

### "LET BOTH GROW TOGETHER," &c.

So said Jesus, the Son of Mary and the Son of God. What lesson did he intend to teach by this sentence, and by the whole of the parable. Did He speak this parable for the sole purpose of making the impression on the minds of His followers, that they must keep in their midst, and continue in perpetual connection with the congregation of which he once became a member, the man, who first, perhaps, became cold in the duties of the Christian life, and then allowing himself to be ensnared by divers temptations, has become a slave to "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life," or, disregarding every principle of purity, has bidden defiance to the claims of Christ and the teachings of the Holy Spirit, has stooped to everything which is low, vile and disreputable, until, in the community in which he is best known his name has become a reproach and a by-word? Mothers try to shield their children from his baneful influence, and the members of the church, as well as respectable members of society having done all within their power, in the Spirit of Christ and philanthropy, to lift him so that he might be "clothed in his right mind," but having failed in their earnest endeavors, have been compelled to leave him in the mire in which he wallows, and in which he seems determined to continue. Did Jesus speak this parable, I ask, to teach such a lesson as this? Some may say that that is the lesson in the parable, because, "both are to grow together," &c. But, I ask again, *WHERE*? and they may tell us, *in the church*, for the angels will gather out of *His kingdom*, &c., and as the kingdom is the church, or body of Christ, therefore they must both grow together *in the church*.

I admit, freely, that the terms—"kingdom of heaven," "kingdom of God," "body of Christ," and "church of Christ" mean the same thing; but, that the harvest field in the same parable refers to the same thing is not quite so clear.

Jesus explains: He who sowed the good seed is the Son of man; the field is *the world*; the good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels. As the tares are burned, so the angel reapers "will gather out of *His kingdom* all things which offend," &c.

Does the term—His kingdom, here, refer to "the church which is His body?" If so, then, as far as this parable teaches, there will be no reaping outside of the church, but only the bad and the good in the church will be properly assorted in the final separation, and all outside will go "scot free." But it will be readily seen that this will not agree with the teachings of the book, so it will have to be abandoned as untenable ground.

Well, what next? Just hold our peace and allow Him who never made a mistake to explain Himself; that will place the matter beyond dispute and above appeal. Well, His explanation is not that the good and bad seed were sown in the church, but that the field where both kinds of seeds are sown is *the world*, and if men will obey the injunction—let both grow, &c., *THERE* both kinds will grow together until the harvest comes, and then the separation, final and eternal, which, I think, is the chief lesson taught in the parable.

In the parable of the pounds, (Luke xix) we find three classes: Faithful servants; unfaithful servant, and citizens who would not submit to the rule or reign. One thought, which, I think, will readily present itself to the mind is, that those men would not be citizens did they not belong to His kingdom. In this parable, the lesson is not one of association, either continued or limited, but of individual responsibility, so we find that the servants will have to render an account, faithful and unfaithful, and that there will be punishment inflicted

because of their rebellion on those, also, outside the church, yet in the dominion of Him to whom "all power in heaven and earth is given."

We may reasonably suppose then that there is a broad and also a narrow sense in which we can refer to the kingdom, as there is a broad and a narrow brotherhood. All men are brothers, in the broad sense; in the narrower, the members of the same society, or church; in another narrow sense, only those who are born of the same father and mother are brothers.

Now then, when Jesus says: *They shall gather out of His kingdom*, &c., I think he refers to the kingdom in the broad sense, and that the reaping will therefore be done where the seed was sown, and that certainly was *in the world*. In this field, then—the world—where the tares and wheat are growing together, it is wrong for man to try to effect a separation.

In the 16th century, the words of Christ, "let both grow together," &c., being disregarded by the dignitaries of the then predominant church; Tetzel, Eckius, Caietan and Miltitz, backed by all the horde of Dominican monks and the sanction of Leo X. would have removed one tare, so esteemed at least, in the person of Martin Luther, prematurely from the field, had it not been for the strong sheltering wing of Frederic, Elector of Saxony, whose wisdom and prudence, under the providence of God, did much to shield the heroic reformer from the ire of the self-appointed "reapers." John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and many others were plucked up by those who "were wise above what was written." Some in the 14th century, before the Protestant Reformation, perished in the flames because they persisted in wearing short frocks and small hoods. This gathering up of tares out of the field was wrong, contrary to the teaching of Christ—let both grow, &c.

