

CHRISTIAN WORKER.

Printed by Watson & McMillan, at the office of the Montreal Morning Star, for the Publishers.

Published Every Month By

H. B. MURKIN, Editor and Publisher

MONTEFORD, - - - ONTARIO.

J. C. WHITE AW, Business Manager, Montreal, Ont.

To whom all Business Letters should be Addressed

Subscription 50 CENTS PER ANNO

THE KINGDOM SET UP.

The question concerning the time when the "Kingdom of heaven" or reign of Christ begins is one that is forced on us just now by the many nonsensical ideas that are issuing from various quarters. The "advanced ideas" contend that the kingdom will not begin until the first resurrection, hence its beginning is in the future. Those who affirm this, claim to be "advanced," in the knowledge of Scripture. We are inclined to think that they have advanced beyond what is taught in the oracles of God. Now the truth is, the kingdom is set up and Christ is our King, or it is not and he is not our King. To learn which of the positions are true we must appeal to the Bible. In the Book of Daniel, 2nd chap. and 4th verse, Daniel says "in the days of these Kings shall the God of heaven establish a Kingdom, which will fill all the earth." The Prophet was interpreting the image for the King, he told the King that the Gold, Silver, Brass and Iron, was four Kingdoms, that one after another would fall, and that "in the days of these Kings" the God of heaven shall establish a Kingdom. If this kingdom is established before "the days of these Kings," this prophecy fails, and if the kingdom is established after the days of these Kings, the Prophecy fails. The Chaldean Kingdom was "the head of gold," that was to come to naught. Time rolls on, and Nebuchadnezzar dies, and the grand-son, Belshazzar, reigns over the Chaldean Kingdom. The Medes and Persians form a union of their respective Kingdoms, Darius is made King, Cyrus is Commander of the united armies. He marches the Medo-Persian army against Babylon, the capital of the Chaldean Kingdom. Babylon falls, and the "head of gold" is destroyed, the Chaldean kingdom is blotted out forever. Here we pass the first mile stone, in the fulfillment of the prediction of Daniel.

The God of heaven has not set up his kingdom yet. The Medo-Persian kingdom flourished grandly for a long time, but its downfall must come, "the Lord hath spoken it" by the mouth of his servant Daniel, the Silver must also perish, as the Nation of Gold had. Alexander of Greece, began his dazzling career, which resembled polished Brass. He leveled down the walls of Tyre, and overran the Medo-Persian kingdom and the glory of that kingdom departed forever—the Silver kingdom fell. Here we pass the second mile stone in the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy. No notice of the God of heaven establishing a kingdom yet.

Alexander's splendid career was of short duration. Rome was fast gaining the ascendancy, and being a war-like people—by a succession of victories, they overran and conquered Greece, then the brilliancy of Grecian triumph faded out forever. Here we pass the third mile stone of Daniel's prophecy. No kingdom established by the God of Heaven yet!

Rome is now the mistress of the world, sitting on her seven hills, and from her throne of beauty ruling the world with an "Iron rod." The kingdom of Iron is now in fall power. The long line of caesars

ascend the Roman throne one after another. We are now nearing the point in the history of the four kingdoms when we may expect to see indications of the work of the God of Heaven establishing a kingdom.

Cesar (Augustus) is on the throne, Herod is Governor of Judea—under him Christ is Born! inquiry is made, "where is he that is born King of the Jews!" Guided by the star, the wise men come from the east, and worship the "Babe in the manger." Herod is troubled because the babe is said to be a King. We are still "in the days of these Kings." Wonderful things are transpiring! God is in it. Thirty years rolls by—a great commotion is being made, people flocking from all quarters to the river of Jordan. John, the immer-ger is preaching "repent ye, for the Kingdom is at hand." Now the signs of work by "the God of Heaven" is apparent. John says "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Not so, John, the materialist would say, not until the first resurrection. If John had meant the Kingdom of the Jews, they would have ridiculed him for saying "it is at hand" by telling him we know that, and it has been here all the time since Abraham. Common sense will indicate to any one that he was announcing the near approach of something new. Jesus comes and is baptised of John in the Jordan, coming up out of the water, God acknowledges him to be his son. Jesus begins to preach by saying "the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." Nothing about the first resurrection yet.

He ordains twelve men and sends them to preach "the Kingdom of heaven is at hand." He sent seventy others with the same commission "preach saying the Kingdom of heaven is at hand." Evidently there was none of our modern materialists there to correct their preaching by saying "no, the Kingdom of God is not at hand, it will not begin until the first resurrection." Jesus is finally brought before the Roman tribunal as a traitor, because he claimed to be a King. Pilate asked him "art thou a King then? Jesus answered "I am a King," but my kingdom is not of this world."

