

EXTRA B.

Vol. 4. MARCH, 1897. No. 1.

THE GOSPEL BANNER.

Subscription Price, 25c. Per Year.

CRUCIFIED By His FRIENDS.

BY ELDER JOSEPH LUFF.

Entered at the Independence, Mo., Post Office
as Second-Class Mail Matter

Issued Quarterly by the Ensign Publishing
Company, Independence, Missouri.



ELDER JOSEPH LUFF.

CRUCIFIED BY HIS FRIENDS.

BY ELDER JOSEPH LUFF.

You may find the words we will use as a text tonight by turning to the twenty-seventh chapter of Matthew and twenty-second verse:

“What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ?”

It may seem quite a strange question to be asked by a minister who makes the profession that he has been authorized to preach Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world; but there are conditions surrounding us in life that make it sometimes necessary for us to carefully examine the ground upon which we stand, the faith we represent; and not only this, but makes it

appear necessary for us to offer words of counsel to those who differ from us in their religious belief; and these differences present so strong a contrast as to warrant us, sometimes, in holding up for public inspection the conditions we first referred to. Various ideas are entertained with reference to Jesus Christ, and some of them are of a character to impress the minds of those hearing the presentation of them, with the thought that his mission work amounted to but very little on this earth among the children of men; and unfortunately for the professions being made in the house of his so-called friends, this variety of representation is not confined to those who declare a disbelief in his testimony. It is an unfortunate thing the name of Jesus Christ is bandied about in the world as though it were a mere toy; any kind of a religious formula may be prepared, and the name of Jesus Christ pasted

to it, like a label, and adherent to the theory set forth therein will be found. You may go today into a restaurant in your town together with a dozen of your friends, and you may ask for any article of diet you wish to partake of. Your companions may ask for the same article of diet, and each may ask for it to be served up in a different way, and men will be found standing at their elbows ready to cater to their tastes. And these men never ask why your tastes are so, never ask whether you are gratifying a corrupted taste or not; because they are paid for the service you require of them. Now, it is unfortunate, but it is true, that you may go into the religious market and whatever may be your conception of the character and mission work of Jesus Christ, if you are willing to pay the price, you can have a pulpit filled by men who will represent him that way. The most blasphemous theories

have been advocated with the name of Jesus Christ attached thereto, and the most exalting theories of religious belief have been advocated with the name of Jesus Christ connected therewith. Between the two extremes there may be found a variety of thought with reference to this individual, his character and his mission work, and if you are ready to meet the demand made upon your pocket-book you can have your taste, however capricious in a religious sense, however corrupted, or however refined, catered to by those who usually appear before you in the light of religious representatives. I do not make this statement unkindly. But I will have to meet, in all probability, those who compose this congregation tonight again some day, and if mistaken ideas have been entertained by any of them with reference to Christ, and it is within my power to correct these wrong impressions as a

man of God I am under moral obligation to do it. If I fail to touch upon the astounding facts that stare me in the face, and in consequence allow men to remain unawakened with reference to the seriousness of the situation, then am I a time-server and a coward. When the revelations of that wondrous judgment day shall be made, I wonder, who will thank me most, the men who had discovered a disposition on my part to pass very gently over these important facts, never seeking to arouse their attention to them, or the men who had heard me in plainness call attention to these facts and notify them with reference to the dangers that might accrue to themselves? I propose to labor in all candor, so that every sermon I preach will pass muster when inspected by the Eternal, and so that I shall never feel under the necessity of making an apology. The object of the minister of the gospel should be to make people

understand him when he declares the message that he has brought. His responsibility ends when he has conveyed an understanding to the minds of his hearers of that that is resident within his own mind; the responsibility of his hearers begins when that understanding is conveyed. Hence the obligation I feel myself under tonight is to make people understand me, and if by the use of such plainness of speech as shall be at my command, by the aid of the divine Spirit that we have been invoking, I shall be enabled to convey readily to the minds of the hearers those thoughts that are in my mind with reference to the gospel, I shall then be ready to go to my God and ask his blessing to rest thereupon. But if I fail because of the fear within my mind that some man or woman shall take offense at what I shall say, I would be ashamed to go to my God and ask him to bless what I had done.

