy Spirit into their being as the sole rule of life and godliness, will show itself. And it cannot be otherwise, for these things are contrary the one to the other, so that however kindly in intention the legalist may be at the start, the presence of the really spiritual will gradually excite heart alienation, and finally the bitterest opposition; they being under the delusion, meanwhile, that in indulging in this un-Christlike spirit they are really doing God service.

We have expanded this thought here because we believe it traces the real dividing line between contending parties in the great holiness revival. Profession of holiness, or correctness in creed, does not ensure spirituality. Some who hold the extremest views concerning faith-cures find no difficulty in being one in the Spirit with others who cannot see eye to eye with them in this matter, whilst others, who are legalistic in spirit, cannot and will not have heart communion with others, however spiritual, ostensibly because of differing creeds, but really because they are not of the same spirit. And the same is true of other professors of holiness, for only those who are walking in the Spirit have real unity. In all others it is simply a name, and often not even that.

But the application of this thought to the subject in hand is easy, for we maintain that so soon as a Christian who receives the "Promise of the Father," in the Pentecostal sense, turns aside from Him as his real guide into all truth, to discover some law of health in the Bible by which to be governed, he has put a slight upon his ever present Counsellor, and begins to walk in darkness.

Whatever law of health is in the Bible is the law of the Spirit, for there is no antagonism between the Bible and the Holy Ghost, the inspirer of the Bible. Why turn aside from Him, the ruler, to the rule. Yes, but, says one, it will strengthen faith if we discover that it is the revealed will of God that our bodies should be free from sickness. Does not this thought simply prove want of confidence in the Holy Spirit? Does it not presume that He might be neglectful of our bodies, and that we should get posted up in order the better to remind

Him, and insure His attention to our need?

Now be it remembered that this does not imply that He, the Holy Spirit, may not show one, through the written word, that it is his or her privilege to be free from all sickness, it simply combats the tendency to take the matter out of the hands of the Spirit and rest it on some law, presumably, revealed in the Bible.

We frankly admit that we are discouraging of things which only those who are or once were spiritual can discern. They will appear as foolishness to all others.

It will be seen, then, that our only hope of unity amongst professors of holiness concerning faith-cures is the close consideration of the Comforter Divine as guide, for every individual, into all personal blessing for the body, and it is not necessary for such an one to settle beforehand concerning the creed of faith-cure teachers whether it is scriptural or not. If it is the will of God that one who walks in the Spirit should be free from all sickness, then he will have the prayer of faith for that definite result given him, for Jesus distinctly promised that He, the Spirit, would take of the things of Christ and reveal them unto us. If indwelt of the Spirit, and led by Him into all truth, we cannot fail of one blessing secured for us in the death and resurrection of Christ. To think or teach otherwise is to impeach the Holy Spirit Himself.

Therefore we conclude that to ask one who has received the Holy Ghost since he believed, and who walks momentarily in Him, being, as a necessary consequence, guided by Him into all truth, to rest his faith for health of body on the doctrine, presuming it to be true, promulgated by the leaders of the faith-cure movement, is to ask him to take lower ground, is to ask him to substitute, in part at least, legalism for spirituality.

If one has an undisputed title to an entire estate, it is better for the owner to rest his claim for any one part on this title, rather than on some disputed title deed which claims only that part.

So we utterly repudiate the pretensions made by some who lay claim to having received *more light* than all others