

not followed the divine rule in appointing elders; we consider them unfit for their position, and have not the humility with which Peter exhorts us to be clothed.

Bro. Murray's last article on this subject can be best answered by his article in the last number of THE CHRISTIAN—"Party v. Religion." He says, "Religion is the love of others, to see others' good; to bless them and help and promote their interest even at the sacrifice of our own interest." "In these, the only true principles of manhood, we find the foundation and cap-stone of all institutions and governments of any worth." Who will say nay to this? Opposed to this he places the party spirit. The fundamental principle of party spirit is government by majority; and the minority has to yield until some flagrant act of injustice is committed, when the real rulers find themselves in a minority and have to resign their rule.

How will the strictures of Joseph Ash in the same number apply to this matter? He writes, "Let any one who has the love of God abiding in his or her heart, look abroad among the churches and see the desolation, the strife, the contention, churches torn asunder, and his heart will be pierced with sadness. I am told it is expedient to have this, that and the other going in the church, all of which is unknown in the New Testament."

The teaching of Christ in Luke ix. 46-49, seems to condemn ruling in the sense of the word as used when we speak of majorities ruling. The principle, if followed to its logical conclusion, is vicious, and will do much to injure the cause we all love. What excuse is there for our plea? The majority is against us. Why should we cling to immersion? The majority say it is not expedient. You may tell me these illustrations deal with matters where we have a "Thus saith the Lord." The majority say the Lord intended this or that; what was expedient then to fulfil His purpose is not expedient now; the apostolic practice is not expedient. Must we abide by the judgment of the majority? Must the majority rule?

Let us face this question fairly, for it means the humiliation of self. Have we the love of God in our hearts as Christ taught it to His disciples, and not on our tongues, if, when we find faithful Christians conscientiously opposed to anything the majority favors, we make them submit? Must the majority rule? Let us rather seek to draw near to Christ in His spirit of love and try to lead others into that faith, then the question of who is to rule will not arise; there will be no ruling; there will be no need of it.

This is the way I understand the teachings of the New Testament. If I am wrong, will some one please show me where I err?

W. S. FREEMAN.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.

"Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it break in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold, the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter, and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure." Dan. ii. 44-45.

In these words we have a prophetic description of the Kingdom of Christ as the fifth empire that should arise from the date of this prophecy. The four preceding kingdoms, although they partake of the most valuable material—silver, gold—and have the strength of brass, and iron, yet they are to be broken in pieces by the fifth kingdom. This Kingdom is spiritual in its nature, universal in its extension, and eternal in its duration. This terrible and wonderful image, that had disturbed the mind of the King of Babylon, denoted four of the greatest empires of the world; indeed they are generally

termed the four universal kingdoms. Its head of gold was a representation of the kingdom of Babylon, and certainly the symbol was a good one. Who can read of its vast wealth—its hanging gardens—its artistic fountains—without wondering at the vast amount of wealth displayed. The breasts of silver denoted the kingdom or empire of the Medes and Persians, who obtained their power about 538 B. C., or sixty-five years after the prediction of Daniel. The belly and thighs of brass, represent the Grecian kingdom under Alexander the Great, who held universal monarchy, B. C., 334. The legs of iron are descriptive of the Roman kingdom in its power and glory. The mingling of clay denotes a time when in a measure, the glory will have departed. As iron is a hard, strong substance, and calculated to bruise and crush whatever material of a softer nature it might encounter, so the power of the Roman Empire was once so great as to crush with its iron grasp the various kingdoms of the world, and subject them to her absolute authority.

The kingdom which God is to set up is here represented under the similitude of a little stone cut of the mountain without hands. That seems to imply that no human power is used in the establishing of this kingdom. It is not done according to man's wisdom. Behold! and see this unostentatious, and apparently powerless stone, more than a match for this apparently invincible image of gold, and brass, and iron. Has this prophecy been fulfilled? Is there any kingdom upon earth coming from a small beginning, that looks as though it would last forever? I answer both of these questions in the affirmative.