Elder Blair and myself on one occasion were acting as ministers in Salt Lake City. A lady was there, lecturing in the interests of what was known as the Religio-Philosophical Society, or what is better known under the name of modern spiritualism. She was on her way East, and she lectured in the Liberal Institute in that city, on three different nights. All that was said by her, it was claimed, was uttered by direct inspiration furnished her while she stood upon the platform. At the end of each of these lectures privilege was extended to the hearers to ask such questions as might be suggested to their minds while her lectures were in course of delivery. Advantage was taken of this opportunity and quite a number of questions were written out and handed her, and each of them were answered, in turn, by inspiration. Some one present thought it wise to ask her a serious question. The

announcement had been made with reference to Jesus, whom we call the Christ, that while it was not a truth that he was the real and only begotten Son of a personal God, as was claimed by Christians, yet he was the grandest type of morality and intellectuality that had ever graced the world. That no age before him had furnished his peer, and that the ages subsequent to his day had also failed to furnish one. The question propounded, that we were interested in at the time, was, "If your philosophy be a correct one, that is, if modern spiritualism be a correct philosophy, why is it that the larger per cent of revelations coming to men through the media prove untrue, and the balance of them unnecessary, because conveying no truth, or no truth not already known?" That was the question. I supposed that, as a faithful advocate of the philosophy, she would protest against the insinuation contained

in the question; but, to my surprise, she admitted the correctness of what was therein declared, and explained it in a way, quite ingenious and proper, in all likelihood, from her standpoint. Said she: "As we leave this earth and enter into the spirit realm, disembodied, we begin our career just where we ended it here; we are not suddenly changed into celestial beings, we are not suddenly transformed into beauteous characters, but it is simply a continuation from the point of development where we left off in this life." In addition to this she added: "Imperfection is characteristic of that sphere just as it is of this. Spirits in that world or realm when seeking to communicate with those who are here, always select affinities; and these affinities, as mediums, are of about the same grade of moral and intellectual capacity as the spirit revealing. And until they shall have reached perfection *there*, and we shall have reached

perfection *here*, there can be no such thing as *absolutely reliable revelation.*" That is what she said. There can be no such thing as absolutely reliable communication so long as there is not absolute perfection here in the medium and in the spirits communicating.

It fell to my lot just after that to lecture in a town not far from that city, upon the question of spiritualism and infidelity. Quite a number of people who had grown sour toward religion because of the perversions connected with Utah Mormonism, had drifted into spiritualism as the only means of accounting for the manifestations they had witnessed when associated with early day Mormonism. After my lecture upon this subject some of the parties pressed upon me a question in regard to Jesus Christ. They asked the question of my text, "What are we to do with Jesus which is called Christ?" I answered by asking them what they would have me

do with him. They understood that I came as a preacher of Christ and that I was ready to recognize him as the only begotten son of a personal God—the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob. They told me that the only authority I had for that was the announcement made in the New Testament record, and that there was nothing in that upon which I could depend absolutely. Their philosophy was arrayed against it, their revelations denying it. “But,” I said, “let me ask you a question or two.” One or two individuals were there who seemed to be pretty well posted in the theory, and I repeated in their hearing what I have tonight repeated to you, regarding the statement made by the lecturer concerning Jesus Christ being the grandest type of morality and intellectuality of the human race. They held up, they said, both hands in support of that statement. “But,” they said, “that does not

prove that he was the Son of God." Then I related to them what she had said with reference to modern spiritualism and the unreliable character of the majority of its revelations, and the way in which she had explained it, and they told me they agreed with her fully. "Well then," I said, "I met a man who, the day before, had been picked up from the gutter, intoxicated. From his lips had escaped language that was foul and profane, even indecent; and yet that individual, under the influence of his familiar spirit, was permitted to occupy a public position on the following day and give revelations for the instruction and benefit of some who had sought information of him. What shall I do with his revelations?" They told me to take its contents for what I decided them to be worth. Ah, but there was the difficulty, how to decide what it was worth. I was but one out of thousands of people, and each person had

