

Christian Worker.

H. R. SHERMAN, Editor.

"WORK WHILE IT IS CALLED TO DAY."

LAW & WHITE, LAW, PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS.

Volume II. No. 2.

MEAFORD, ONTARIO, DECEMBER, 1882.

Whole No. 14.

IS CHRIST ON THE THRONE OF DAVID.

From A. C. Review.

On the above question many articles have been written and many discourses preached, for the purpose of proving that the Lord Jesus Christ has not yet taken his position on the throne of David, neither has he any kingdom, and will not have either till he comes to the earth the second time, takes his seat on the throne of David, and then he will establish his kingdom. A respectable class of religious people assume the above position; some very respectable persons of this country are advocating this position. The purpose of the following papers is to examine the position to some extent, and see if it will stand the test of Scripture and reason. I am well satisfied that the whole error grows out of a misapplication of many passages of Scripture to the neglect of others. If I shall succeed in establishing the affirmative, then of course the negative goes by the board. First, however, we must have the definition of "throne," according to some of the best authorities.

Greenfield, in his Lexicon of the New Testament, gives it thus: *Thronos, ou, o* (from *throno*, to sit); a throne, i. e., and elevated seat with a footstool (Matt. v. 34; Matt. xiv. 28; Luke i. 51); metonymy—power, dominion (Heb. i. 8), a potentate (Col. i. 16), et al. Donegan: "*Thronos, ou, o*, seat, a stool or chair, especially an armed chair, a chair of state, a throne, probably elevated, as *thronos*, a footstool, is said to be used with it in late writ; a judge's seat, a pulpit, viz.: regal power; also high office, as that of Supreme Judge, magistrate." Webster's Unabridged Dictionary: *Lat. thronos; Gr. thronos*, allied to *thronos*, a bench, and *thronos* a footstool, from *throno*, to sit; sortist middle, *thronothai*, to sit one's self to sit; *Fr. throne; Pr. throno; It. and Sp. trono; Pg. throno*. First, a chair of state, commonly a royal seat, but sometimes the seat of a prince or bishop. "High on a throne of royal state." Milton. Second, hence sovereign power and dignity. "Only in the throne will I be greater than thou." (Gen. xii. 40) Third, hence one who is invested with power or authority, an exalted or dignified personage.

The Greek term occurs sixty times in the New Testament, and is rendered seven times seat, or seats. The reader will notice that it is defined to mean sovereign powers, authority, etc. With the above definitions before us, let us examine a few passages of Scriptures found in the New Testament: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son; in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins; who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible or invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and

by him all things consist." (Col. i. 13-17.) Verse 18: "And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence."

Now, reader, let us note a few points in the above passage. First, all things were created by Jesus the Christ, and for him, whether thrones, etc.; second, he is before all things; third, and that he should have the pre-eminence.

Of course, then, the throne of David was created for him, and he is before the throne of David. Of course, then, if he is pre-eminent, he is on the throne of David, or above it. It is very remarkable that all things were created by him, and for him, and, of course, the throne of David too; and it is now nearly 6,000 years since creation, and more than 1,800 years since his crucifixion, resurrection and coronation to the right hand of the majesty on high, and still never has been permitted to occupy his own throne! Believe it, who can; I can not. Reader, notice the clause, "the kingdom of his dear Son." This clearly indicates that the Lord Messiah, has a kingdom at the present. Notice again, "who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and translated us into." Here the apostle affirms three important facts: First; that Christ was in possession of kingdom; second, that he and the Colossians were, delivered from darkness; third, and were translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son.

But still, that class of persons of whom I spoke above, declare that Christ has no throne and no kingdom! I must notice a few more passages in the New Testament: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." (Phil. ii. 9-11.) Now, reader, notice the declaration of the apostle: First, that God hath highly exalted him; second, and given him a name above every name, and of course above the name of David; third, all things in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, should bow at his name. Ah, reader, and has never reached the point where he can be honored with a seat on David's throne!

Reader, notice the verb "hath given," in the above passage, which indicates an action just and completed. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the sufferings of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." (Heb. ii. 9.) The apostle, in this passage, most clearly affirms, "we see Jesus crowned." Where was he crowned, in heaven or on earth? We will see more about this after awhile. "All power in heaven and upon earth is given to me." (Matt. xxviii. 18.) This is more power than was given to David or Solomon, or any other person on earth or

in heaven; therefore if Jesus is not on the throne of David, he has no more power than David had, and there is necessity for him to be seated on the throne of David.

