

the following context—"This commandment have I received of my Father." For in this latter sentence there is an argument directly opposed to the orthodox teaching. What need was there to bring in the Almighty Father as giving Him this power if it existed in Him already, of necessity? Evidently there is room for further investigation, indeed such additional examination is invited by this latter expression.

If Jesus received His call, from the Holy Ghost, i. e., from God, to testify to the truth till the Jews should destroy His life, is it not certain that if He ceased to be led by the Spirit in this thing that all danger of martyrdom would then have ceased? So, in this sense, He had power to lay down His life or to refrain from so doing. The whole expression then—if this view of the matter be taken—simply affirmed His voluntary obedience to the Holy Ghost. There was no compelling force upon Him. If he should cease to be led absolutely by the Spirit then would all persecution cease, and no martyr's death would be before Him.

In this He is exactly on a par with all His followers—the first born amongst many brethren. For we, who, in obeying the Holy Ghost awaken the opposition, the persecuting spirit of religionists' have power to stop all such persecutions any moment we choose. Should we, for example, as editor of the EXPOSITOR, write and publish an article expressing even doubt concerning the correctness of our former teachings, how suddenly would all antagonism be withdrawn, and if we followed it up with decided action along the orthodox lines, how soon would we be welcomed back to more than former cordial treatment by those who now oppose! In this respect we have power to continue the antagonism, yea, to continually increase it, and we have power to end it.

But what about the expression, "to take it again." Does not this distinctly allude to his resurrection? Well, granted that it does—although to us the allusion is by no

means a matter of course—then it must refer to His ability to carry out a distinct personal revelation of God to Him just as any of his followers may do. If for example, it was a distinct revelation to Him that, if obedient, he would be put to death by the Jews and then be raised from the dead the third day, this even must be contingent on His distinct, absolute obedience to the Holy Spirit. That He should proclaim the prophesy concerning Himself was part of the necessary obedience which was to result in His resurrection—this commandment, i. e., revelation He received from God just as we receive our definite revelations from God.

Once we were called upon to publicly state that the work of a certain American evangelist was done, as far as Canada was concerned. Now this commandment we received from God, exactly after the pattern of Christ receiving His revelation, that is, if He is our example. But we had the power to disobey, just as Jesus had. We had absolutely nothing to do with the whole matter but simple obedience. And just as God made good the utterance of Jesus so He made good our utterance.

In this exegesis of the passage we make it fully harmonize with the teachings of Christ as a whole, and so the incident becomes freighted with helpful lessons, a real tonic to our faith.

We write this article in the city of London whither we have come in obedience to the distinct revelation of the Spirit. Now we had power to nullify this revelation by want of perfect obedience. But as we have no definite intimation as to the ultimate object of our visit we simply leave it to our Master to vindicate the wisdom of our act in coming. Still we can say, like our Master before us, concerning this and every direct intimation of the will of God—"I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it up again, this commandment have I received of my Father."