"That both should grow together in the church," (I quote from a previous article, see "Remove The Weeds," in the February number of THE CHRISTIAN) is contrary to the common sense, to all experience, and to the teachings of the Bible. It will have an evil influence on the character of the church. Growth in grace will be almost impossible to the generality of the members, because minds which are capable of being influenced by that which is good, are also capable of being influenced by that which is evil; therefore, we should not macadamize the road which leads to temptation, but, removing the evil influences, we should smooth, as much as possible, the way to holiness, to glory, and to God.

I have much more to say on this matter, but this will more than fill my corner, so I will ask you to read carefully, 1 Cor. v. 13; and 2 Thes. iii. 6, and rest.

O. B. EMERY.

Deer Island, June 23, 1884.

## THE FAMILY.

### DRUDGE-MOTHERS AND FINE-LADY DAUGHTERS.

Every one blames the fine-lady daughter and pities the drudge-mother.

The daughters sit in the parlor, in nice clothes and elegantly arranged hair, dawdling over a novel or chatting with companions or friends. Her mother is toiling in the kitchen or fretting her soul in the vain attempt to reduce her pile of "mending," and at the same time looking after a tumbling baby.

The mother's face is worn and thin. Baby has pulled her hair askew. She still wears the old dress she put on in such a hurry at half-past five in the morning, when baby woke her from a weary sleep.

She is tired! She is always tired. She is

tired on Saturday, and she is tired on Sunday; she is tired in the morning, and tired in the evening; and goes to bed and gets up tired.

It is hard not to be angry with the daughter, we confess. She can look in her exhausted mother's face, and know how much work there is to be done, and never willingly put forth a hand to help her. Nay, she is going out to tea this evening, and will come to her mother to have her dress adjusted for the great occasion. She casts much of the burden of her existence upon the too generous heart that she does not appreciate, and never once feels the impulse to give the aid of her youthful strength.

In all our modern world there is not an uglier sight than this—no, not one. It is but natural to throw the blame of it upon the daughter. "Heartless wretch!" we have heard such a girl called by indignant acquaintances.

She is to be *pityed*, rather. When she was a little child, all lovely and engaging, her mother said to herself, "She shall not be the drudge I was. She shall not be kept out of school to do housework, as I was. She shall have a good time while she is young, for there's no knowing what her lot shall be afterwards."

And so her mother made her young life a long banquet of delights. Rough places were removed from her path. The lesson taught her every hour for years was, that it was no great matter what other people suffered, if only her mother's daughter had a good time.

She learned that lesson thoroughly, and a frightful selfishness was developed in her.

Her eyes may fall upon these lines. If so, we tell her that people in general will make no allowance for the faults of her bringing up. They will merely say: "See what a shocking and shameful return she makes for her mother's indulgent and generous care."—*Youth's Companion*.

### HOW HE CAME TO "SWEAR OFF."

"No, I won't drink with you to-day, boys," said a drummer to several companions, as they settled down in the smoking car and passed the bottle. "The fact is, boys, I've quit drinking—I've sworn off."

He was greeted with shouts of laughter by the jolly crowd around him; they put the bottle under his nose and indulged in many jokes at his expense, but he refused to drink, and was rather serious about it. "What's the matter with you, old boy?" sang out one. "If you've quit drinking, something's up; tell us what it is."

"Well, boys, I will, though I know you'll laugh at me. But I'll tell you, all the same. I have been a drinking man all my life, ever since I was married; as you all know I love whiskey—it's as sweet in my mouth as sugar—and God only knows how I'll quit it. For seven years not a day has passed over my head that I didn't have at least one drink. But I am done. Yesterday I was in Chicago. Down on South Clark street a customer of mine keeps a pawn shop in connection with his other business. I called on him, and while I was there a young man of not more than 25, wearing threadbare clothes, and looking as hard as if he hadn't seen a sober day for a month, came in with a little package in his hand. Tremblingly he unwrapped it, and handed the article to the pawn-broker, saying, 'give me ten cents.' And, boys, what do you suppose it was? A pair of baby shoes, little things with the buttons only a trifle soiled, as if they had been worn only once or twice. 'Where did you get these?' asked the pawn-broker. 'Got 'em at home,' replied the man, who had an intelligent face and the manner of a gentleman, despite his sad condition. 'My wife bought them for our baby. Give me ten cents for 'em—I want a drink.' 'You had better take the shoes back to your wife; the