We ask then; how say some that "he will come and reign in Jerusalem in Palestine on a temporal throne?" evidently this is a contradiction of what Jesus said, to say that his kingdom is of this world. But again, Jesus says "I am a King." Not "a prince" that will get a Kingdom at the first resurrection. How can a person be a King and not have a kingdom? he may be a Prince or "heir apparent," but it is impossible to be a king and yet no kingdom, unless he is king of Nothing!

Jesus and his disciples preached saying "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" until Pentecost. Since Pentecost we hear no more of "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," but the disciples "preach the things concerning the kingdom and the name of Jesus Christ." We are still "in the days of these kings" spoken of by Daniel. Caesar is still on the throne, Rome has not lost her prowess. A new order of things is instituted on the pentecost of A. D. 31. Eight days before this pentecost Jesus said "all authority is given into my hand." Is he not a king? when all authority is given into one's hands, that makes him king, in all that the term "king" means. He said "all power in heaven and earth is given into my hands." Is he not king? can he have all authority and power, and then exercise the authority and power as he did when he said "go ye into all the world." "He that believeth and is baptised SHALL be saved," and yet not be a king! These words are the words of a king, not of a subordinate. A kingdom is a government with an

absolute monarch at the head of it, from whom all laws must emanate, whose word is law. Where this is true, it is a kingdom, no difference what you call it, Church, Society, Congregation etc., or what you may, Christ is the Supreme law-giver, and he will never be more so than he was on pentecost, and is now.

"The days of these kings" are passed and if the kingdom is not established, then Daniel's word failed, and he is found, "a false prophet." Rome lost her hold on the world before the first century was past. Where is Rome to-day, she crossed the Rubicon and her fate was sealed. The student of ancient history is familiar with the history of Rome, modern history knows nothing of Rome, her glory departed forever more than twelve hundred years ago, but not until "the God of Heaven established a kingdom." Daniel told the truth, hence modern materialism is false that says the kingdom will not be set up until the first resurrection.

We will have something to say about the "thousand years reign" in our next.

HOLY GHOST RELIGION.

In another part of this issue our readers will find a lengthy article on "Baptism of the Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost Religion." The article is written in excellent spirit, and bears every mark of candor. We do not aim to reply to everything our respondent has said, for we agree in the main in what is contained in the article. The question is, is there authority for praying for the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and for Holy Ghost Religion? We said that we could not find a word of authority for either. We have never said that we were not authorized to ask our Father in heaven for the Spirit. We need the Spirit of Christ every day, and we regard a petition for what we need unfinished, without a heart appeal for the Spirit of God. If our respondent can prove that we need the baptism of the Spirit, then we will not ask for authority, as the need will be all the authority we want. The baptism of the Spirit is a promise, not a command. John promised that Jesus would baptize the Jews "with the Holy Ghost and with fire." If they did not receive it the fault is not theirs, but of him who promised. Those who received the baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, A.D. 34, needed it, and they could not perform their work without it. The baptism of the Spirit enabled them to speak the Gospel in all the languages. The baptism of the Spirit did the same thing at the house of Cornelius. "They heard them speak in tongues." Peter did not instruct them at Caesarea to pray for this baptism, but, "while he yet spake the Holy Spirit fell on them." If the promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was predicated on asking in prayer, these should have been instructed to pray for it. Those two cases recorded in Acts ii, and x, are all we have in the New Testament of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In one of the cases it is clear that they were not commanded to pray for it, nor did they pray for it. It may be urged that the Pentecostians did pray for it for eight days, yet the record does not say so, and surely there was no authority given them to do so. But Jesus said to them "ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Would their prayers affect this unequivocal promise of Jesus? Certainly not, unless He had said "ye shall be baptized if ye pray for it."

These two cases present the question fairly, so "that he that runneth may understand." The baptism of the Spirit was the cause, speaking with tongues was the effect, in both instances. Can we have the cause without the effect? The authority for praying for it is not shown in either case. It is the authority for such praying that we want. We do not need the baptism of the Spirit now. We have the word of those who were baptized with the Spirit to properly guide us into all truth, so we do not know things by "experimental truth," but by the reading of the word of those who were guided

into all truth by the baptism of the Spirit. You make "the gift of the Spirit" promised by Peter to those who repented and were baptized, "the baptism of the Spirit." I am puzzled to know how you can make "the gift of the Spirit" and the baptism of the Spirit, one and the same thing, since the baptism of the Spirit is the gift of Christ, and the other is the gift of the Spirit.