I am at a great loss to conceive what sort of a thing the materialists imagine the throne of David to be, and of what sort of material it is composed, whether of wood, iron, silver, ivory or gold! I would like to know how many thrones the above persons suppose God to have! One, for David, one for Solomon, one for himself and one for Christ! I wish to say to the readers, that so far as the Bible reveals, God has but one throne: "Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool." (Isaiah lxi. 1; Matt. v. 34.) But before proceeding farther, I wish it remembered that we learned in the above definitions, that the term throne comes from the Greek *thronos*, which means to sit, elevated, power, etc. We have learned that Jesus sits at the right hand of the majesty in the heavens, and that he has all power. The Lord Jesus the Christ is heir to the throne of God in a twofold sense, first, by sonship, and second, by appointment. (See Heb. i. 2.) Third: In the third place, he is heir to the throne of David according to the flesh, descent of genealogy, for Jesus the Christ is in the direct line from Abram, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David and Solomon in whatever typical sense David or the throne of David may have been typical of Jesus the Christ, or his throne, the whole has been verified in the Lord Messiah; if not, then those Scriptures which were quoted above are a nullity. God was King of the Jews until they devalued other kings, by doing of which they rejected God from being their King. (1 Sam. xii. 12; 1 Sam. xviii. 7.) But in consequence of Saul's disobedience, God rejected him from being king, that is, God took the kingdom away from Saul and gave it to David. (1 Sam. xiii. 14; 1 Sam. xv. 23-26.) God selected David as his king to reign over Israel. (Sam. xvi. 1, 2.) But when David was about departing this life, Solomon sat on the throne of David. (1 Kings i. 19, 20, 30; 1 Kings i. 33; 1 Kings i. 10-12, 45.)

It will be seen from the above Scriptures: First, that God was King over Israel; second, that God allowed Saul to be king; third, that God took the kingdom and throne away from Saul and gave them to David; fourth, that Solomon sat on the throne of David, and thus it is seen that God transferred the kingship on Saul, took it away from Saul and gave it to David, took it from David and gave it to Solomon; also transferred the kingship of David to the Son of David, the Son of God, and the throne of David from earth to heaven, where the Lord Jesus the Christ reigns to-day over his subjects.

In 956 B. C. the Jews divided into two governments of Jerusalem, and Rehoboth, son of Solomon; and in this condition they remained until 588 B. C. (1 Kings xiv; Jer. xxxix. 1.) When the King of Babylon carried the Jews captive to Babylon, where they remained seventy years. God, by the

foretold the return of the Jews one year after they had gone into captivity, and, says David, "his servant shall reign over them." David in person certainly never reigned over them, but some of the seed of David. Here by metonymy, i. e., one person put for another, David reigned over the whole house of Israel. Here let it be noted, from the return from captivity, Israel had but one king, and they never went into captivity any more. (See Ezek. xxxvii.)

I wish now to say, before I close this article, that many persons, by failing to observe what the prophets are speaking about, when speaking of the return of the Jews from captivity to the land of Canaan, fall into great errors. Such persons suppose the prophets to be speaking of the return of the Jews, yet in the future. If there is a single promise in the Scriptures that the Jews will yet return to Palestine, I am totally ignorant of the fact. I may say more about the above matter in the future.

Once more before I close. Moses was a prophet, mediator, law-giver; Aaron was a high priest; Joshua was savior; David was King of Israel; the blood of Isaac typified the blood of the Son of God, the blood that was sprinkled on the mercy seat, and the blood that sprinkled the book, the tabernacle and the people. All the above characteristics found their fulfillment and antitypical verification in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

In my next I propose to ascertain, if possible, whether or not Jesus the Christ has a kingdom. G. W. CONE.

NEWBURGH, ARK. FINE CHURCHES AND MISSION WORK.

"A LAY SERMON."

To the Editor of the Times:

Sir,—We have already hinted that in our opinion, the mania for erecting expensive piles of masonry by comparatively poor congregations is a serious obstacle to all missionary enterprise. It will now be in order to point out some of the incongruities manifested in the church, which not only have a tendency to nullify her missionary efforts, but also lessen, if not kill, her influence for good among thoughtful young men. A merchant who borrows money at interest to build a warehouse costing \$50,000, with a view to transact a profitable business, will discover that his credit is the reverse of what it ought to be, and will soon find it necessary to yield to the inevitable. Now, if the Church should regard this speculation with suspicion, it may reasonably be asked how a congregation of merchants expect to carry on missionary work if it erects a church upon the same false basis. The congregation proclaims the merchant dishonest. What if the merchant retaliates on the congregation by asking what right have you to involve yourselves and those who may come after you by erecting and dedicating to the Lord a church, neither you nor they can afford to pay for, except at the expense of carrying on your missionary work at home and abroad! Surely nothing can be more paradoxical.

