

This parallelism is that established between Christ and the Holy Ghost. The words of Jesus imply this similarity, "He will send you *another* Comforter." Jesus was one Comforter sent from the Father. The Holy Ghost was to be and, of course, now is another *similar* Comforter sent by the Father. "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you." Here the similarity almost dissolves itself into absolute identity, so close is the parallelism. "I have many more things to say unto you but you cannot hear them now, howbeit when He, the Comforter, is come, He shall *teach* you all things." Here the parallelism is concerning teaching. As Christ taught His disciples, so the Holy Ghost is ready now to teach them. "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come." Here the similarity is maintained, but the preference given to the latter as far as practical purposes to us are concerned—similar but better.

Need we go into the subject of the divinity of the Holy Ghost? This is granted by all, and so here also, in every infinite direction, similarity is discovered.

What then is the practical difference between the presence of Christ with His disciples and the presence of the Holy Ghost? We reply the difference is a pure matter of faith. Christ appealed to their bodily sense, the Holy Ghost appeals to our faith in Jesus Christ. Consecration to Jesus, in the days of His flesh, meant accepting Him as sole Law-giver and Teacher with implied willingness to carry out His wishes against the clamors of every other teacher, whether represented by their own reason or common sense or the divine church of which they were members.

Peter got into difficulty in trying to decide a case of civil law, and, as was right, laid the matter before Jesus. Christ's deliverance was that by the law of strict justice the tribute money should not be paid, but that as a matter of expediency it had better be given. Then to accomplish this end He directs Peter to catch the fish which would bring him the amount needed.

Now imagine a philosopher, or an

opponent of Christ, to have met Peter when on this fishing expedition and put forth efforts to dissuade him from accomplishing his undertaken task, would it not have been a sufficient answer to any and all arguments and sophisms used for this purpose to simply state that he, Peter, was carrying out the instructions of his Master; that he had examined carefully and exhaustively His credentials and had consecrated himself to His service, and he now was simply carrying out that contract. For Peter to yield to the most powerful arguments at this point and stop from his intended action, or even to discuss its reasonableness or harmony with reason, the Church or the Bible would have been disloyalty to Christ. He could, in the nature of things, only discuss the claims of Christ to his continued discipleship, or his, Peter's, understanding the wishes of his Master, and still be a real follower of Jesus Christ.

Manifestly the nature of the command itself, its reasonableness or unreasonableness, its secular or its spiritual character, whether compromising in its nature to existing creeds, or notions entertained about religion, morality or seemliness—none of these matters could be seriously entered upon without in that act admitting doubt as to the claims of Jesus, and so be a virtual rupture of the contract between them.

And so of all commands given to the disciples, whether to go on an itinerating expedition, to accept a thief for their treasurer, or to take, unasked, the ass which was to bear their Master in triumph into Jerusalem.

Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well for so I am, said Jesus to His disciples, thus formulating the contract between them, and loyalty to Jesus Christ accepted this absolutism without reserve. The only redress the disciples had was to refuse to follow Him. The way to this refusal on their part was open at all times and they could exhibit it openly, as did many when some of the public sayings stumbled them, or secretly, that is, in the spirit of hypocrisy, as did Judas. But we repeat it for a purpose, whilst loyal to Jesus, they were bound by that loyalty to carry out all