

ing all action to be undertaken concerning him. Yes, even if he sees his brother apparently going astray after a serious sort, still he acts or refrains from action as led every moment by the Almighty, All Wise Holy Ghost, and he continues so to act even when legalists, to a man, pronounce on his conduct as unchristian, uncharitable or devoid of natural affection. It is because he is possessed of the peace of God that he still pursues his course with tranquil mind even amidst opposition or hostile criticism.

The peace of God, then, is the gift of God to every one who really and truly walks in the Spirit, and to none others, and, moreover, it can be *successfully* counterfeited by no one.

EXPOSITION.

"Ye have been called unto liberty." Gal. v. 13.

What liberty? Liberty to do what? Who called them? Does this refer to liberty of thought, speech or action?

All the liberty modern so-called Christianity has ever called us to, is to believe in what is contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith—more or less.

If I were asked to answer candidly whether the Presbyterian Church gave me the liberty to do the will of God in thought, word and deed, I would be compelled to answer emphatically, no!

If asked if I had liberty to sin in the church I would be compelled to answer, yes! No other categorical answers could be given to these questions.

If modifications to their answers were allowed, the answer to the "doing of the will" question would be made to cover such ground as to exclude anyone who laid claims to this high type of Christianity from membership in the Presbyterian Church, and, on the "liberty to sin" question being submitted to modification, the same result would ensue.

Paul was referring to those who were

"troubling" the Galatians with questions affecting circumcision etc., and after declaring that the Galatians were "running well" "who did hinder you," goes on to say, for "ye brethren were called to liberty" or as it is in revised version "freedom."

And Paul, too, still further emphasizing this call to liberty, and how this liberty could be secured and retained, goes on to say, "Walk in the Spirit" or "by the Spirit," as it is in the revised version.

What we would like to ask is, if anyone carried out Paul's direction here to "walk in the Spirit" or "by the Spirit" that is, under the Spirit's direction, how could anything else than the will of God be done, or how could sin become a rule of life?

Must a part only of man walk by the Spirit, and the remainder walk by the devil's direction; or by what conceivable process could sinning and doing the will take place? "Out of the same fountain cannot come forth sweet water and bitter." "He that is not with me is against me."

To walk in, or by, the Spirit is to be with Jesus—to carry out Jesus' directions—is to do what Paul urged the Galatians to do. How then can sin mingle with actions, thoughts and words dictated by the Holy Spirit?

And we have certainly liberty to walk in the Spirit, if we so desire—in fact to do this is the very liberty that Paul enjoins, when he said "Ye have been called unto liberty." Paul certainly could not have meant that the liberty that the Galatians were called unto was a liberty to sin!

Where the Spirit is there is liberty—surely not to sin!

When changed by the Spirit of the Lord into the image of the Lord—this cannot by any process of reasoning be made to prove that sin must be a part of that image.

"Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free" surely cannot be interpreted to mean, that