

followed the Israelites, for it has not the pronoun *them*, the insertion of which has unduly affected the sense, and which ought to have been printed in *italics* to mark its absence in the Greek. The exact version of the original is this—*For they drank out of a spiritual following rock*. And according to this, we are not required to suppose that either rock or stream moved forward along with the Israelites; for it is plain that a thing may be said to *follow* when it merely comes after or succeeds in point of time, without at all implying that it moves from place to place after something else. Thus in Rev. xvi. 8—‘and there *followed* another angel, &c.; the word denotes succession in time, or in the order of events; and in Mac. xvi. 20—‘with signs *following*,’ we understand that the signs in confirmation of the word were given after it had been preached. The critical reader may look also at the Greek in 2 Mac. iv. 17, and 3 Esd. viii. 16. We therefore understand by the *following rock* in this place, one that succeeded in the order of events, or that *came after* in the history of the Israelites: and by referring to that history, we at once see that the supply of water was *subsequent to* that of manna, or in other words, that the ‘spiritual rock’ followed the ‘spiritual meat’ or food: see Exod. xvi. 15, and Exod. xvii. 6.

Probably Paul was led thus to mention the rock as following the manna, because he was, as already explained, instituting a comparison or analogy between these things, and the bread and cup in the Lord’s Supper. As the cup follows the bread in the order of the encharist, so the rock follows the manna in the history of the ‘church in the wilderness.’

Such is the view, which after careful examination has commended itself to the writer’s mind; but let each one examine and judge for himself.

B. D.

“*And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain,*”—1 Cor. xv. 37.

The verb *bear*, being much more frequently used both in spoken and in written language than the adjective *bare*, and the two words being precisely the same in sound, and very similar in appearance; there has arisen, and most likely in consequence of these facts, an amazingly wide spread misunderstanding of the text just quoted. Thousands of well informed christians, (not verbal critics), understand the apostle as though he had written thus: “that which thou sowest, is not that body that shall be, but being sown, it will *bear* grain, whither it be wheat that is sown or any other grain!” And knowing, moreover, that the grain produced, is, *in form*, the same as the grain which produced it; they conclude, that the resurrection body will be as like the present body, as the new Kernel is like the old! Thus completely reversing the apostle’s teaching! And so extraordinary is the blinding power of this illusion, where it has taken root in childhood, that one case, at least, is known, of a theological student, in no way remarkable for stupidity, who, on coming to the critical examination of this text, found to his astonishment that the original words for “*bare grain*,” were “*γυμνον κοκκον*,”—NAKED

grain, he exclaimed! *Yes*, it is naked grain that we sow, grain destitute of straw and chaff, and God gives it a body as it hath pleased him, first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear. And here for the first time, the truth broke in upon his mind, that the xv. chapter of Cor. teaches, that the resurrection body of the saint, in the glory of its form and structure, may as far transcend his present body, as the beauty and attractive grace of the stalk of corn in the full bloom of its perfection, excels the aspect or appearance of the naked Kernel from which it originated.

LETTER FROM THE ZORRA FARMER.

DEAR SIR,—You have favoured us with a specimen of Mr. Noel’s plea for the communion of saints, and I confess I cannot help thinking that every heart imbued with genuine christian candour must feel the force of his reasoning, for his arguments are eminently *evangelical*. They are indeed characteristic of the amiable author.

There is an important argument arising from the case of Mr. Noel, and others similarly situated, which neither he nor any other advocate of christian communion, as far at least as I am aware, has taken the advantage of. It is true, it is of the presumptive kind, yet, in my humble opinion, more than sufficient to settle the question. It is simply the gross incongruity involved in Mr. Noel’s taking such a position as close communion renders imperative on all its abettors. I cannot avoid viewing it to be strong presumptive evidence that the system must be wrong somewhere that would be the cause of the exhibition of such manifest incongruity.

Those who themselves submitted to the ordinance of baptism at the commencement of their religious life, may, with some show of modesty, assume the position which our close brethren assume in reference to pado-baptists; but for Mr. Noel, after living so many years himself in the neglect of what he now holds to be the duty of every one as soon as he believes in Christ, to turn round to his brethren with whom he was wont to associate, and take sweet counsel, and say to them:—“brethren, it is true I held for many years the same views of baptism that you still conscientiously hold, I sprinkled many infants, thus doing a service which God required not of me, while I rendered his commandment of none effect by my tradition, which you still do. I have got new light on the subject, however, and have in consequence, abandoned my erroneous opinions and practice; but as you still adhere to your errors, and refuse to yield obedience to what is so manifestly your duty, I cannot—I dare not allow you to sit with me at the table of the Lord, or be a member with me of the same church.”

This would necessarily be the plain language of Mr. Noel’s close communion. And what manifest incongruity would be here! How could his former associates possibly view this in any other light than as the height of arrogance; and how could they but repel it with sovereign contempt! How could they but feel pungent regret that the mind that was wont to be deeply imbued with christian modesty, and liberality.