

their living, of whom it is said: 'Ye are they which justify yourselves before men, for God knoweth your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God.' . . . Most men reject it, for they would rather be blind leaders of the blind, and perish in the same pit, than sit in condemnation of their own lives."

No other conclusion can reasonably be drawn than that Christians are bound to keep God's Law as being the "law of the faith," recognized and confirmed by Jesus and characterized by Paul as "holy, just and good." True Israelites are doubly bound to keep it, because to them it is not only a "law of the faith" but also a "law of the blood." Accordingly, when a Christian, knowing that so long as he lives in this world he must of necessity keep law of some kind, is asked what law he should rightly keep, it would seem that the immediate and unequivocal reply must be: "God's Law," with the tacit understanding that it may be supplemented by secular regulations, not inconsistent therewith, if and when modern or transitory conditions so require.

But though conceding in a general way that Christians are bound to keep God's Law, it is usually contended either—

1—That they are not obliged to keep all of it, but only such portions as are consistent with modern conditions (meaning, in reality, such portions as they may personally approve of), or

2—That God's Law consists only in the Ten Commandments.

These contentions are essentially the same, so far as their results are concerned, and they pose a most serious threat to Christianity. The position of those who reject God's Law in its entirety—who would enjoy all the benefits of Christianity but evade all its burdens—is so clearly wrong as to deceive no one. On the other hand, the position of those who attempt to cover themselves with a cloak of lawfulness while observing only such portions of God's law as do not tend to disturb the existing order of things, or who teach that the Ten Commandments are God's only law, has the questionable merit of a certain plausibility when not carefully considered, and is therefore misleading.

It would be hard to conceive of a doctrine more fallacious, or more subversive of Christian order, than that one may pick and choose from the whole Law those particular laws which he will obey. The most pernicious law-breaker would heartily approve of it, no doubt, since it would leave him free to exercise his own evil propensities without legal condemnation, while at the same time, pointing the finger of scorn at those who violate other laws.

But this doctrine finds no support in Scripture, according to which

*Moore v. Strickling (1899) 46 W.Va. 515, 33 SE 274, 50 LRA 279.