

our conscience, that in simplicity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God we have had our *conversation* in the world."

Now, we ask our readers, if any one studying these extracts would not be justified in saying that the compilers admitted the possibility, nay, taught the duty or privilege, of obeying the commandments of God completely? and, indeed, upon this as a foundation built up the doctrine of assurance.

In chapter xx., Christian liberty is described as, amongst other things, "yielding obedience to Him (God), not out of slavish fear, but a child-like love, and a willing mind," and in the third clause it is said, "They who, upon any pretence of Christian liberty, do practise any sin, or cherish any lust, do hereby destroy the end of Christian liberty; which is, that, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life."

In connection with this last deliverance are quoted the two following Scriptures: "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption, for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage" (2 Peter ii. 9); "Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (John viii. 34).

We draw particular attention to the natural inference from the above, that the statements of creed concerning dominion over sin, both inward and outward, must imply freedom from committing sin in any form, for the words of Jesus teach that no man can commit sin without being its servant, that is, under the dominion of sin.

We have not exhausted all the references marked to do service in this connection, but enough have been given to establish our contention, viz., that judged by these quotations, the Confession of Faith teaches, with the Bible, not only the desirability, but also the possibility, of the child of God walking in obedience to all the commandments of God; and as the Shorter Catechism defines sin as *transgression of the law of God*, and

as the commandments constitute the law of God, it follows that the child of God, according to the deliverances of the Westminster Confession of Faith, may live without sin.

If, now, Dr. Middlemiss proves with equal clearness that the same creed teaches that the child of God cannot live without sin, we submit that the proper course for him to take is to join the increasing army of *revisionists* and set the fathers of his Church right before he attempts to deprive fellow-Christians of their birthright privilege of being preserved blameless; a privilege guaranteed them, we repeat, not only by the Bible, but by the deliverances of the founders of the great Presbyterian Church.

MORE ABOUT GUIDANCE.

"Now, if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His." That settles it. No court of appeal beyond that. No excuse for deceiving either ourselves or others as to our claims to spiritual life.

"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." This is just as true as the other, and means plainly that they who are *not* led by the Spirit of God, are *not* the sons of God.

We say blessed sonship, blessed condition of sonship and blessed experience in being led. How could we have sonship without the leading, and would we if we might? Why divorce the two? Does it seem reasonable that we could lead ourselves as well as God the Spirit can lead us? Has our past record been so satisfactory that we don't wish it improved? And how can we work out our salvation unless God works in us to will and do of His good pleasure? How can we please Him who hath chosen us to be soldiers, unless we obey orders?

Nearly everybody admits the right of God to be our proprietor, and if this can be established, surely He has every right to have all they say about us.

Our contract specifies that we present our bodies a living sacrifice to God, and calls it a *reasonable* service. And yet we are often *unreasonable* enough to