

literature of the day without seeing that a prominence is given to His death out of all proportion to that given to His life. And yet if His death were the chief thing, why did He live so long and endure such contradiction of sinners? If His mission was simply to die, why did He not die at once and be saved from years of useless suffering?

Taking the Master's own words for it we maintain that He gave far greater prominence to His life than to His death and that He came rather to teach men how to live than how to die. His most important discourse, the sermon on the Mount, deals almost exclusively with matters pertaining to practical every day life with scarcely a reference to the subject of death. The whole tenor of the three synoptic Gospels are to the same effect. They deal almost entirely with the subject of right doing, right living or righteousness. If such great prominence then is given to right living in His teaching is it not reasonable to suppose that He would leave behind Him some important secret bearing on the greatest of problems?

If the lesson which He came to teach was not Divine Guidance, what was it?

We look in vain for any other secret bearing directly upon the subject of righteous living. The lesson of forgiveness men had learned before. The Old Testament saints rejoiced in a clear sense of forgiving grace. Their death was triumphant. True they failed to keep the law and committed daily sins, but they obtained daily forgiveness just as modern Christians do. It may be said that Jesus gave a deeper and more spiritual meaning to the law than did any of the prophets. But what would be the advantage of this unless He gave power to keep the more perfect law? But as a matter of fact He gave no such power unless it be in the gift of the Holy Ghost. Legalists of today are just where the Jews of old were. They see the law to be just and perfect and good but find no means to keep it. A

Christian without Divine Guidance in this dispensation is little if any better off than a Jew under the law. He fails to keep the law and so did the Jew. The Jew needed daily forgiveness and so does he. Both are constrained to cry out under their sense of failure, "O wretched man that I am."

Now Jesus plainly taught that there was to be a great difference between the two dispensations. That the privileges of Christians were to be so much greater than the privileges of Old Testament saints; that the *least* in the new dispensation should be greater than the *greatest* in the Old. If this be so what makes the difference? The superior teaching of Jesus could not make the difference? Neither could His superior example unless power was given to practice the teaching and follow the example. The history of the first Christians fully corroborates the above statement. Until the day of Pentecost the characters of the apostles were marred by the same weaknesses, faults and sins as other men. They were narrow and biggoted, wanting to forbid others doing good because they "followed not us." They were filled with worldly ambitions and selfish desires, disputing which should be the greatest among them quite after the fashion of modern place seekers in the church and out of it, and these thoughts filled their minds up to the very eye of Pentecost, as is shown by the method of electing a successor to Judas immediately after the ascension of their Master. Here is the clearest evidence that they were still bound to the old legalistic form of service. The only reason given by Peter for electing a successor to Judas was that the Master had called twelve and therefore they must keep up the number. So they make their appeal to blind chance to elect a successor the lot falling on Mat-thias of whom we fittingly hear nothing afterwards. To be sure they prayed over the matter, forgetting as all legalists do, that prayer cannot sanctify a foolish and need-