Now for the proof. Daniel says, this kingdom is to be set up in the days of "these kings." Evidently the word "King" is used in metonymic sense. Thus we find Daniel saying to the King of Babylon, "Thou art this head of gold," putting the king for the kingdom. Here we conclude that during the existence of one of these four universal kingdoms, God will set up the kingdom which shall never be destroyed. The Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, lived, flourished, and passed away. The Roman Kingdom, the last of the four, is in existence. Is the prophecy not true? Six hundred years have rolled by since it was uttered. When lo! there appears a man on the banks of Jordan, dressed in the costume of a prophet. Strong and clear his voice rings out, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Crowds attend on his ministry. Thousands of converts are made. The Son of God appears on the scene. He selects some devoted followers, and they all join in proclaiming to the people the wonderful news, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

It might be profitable just here to digress a little from the straight course we have been following, and consider the following question. Why did Christ use the term, "Kingdom of Heaven?" It is a phrase peculiar to the New Testament. Let us consider. 1st. That the Jews were in the habit of hearing the scriptures read regularly, and the portions read would frequently have reference to the Messiah as sitting on the throne of David, or else speaking of his kingdom. 2nd. Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, all speak in terms that would lead the people to think that when the Messiah came, He would restore the Kingdom of Israel to its pristine splendour and glory. Accustomed to this mode of speaking, the Jews expected the Kingdom of the Messiah to resemble a temporal kingdom, that he would deliver them from bondage, restore the Hebrew monarchy, and subdue the nations, and reward his faithful servants in proportion to their fidelity and success. This accounts for the contentions among the apostles about precedence in His kingdom. It also accounts for the questions propounded to Christ after His resurrection, by the apostles, "Lord,

wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel." I think then it is plain to see the reasons why Jesus used the term as He did. 1st. It corresponded with the inspired writers. 2nd. It agreed with the expectations of the people. This brings a double force to the words of John 1. 2. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not."

I now return to the main question, but the conclusion we have arrived at in regard to the reason why Christ used this term alters it a little. Instead of enquiring whether this prophecy has been fulfilled or not, we ask, "Is the kingdom represented by the stone cut out without hands, the kingdom that Christ preached to be at hand." The term Kingdom of Heaven might be rendered the Heavenly Kingdom, for Jesus came from heaven to die for men; and as we have seen that the king was put for the kingdom in speaking of the four earthly kingdoms, why not place Jesus, who is a heavenly being, for the kingdom which when cleansed and purified will also be heavenly. The stone in the vision typified Christ. The feet of image typified Rome. The stone smote the feet and caused the downfall of the whole image. Christianity caused the overthrow of the Roman empire, and in so doing broke in pieces the spirit that animated the different monarchies. The stone was apparently insignificant; Christ was born in a manger. It became a great mountain. The knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth.

I might give other analogies, but I think it is plain indeed to see that the kingdom spoken of by Daniel, and the kingdom spoken of by Christ and John are one and the same. Babylon and Medo-Persian represented wealth. The Macedonian, and Roman had strength of arms, but both wealth and strength have been brought low by the little stone of God's love. I must close this article for this month, hoping to take it up next month, and show the difference between the kingdom as it now exists, and what it will be hereafter, when the wheat is gathered from the tares.

W. H. HARDING.

News of the Churches.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

DRER ISLAND.

We are here on this island for a short time. Our last visit here was at our Annual Meeting in Lord's Cove nearly two years ago. There has been marked improvement since then in many respects. A number of fine, neat, tasty houses have been erected, and many other dwellings have been improved. One cannot fail to see the marks of activity and industry. Kind nature has graciously smiled on the people of this island by the sea. Poverty and want, the haunting demons of homes, have fallen very lightly on this people. These changes for the better show plainly that they are living in the nineteenth century and not back in the dead past. A living active man will always be subject to changes for the better. "He who changes not, liveth not." The man who lives must grow, and the man who grows must change. The man to-day who is not growing and improving in mind and soul and body, will be left. The man who pitches his tent among the living will be constantly growing and going onward and upward. It is the dead fish that go down the stream. While we are delighted with these marks of improvement in the temporal concerns of life, we very much regret the lack of a corresponding growth and improvement in the things pertaining to Divine life. It must be admitted by all who give any thought to the subject, that the spiritual life, both in the individual and in the church, must be constantly growing better in all good things. The church or