they did not believe in such Messiahship as His, and had no use for such a kingdom as He was establishing. It was their so-called zeal for the true Messiah that made them so bent on crucifying Him and destroying His kingdom. Their leader afterwards avowed: "I verily thought I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus."

The question springs unbidden to the throat, how could they reach such a conclusion from such a test? Were not the Saviour's miracles just such as the world needed to force conviction? Was not His preaching just such as to satisfy all honest inquiry? And was not His life just such as to silence all cavil? How then could they pass through all these things and come out such reprobate unbelievers, while others, sceing the very same things, come out undying believers? The answer is instinct with alarm: They did not come as Nathanael came, and, therefore, did not see as he saw; "seeing, they did not see; hearing, they did not hear." Appalling possibility! Who can look over that dizzy precipice and not feel his very brain reel?

I mean no comparison in what follows. I only use a known religious truth and men's relation to it, to illustrate a different religious truth, of the present day, and the relations men sustain to it.

Nathnaels always get good out of a holiness meeting: all good, and no harm. They come fresh from their "fig-trees," where they have been holding sweet communion with the Holy God, talking almost face to face. Then, again, they have no "guile." They are absolutely incapable of prejudice. No film obscures their eyes; no pet theory of sanctification gives coloring to their vision; no adverse Church creed restrains their liberty; no undue deference to the opinions of men hampers their It was not Nathanael who asked, "Have any of the rulers believed on Him?" No Nathanael would ever have asked that question. He would believe the truth for himself, if no ruler ever did accept it. The more of such men we can get to attend our campmeetings and conventions the better. If I could, I would have them pour out from every city, town and hamlet, from of guilt.— "artineau.

every hill and valley. All that such men need is to "come and see." there is any good, they will get it. there is no good, they'll make it. They cannot "come" in vain.

Not so with others. There are men of such prejudice, that they could go and see the very "Tongues of Fire," and yet not believe. Many did do it in the streets of Jerusalem. No use to tell such men to "come and see." There are good men by the hundred who ought never to go to a convention, or read a holiness book, or talk on the subject at

They go only to criticise; they read only to reject, and they talk only to ridicule. Better a thousand times let it alone altogether. What Paul said of the whole Gospel is equally true of the highest doctrine in it: "It is a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death;" and the issue turns on the spirit with which we approach it. When Bethsaida had finally decided not to receive the truth, the Master preached a farewell sermon to them and let them alone. He never preached to them again; never did another miracle in their midst. When that blind man was brought to Him in the city, He took him by the hand and lead him clean out of the town, before He would heal him. Even then He forbade his returning through the city, or letting anybody there know of the miracle. There is such a thing as pressing good men in a way that will bring them into condemnation if they draw back. Can it be avoided? O, can O that I had the wisdom of a serpent and the harmlessness of a dove, that I might do good to all men, and Could I do it even harm to none. The Master could not. is sufficient for these things?"-Way of Life.

THERE is always a presumption that a pure-hearted will be a right-hearted man; and it is delightful to see such a one stand up before the ambitious sophist, and dart on his ingenuities a clear ray of conscience that scatters them like mist. The divine light of a good mind is too much for the mystifications