equal right to decide upon the worth, in truth, of that revelation. *Whose decision was to be paramount?* There was the trouble. Spiritualism had no universally recognized standard to which to appeal, while the Christian had. But, continuing my arraignment, I said: "I found another individual who had never descended to the depths of profanity, foulness and obscenity that this first one had, so far as I had any knowledge of him. He was more refined in his ways, methods and habits. And moved by his familiar spirit this person had also furnished a communication. When I placed this latter communication alongside of the first one, I discovered some very material differences, there was a striking conflict. Now, gentlemen," said I, "what shall I do, or which one shall I believe?" "Why," the explanation came, "be guided by the principle the lecturer called your attention to—accept the revelation that came

through the more refined, educated, moral and intellectual medium." "And why?" I asked. "Because you may rest assured that a spirit of higher intellectuality and morality selected that medium as a channel of communication than the spirit that selected that degraded personage that you first referred to." "Well," I said, "if this is the case, what am I to do with the two revelations given?" "Why," they said, "wherever you find conflict, strike out that which is in conflict in the inferior one." "Then," I said, "your argument is, that I am authorized by your philosophy, you being a correct representative and exponent of the faith, to strike out whatever I find in revelations of lower grade mediums to be in conflict with what comes through those of higher morals and intelligence." "Yes," they said, "on the ground that better spirits select a higher order of intelligence through which to communicate." They

said I would be safe in following that rule. After I had followed this line of argument along awhile I said: "Did you not inform me at the start that Jesus Christ was the grandest type of intellectuality and morality that any age of the world had produced?" "Yes," they answered. "Then," I said, "according to this argument the grandest type of intellectuality and morality existing in the spirit world must have selected this Jesus Christ as the medium through which to give revelations to the world." "Yes, certainly," they said. "Then," said I, "the revelations coming from the highest source, or the best medium of the world, must be the most reliable information that the world has got." "Yes, of course." They had to follow that argument, they could not escape the logic of it. "Then, gentlemen," said I, "the revelations coming through this highest grade medium, which are found in the New

Testament, are the most reliable that the world has ever received, and these revelations say that *Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God*, and by the authority of your philosophy I strike out of your revelations all that is in conflict with them. What answer have you to make?" They ventured no answer except to the effect that they had not before so seen Christ.

I am not surprised that these individuals should argue against Christ and the claims made in the Scripture with reference to his authority; but turning to institutions that professedly represent him, I naturally ought to be warranted in expecting that there would be a unity of testimony. But, unfortunately, the condition we find there only furnishes further evidence of what I referred to when using the illustration of the restaurant. The atmosphere is rife with speculations regarding the mission work of Christ as diverse as are

the imaginations of men—from the highest and noblest representations thereof to the most degrading that has ever darkened the minds of mortals. No one will dispute me in this when I give an illustration of it. Take, for instance, the text, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” One man preaches a sermon on it, and the climax is reached in calling for a crucifixion of the flesh and the renunciation of all things that contaminate the moral character; the entire subjugation of self and a defeat of the powers of carnality is necessary before a man can represent the principles set forth in the statement to “love thy neighbor as thyself,” doing for every man as cheerfully and as much as he is anxious to do for himself. That is one way of using Christ’s counsel. Now for another: A certain man who was at one time president of the dominant society in Utah, in preaching a sermon, used this

same passage of Scripture, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." In the explanation of it he said: "You have often heard it stated from this stand that man may commit sins for which the blood of Christ cannot atone, and a man's own blood must be shed to make the atonement. Now, if you love your soul better than you do your body, you will be willing to sacrifice your body in order to save your soul. Such a provision has been made. My text says, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' Now, if you would do so much to save yourself, then if you should find your neighbor in such a fix that it would be necessary to spill his blood to save his soul, you should go and spill it. That is what Jesus meant in saying, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'"