The language of Scripture tells us that we cannot "serve God and mammon." From what authority does the Church get her license to serve both? When a church expends large sums of money in a magnificent organ, while many of her "poor" members are allowed to exist almost without common necessities of life, it may be asked which of the two masters she is serving. When a church expends large sums of money in building Babel-like steeples while not a few of her members are allowed to waste away through disease without being able to procure medical assistance, it may be asked, which of the two masters she is serving. We see families of "respectable" churches growing up without a Common School education to fit them for the work of the Church and to enable them to become useful members of society, and we listen, with pain, to the pulpit breathing out warnings against crimes, chiefly born of ignorance, in language which would puzzle the scholastic student from the college to understand. We know of "young men and maidens" who are sacrificing many of the comforts of life in order to support their aged parents; and yet they are "waited upon" by a "special committee" to aid in meeting the interest of a miserable church debt. We could point to struggling missions that have appealed to the parent church for bread, but have received a stone instead. We could name missions that have actually died out for lack of funds and have seen their "respectable," though over-burdened parents attend the funeral and drop a silent tear into the grave as they buried them, with a "sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection." We have listened with burning interest to the pulpit's oration upon foreign missions, punctuated with pathetic appeals for help to send the "gospel to every creature," and during the week the Building Fund Committee has signed a death warrant to the oration by begging from house to house for the church debt. To-day the pulpit is draped in mourning on account of the "poor heathen" who are dying in far off lands, and to-morrow the occupant of that funeral platform urges the congregation to mortgage the present and future energy of the congregation by "coming down handsomely" to build a "gorgeous palace" that poor people are afraid to enter. Last Sunday we heard a disquisition upon "Consider the lilies," and "Take no thought for the morrow," and ere long we hear of a scheme to erect a church to cost \$50,000, which will require considerable anxious thought for several to-morrows. To-day we lay aside a few dollars of hard earned money for the "poor heathen," and to-morrow we are waited upon by a "special committee," and are told that charity begins at home. Now, it is reasonable to inquire, in view of these incongruities, how the church expects to bring all men everywhere to a knowledge of the truth. It would seem that the sublime mission of the Church to-day consists in bringing men, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, to a knowledge of her financial position, instead of to a saving faith. What should we think if it had been recorded of the most unique personage that ever walked this cold earth of ours

that He "went about" begging the poor people of Palestine to build magnificent palaces in which to bewilder the people with theological riddles—eh? Yet this is what the very Church He founded is doing. We preach eloquently against the tendency to unbelief, forgetful that we are scattering the seed from which springs this noxious weed.

Talking about missionaries, the following bit of unrecorded history from the *Christian Leader* tells the true character and exhibits the genuine spirit of such a person:

Helen Chalmers, the daughter of the great Free Church leader, sacrificed the bloom of her life and her womanly hopes to call for her venerable father in his declining years—a care which she continued until his death. Subsequent to this she took quarters in the worst district known in Edinburgh, and devoted her life and being to the reformation and salvation of the masses around her who had been to human appearance, ruined in both worlds by the demon of strong drink and accompanying vices. On her way to her temporary meeting, one evening she called upon a family to persuade the intemperate husband and father to accompany her to the place referred to. She found there a visitant deeply intoxicated. As soon as he saw her he began, of course, to "talk religion," ending with the complacent remark, "Well, it will all come out right at last, and I shall find myself in the better land, as well off as any of ye. Won't it be so, Miss Chalmers?" She promptly opened her Bible, and with an emphasis peculiar to herself read the passage, "No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God." The man was sobered in a moment, accompanied her to the meeting, signed the pledge and was saved. Many have been and are living thus saved through the prayers and influence of this saint of God. The life of even Florence Nightingale waxes dim when compared with that of Helen Chalmers.

THE BEST PREACHING.—Of all preaching, in our ordinary pulpits and on common occasions, apologetic preaching is the poorest and meanest. The minister or the christian who is constantly defending Christianity is sure to leave the impression that it needs to be defended. The best defense of our holy religion is the preaching of the great central truths of the Gospel by the lips and lives of Christian men from the pulpit, in the pews and the common walks of life. The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, enforced by the Spirit of God in the hearts and consciences of men, is an argument which none can gainsay or resist.

Eighty millions of bushels of grain are annually destroyed by the brewers and distillers of Great Britain, and forty millions of money sent abroad for grain to supply food for the people.

Alcohol is the "devil in solution." The authority to license involves the right to prohibit. Water, sugar, and rum—the third party people like to know