You quote Paul wrong, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," not "in one Spirit." Christ is the body into which we are baptized by the direction of the Holy Spirit, speaking to us through the Apostles. This baptism is a command, "Teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost." The baptism was in the name of the Holy Ghost, not in Him. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Yes, there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," but if there is one of the Spirit and one of water, then we have two baptisms. Water baptism we can obey, and we are to blame if we do not enjoy it. Spirit baptism is a promise, and we cannot obey a promise, and hence we are not to blame if we do not enjoy it, unless we have it promised to us in answer to prayer. Right here would be a good place to insert the authority from God's word. I am still looking for it. I can't find it. Has S. found it? If so, I am too stupid to see it. I would not dare to affirm that Jesus did not teach His disciples from beginning to end of His ministry, "that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost," for He did so teach, even after His resurrection, but He fulfilled that promise eight days after ascension, and at the house of Cornelius. But one word please, "Where is the authority for praying for asking for the Holy Spirit, but not for the baptism of it. You virtually

made a question out of hearts, are we doing better?" Often, this question will dry up the fountain of "bitter criticism." As a rule, you will find those who are constantly finding fault and criticizing others; are the ones who do little or nothing themselves. Christians should not "give themselves away," by becoming chronic critics.

Our first and fourth page is completely filled with puzzles. Sincerity seems to be advancing somewhat. His little talk with the Presiding Elder is quite refreshing. He is now in the hands of an enlightened teacher, so we may look for some progress in learning the way of the Lord. S. in his production exhibits about the same ability in gospel exegesis as is seen in the Elder. Truly "the light shineth but the darkness comprehended it not."

Now we come to the part of the article where the authority will be given. Ezekiel xxxvi. is cited. I read it carefully. I can see no "authority in it for praying for Holy Ghost religion, or for Holy Ghost baptism." I admit that it is a good chapter, but not for the proof called for. Isaiah lvi. comes next. A prayer that God would "rend the heavens." Surely S. is not trifling with us! The prayers of the disciples just before Pentecost are next cited, but who told them to pray for the baptism of the Holy Ghost? Who said they did pray for it? Jesus had promised it to them as His disciples; do you suppose that they were skeptical about His promise? and that they prayed for Him to do as He had promised. This is a sad comment on the faith of the disciples. "The ground was shaken where they stood." Very true, but where is the authority for praying for the baptism of the Holy Ghost? Did they pray for it then? If so, by what authority? Acts viii. 15-17—"Prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost." Yes, the apostles always done all the work that was committed to them with prayer, but the Holy Ghost was given by the laying on of the apostles hands. You say it was "the (baptism) of the Holy Ghost." We would like a little divine authority. The Holy Ghost that they received by the laying on of the apostles hands was a visible power that Simon Magnus could see. Do you get the same power now in answer to prayer? Anna, the prophetess, is next cited. She was "baptized with the Holy Ghost," says S., and thus enabled to prophesy concerning our Saviour. Now if I did not know the candor of our respondent, I would surely think this was trifling to see what could be done. Why this text should be cited as authority

for praying for the baptism of the Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost religion is more than we can even guess at. "Jesus taught His disciples to pray for the baptism of the Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost religion." Now it is just justice and truth to say that Jesus did not teach any such thing. Now, after this we hope that our reverence for holy things" will be measured by a higher standard than this. We have never, for the sake of gaining a point, put something in the Saviour's mouth that he never uttered. Certainly S. has some way of explaining this. I am sure this is not intentional. That Jesus promised the Holy Spirit to them that ask for it is no one has ever denied. But has He promised the baptism of the Holy Spirit to those who ask for it? Is "living water" what you mean by baptism of the Spirit? I venture to say that S. will not affirm it.

Now, I have followed S. perhaps beyond the limits of our paper. I desire to say in conclusion, that I intend, that the pleasant relations heretofore existing between our respondent and ourselves shall be retained so far as we are concerned. So far as my "reckless handling of holy things" is concerned, I beg to assure S. that it must be an error of the head, not of the heart, for I have a profound reverence for God's word, but I confess a weakness in reference to those shallow, dreamy sentimentalisms, so often palmed off on the world for holy things. God's word is our only safeguard against error. Even so, Amen.

