

ish parents he had been trained, in order to set the example of honest industry to the converts there. Impressed with the false idea of the immediate coming of their Lord many of them were going about idle, lazy loiterers. A good-for-nothing idler, a gadding gossip, he could not away with. Hence his earnest exhortation to them "with quietness to work and to eat their own bread and work with their own hands." Having respect to the dignity of labor and the example of that Master who said, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" who as a carpenter wielded hammer and saw and plane at the mechanics bench in the workshop at Nazareth, he would enforce his precepts by his practice. Hence as we take a look into the lodging of Aquila and Priscilla we find him busy in company with that worthy couple plying the needle and the scissors, for by their occupation they were tentmakers. In other case living among the heathen, and that he might the better illustrate his own saying, "We seek not yours but you," he preferred being independent still, "once and again the Macedonians ministered to his necessities and to them that were with him." He lauds certain churches, the Phillippian for example, for so assiduously providing for them.

In ordinary circumstance the right to support on the part of these whom he benefited by his labors, he never doubted. It was a principle which he strongly held. Hence his question in v. 4. "Have we not power to eat and to drink?" In other words—"Have we not a right to worldly maintenance?" The answer to this and the succeeding questions is plainly meant to be affirmative. "I have a claim to be supported just as much as any other. If I choose for the present and amid certain surroundings to waive that claim, do not for a moment suppose that I therefore abandon it. In v. 5, he claimed the right of a support not for himself alone, but for a wife as well as other Apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas." His "power" or right he proceeds to establish by "many infallible proofs."

I. The first argument as contained in the 7th verse is derived from the principle that is universally acknowledged and acted on, namely, that *labor deserves a return*. "Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges, who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof, or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" Here are three classes who live by laboring. The sol-

dier supplies not his own rations. These are provided for him. In like manner farmers and shepherds receive the fruit of their labors. They work and they are paid for it. Why should not they who endure hardships as good soldiers of Jesus Christ who labor in the Lord's vineyard and feed the flock of God?

II. Paul's second argument is derived from the recognized regulations of the Jewish law. "Say I these things as a man, i. e., according to human judgment. Is it only my own opinion I am giving? Is this a view which accords only with human reason or common usage? By no means. It is substantiated by the Divine Word. Don't take my word for it. To the law and to the testimony." "Sith not the law the same also? In the law of Moses the Divine Author legislated mercifully for the fowls or birds, forbidding the disturbance of the parent bird when sitting on his nest: Deut. 22:6-7, for beasts—as with the prohibition against seething a kid in its mother's milk, Deut. 14:21. So here is his regard shown for oxen "for it is written in the law of Moses Deut. 25:4 thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." The ox's mouth must not be muzzled in drawing the threshing machine through the corn, or while treading it beneath their feet. They must get a chance to eat. They must be at liberty to stoop down and crop the ears when they feel hungry. "Doth God take care for oxen?" and will he not take care of his own faithful servants? Are they not of more value than many sparrows? How is a man better than a sheep or an ox? Was this special legislation for the oxen's sake alone? Was it merely to prevent cruelty to animals? That of itself was good. Yet had he a higher aim.

The immediate object no doubt was to promote kindness to the lower creation which groaneth and travaileth in pain until now, but wrapt up in the bosom of the precept is a hidden—a higher meaning. The argument "much more," plainly comes in. That thoughtful, loving Lord who is so regardful of the welfare of oxen, can not be unmindful of his intelligent, immortal creatures. If he would have these dumb animals not cheated of their due surely he will not the less insist on justice being done to those who serve him in the ministry of His Son.

"Or saith he it altogether for our sakes." For our sakes no doubt this is written "that he that plougheth shall plough in hope, i. e., in hope of being