

there is any liberty to sin left, and yet the freedom here spoken of remain. "And be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" cannot be interpreted to mean that "entanglement with the yoke of bondage" is another form of expression for "purity of life" "doing the will" "walking in the Spirit."

To serve the Lord without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life seems to have been the aim of Paul's preaching. Whether he succeeded in doing this is not recorded. He, himself, declared that he "kept the faith."

This expression is not so strong as when Christ said "I do *always* those things that please my Father" or "my meat and my drink is to do the will of my Father."

Using liberty as an occasion to the flesh, Paul condemns, and Peter's exhortation is to "use not liberty as a cloak of maliciousness."

The only liberty we have, is to do the whole will of God. We have no liberty to dictate what another should do. We have no liberty to dictate what the beliefs of another should be.

In this sense we have improved upon Paul. When Paul said "don't keep company with covetous or idolaters etc.," we fail to see that in this he truly represented the friend of publicans and sinners—the one who remained in the company of and discoursed with the "woman at the well."

When Paul teaches not to receive into your house the one that bringeth not the doctrine of Christ, we assuredly believe Paul misrepresented Christ's teaching about liberty.

When Paul teaches us to withdraw ourselves from those who teach otherwise from ourselves, in this we firmly believe he misrepresents Christianity, and the liberty he exhorts us to stand fast in.

When he says that the "mouths must be stopped" of those who teach circumci-

sion, we really believe he interferes with that "liberty of speech" which is one of the crowning glories of the christian dispensation and stultifies his own teaching about liberty.

When he makes a law to "rebuke sharply" the unsound in the faith, we are convinced he departed from Christ's injunction to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and while urging freedom from law, made laws; while urging the "walk in the Spirit," actually made laws that would interfere with that "walk."

And when he enjoins the "rejection of heretics after the first and second admonition," we cannot help but contrast this teaching with that of Christ about the seventy times seven offenders.

And must we imitate Paul and "deliver Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan," or obey the Spirit, when that Spirit's teaching is in harmony with Christ's teaching about leaving the ninety and nine and seeking that which has gone astray?

And when Paul discourses about the execution of speedy judgment, whether it be unto death or to banishment or confiscation of goods or to imprisonment upon those who will not do the law of God and the law of the King, will some of the gallant champions of Pauline liberalism kindly come to our relief when we confess to a difficulty in harmonizing this legalism with the freedom of the walk in the Spirit—with the abrogation or swallowing up of everything having a Mosaic tendency or that savors of Judaism.

H. DICKENSON.

THE LAW OF LIBERTY.

THE Old Covenant consists of commands and prohibitions—Thou shalt, and thou shalt not; but the New Covenant recognizes motives. The Old says thou shalt not kill, but the New declares a man a murderer who hates his brother.¹

Under the law, man might do the best