WHAT DO YE MORE THAN OTHERS? Here is a text from which every man may preach a sermon to himself. We spend so much time talking over the failures of others, that we, too often, do nothing ourselves. Before we adversely criticize others, let us question our own hearts, "are we doing better?" Often, this question will dry up the fountain of "bitter criticism." As a rule, you will find those who are constantly finding fault and criticizing others; are the ones who do little or nothing themselves. Christians should not "give themselves away," by becoming chronic critics.

There is a text from which every man may preach a sermon to himself. We spend so much time talking over the failures of others, that we, too often, do nothing ourselves. Before we adversely criticize others, let us question our own hearts, "are we doing better?" Often, this question will dry up the fountain of "bitter criticism." As a rule, you will find those who are constantly finding fault and criticizing others; are the ones who do little or nothing themselves. Christians should not "give themselves away," by becoming chronic critics.

Our first and fourth page is completely filled with puzzles. Sincerity seems to be advancing somewhat. His little talk with the Presiding Elder is quite refreshing. He is now in the hands of an enlightened teacher, so we may look for some progress in learning the way of the Lord. S. in his production exhibits about the same ability in gospel exegesis as is seen in the Elder. Truly "the light shineth but the darkness comprehended it not."

Now we come to the part of the article where the authority will be given. Ezekiel xxxvi. is cited. I read it carefully. I can see no "authority in it for praying for Holy Ghost religion, or for Holy Ghost baptism." I admit that it is a good chapter, but not for the proof called for. Isaiah lvi. comes next. A prayer that God would "rend the heavens." Surely S. is not trifling with us! The prayers of the disciples just before Pentecost are next cited, but who told them to pray for the baptism of the Holy Ghost? Who said they did pray for it? Jesus had promised it to them as His disciples; do you suppose that they were skeptical about His promise? and that they prayed for Him to do as He had promised. This is a sad comment on the faith of the disciples. "The ground was shaken where they stood." Very true, but where is the authority for praying for the baptism of the Holy Ghost? Did they pray for it then? If so, by what authority? Acts viii. 15-17—"Prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost." Yes, the apostles always done all the work that was committed to them with prayer, but the Holy Ghost was given by the laying on of the apostles hands. You say it was "the (baptism) of the Holy Ghost." We would like a little divine authority. The Holy Ghost that they received by the laying on of the apostles hands was a visible power that Simon Magnus could see. Do you get the same power now in answer to prayer? Anna, the prophetess, is next cited. She was "baptized with the Holy Ghost," says S., and thus enabled to prophesy concerning our Saviour. Now if I did not know the candor of our respondent, I would surely think this was trifling to see what could be done. Why this text should be cited as authority

for praying for the baptism of the Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost religion is more than we can even guess at. "Jesus taught His disciples to pray for the baptism of the Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost religion." Now it is just justice and truth to say that Jesus did not teach any such thing. Now, after this we hope that our reverence for holy things" will be measured by a higher standard than this. We have never, for the sake of gaining a point, put something in the Saviour's mouth that he never uttered. Certainly S. has some way of explaining this. I am sure this is not intentional. That Jesus promised the Holy Spirit to them that ask for it is no one has ever denied. But has He promised the baptism of the Holy Spirit to those who ask for it? Is "living water" what you mean by baptism of the Spirit? I venture to say that S. will not affirm it.

Now, I have followed S. perhaps beyond the limits of our paper. I desire to say in conclusion, that I intend, that the pleasant relations heretofore existing between our respondent and ourselves shall be retained so far as we are concerned. So far as my "reckless handling of holy things" is concerned, I beg to assure S. that it must be an error of the head, not of the heart, for I have a profound reverence for God's word, but I confess a weakness in reference to those shallow, dreamy sentimentalisms, so often palmed off on the world for holy things. God's word is our only safeguard against error. Even so, Amen.

MARRIED. April 26th, at the home of the bride's parents, in Montreal, Ont., by the Editor of the Worker, Samuel W. Hamley to Clara J. Ellis, both of Montreal. The bride was made the recipient of many valuable and useful presents. Clara is one of our best young ladies and a very earnest worker in our Sunday School. Mr. Hamley is one of our energetic business men. Well may he congratulate himself on the prize that he has drawn. May peace and prosperity attend them in life.

Tuesday morning, May 16th, at the residence of the bride's parents, in Montreal, by the Editor of the Worker, Walter E. C. Arldige to Ada B. Saunders, both of Montreal. The happy pair left on the morning train, on their bridal tour. They expect to "take in" Caledon East, Avening, Niagara Falls, and Rochester, N.Y. We wish them much happiness through life's journey.

By the time this issue reaches our readers we will be engaged in a protracted meeting at Warton, as we begin there on the 21st.