

at that time (Acts iv. 8). Moreover, nothing is said of their praying for a fresh baptism, or of their being refilled. Neither does it say "they were all filled again."

Furthermore, why should the apostles demand that deacons should be men *full* of the Holy Ghost (Acts vi. 5) if the apostles could only be full occasionally?

Nor are the Samaritans a case in point to prove that believers receive fresh baptisms of the Spirit. It is not stated whether their belief was of the head or heart. It is written that Simon believed also and was baptized. Philip evidently thought him as good a candidate for baptism as any of the others.

Comforter? Isn't the Comforter we receive at conversion equal to the soul's needs?

What constitutes the difference between flesh anointings and the anointing that abideth in you?

Where in Scripture are we told to expect fresh out-pourings of the Spirit, fresh anointings, fillings, etc.? What constitutes the difference between men who were full of the Holy Ghost, Stephen, Barnabas, etc., and those who are always seeking fresh fillings?

Did Paul command the Ephesians to be filled occasionally or constantly? (2 Eph. v. 18). Is not the Greek verb an imperative, present, passive, and would it not literally read, "continue to be filled with the Spirit?"

Jesus says: "Lo, I am with you *always*." And will he not do for us at *all times all* that our soul needs? He is able to do exceedingly, abundantly above all that ye ask or think, and my God *shall* supply *all* your need according to His riches in glory, by Christ Jesus.

W. E. DEAN.

Halleck, W. Va.

WHO has given you more trouble in life than all the rest of mankind put together? Yourself.

THOSE who witness to full salvation should be sure that their life is consistent with such a profession. Otherwise they will bring reproach upon the cause of holiness.—*Sel.*

ONCE ADMIT THE ALMIGHTINESS OF THE HOLY GHOST AND THERE CAN BE NO OTHER ULTIMATE GUIDE.

This proposition is so self-evident that it scarcely needs expansion. But since many will not consider it long enough or regard it with unprejudiced mind, it is necessary to view it from different standpoints, if happily men may at last take in its far-reaching meaning.

But this strange anomaly is witnessed in the Christian world, viz., that, almost without dissent, this Omnipotence is conceded in thought, and creed, but denied in practice.

The Roman Catholic Church accepts it as part of its creed, and then, without the sanction or specific instructions of the Holy One, limits Him to a certain kind of guidance, which is found upon careful examination to be no spiritual guidance whatever. For upon their own showing their claims for such limitation are far too small for the mighty superstructure they vainly would rear upon them. A scrap or two of Scripture, whose connections are somewhat obscure, even if we allow them the benefit of every doubt concerning these connections, are manifestly utterly insufficient for such a purpose.

Even if Jesus Christ had defined minutely and clearly the province of the Holy Ghost according to their limitations, if, along with such restrictions, He also taught the Almightyness of the Holy Ghost, then would His teaching be pronounced on as absurd by every thoughtful student who could approach the subject with unprejudiced mind. For as in the multiplication table, when the quantity infinity is brought in as one of the factors, all the other quantities are swallowed up in the operation and nothing but infinity is left as the final result, so in this case all finite restrictions and multipliers are lost in the one factor, Almightyness.

If the Holy Spirit comes in His Omnipotence to guide men, then it is evident that He can define the extent of such guidance or else He is not Almighty. He who would impose limitations upon