From this you may see the truth of what I told you at the start; there is nothing too degrading for some men to attach

the name of Christ to. I have given you two extremes, each setting forth what is declared to be the sentiment of that text. The only object in calling your attention to this is to show that there is a necessity in this world for an understanding of the claims of Jesus Christ; a unity of understanding. We are divided, and there is no use in trying to disguise the fact. What was witnessed in the city of Chicago is evidence. It manifested the astounding fact, that religion under the name of Jesus Christ is divided until any man can form a thought with reference to him and find that thought acknowledged in some department of the philosophy of religion that is being proclaimed today. It is unfortunate, I said at the outset, but it is true. Now, note, my text asks the question, "What shall I do with Jesus which is called Christ?" Suppose I begin a tour of the different departments of philosophy of religion

for an answer. I knock at the first door, and meeting a religious teacher, ask, "What shall I do with Jesus?" and he answers, "Believe on him." "Yes, but is that all?" What is implied in that statement? If the word "believe" is understood by him to imply obedience, then there is no difficulty in understanding him; but if he means simply the assent of my mind to the truth of the historical account of Jesus, as found in the New Testament scriptures, as the majority of them do, then there is a strange diversity, there is no system represented. Wanting to know what further can be said on the subject, I go to the next church door and urge my question with the same vehemence that I did in the beginning; and as I proceed, I, in response to the answer "Believe on him," ask the question, "What is to be understood by this belief that you announce as being a complete answer?" He takes up the Bible and reads:

“God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” Yes, I say, but all scripture is not written in any one verse, all scripture is not to be found in any one chapter, and the counsel of the apostle Paul is, that “all scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable, for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto every good work.” Now, will somebody please tell me which part of the scriptures given of God is *most* profitable? If I confine myself to the utterances of Christ and his apostles, will any one claim the right to tell me which part of the utterances of Christ and his apostles is to be the most profitable in the work of perfecting the man of God? You have not the right, you have not the ability to decide in regard to this. Hence I take it for granted, when

I read the Scriptures, that one statement uttered by the Son of God is equally as important as another, upon the subject upon which it treats and to which he devoted his life. The seriousness of this question will be more apparent when I quote that verse again: "God so loved the world that he g-a-v-e—he gave his only begotten Son." Well, what did he give him for? One man says, "He gave him to die." That man has a very small idea of Christ if the Scriptures are worth anything. Don't you know there is not a single particle more of significance attached to the death of Jesus Christ than to the death of any other man crucified, except to the degree that his life, preceding his death, made that death more significant? All the extra of significance attaching to the death of Christ above the death of any other man, come because of extra significance of the life he led before that death. Now then, I want an answer to

this question: What was the object of the Almighty in giving his Son? "God so loved the world that he gave" him; I appeal to God for an answer. The answer coming by revelation through the Prophet Isaiah (55: 4), is: "I have given him for a witness unto the people, a leader and a commander unto the people." Now notice, this man, whom I asked what I should do with Jesus, answered me that I should believe on him. And when I ask if it is a question of simply believing what this book says with reference to him, simply accepting as a truth this historical account of him, he tells me it is to simply believe that Jesus is Christ. He did all that was necessary to save the world, and nothing is left for me but to believe that. If this is true, what was the use of Christ being given as a leader, a commander and a witness? The business of a witness is to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Jesus Christ, coming as a witness, understood what he would have to endure in this connection, and he made the statement before Pilate, when he was asked if he was a king, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." God sent him as a witness; he understood his mission, and he bore testimony in reference to the truth. I am to be affected by his testimony. Now, what obligation does his testimony place me under? "Why," you answer at once, "it was intended of God that you should believe whatever the witness testified to;" and I say *amen* to that. Why? Because if God sent him to work out a plan, or reveal a plan by which redemption was to be wrought, and in the carrying out of that plan he was to act the part of a witness to me, it necessarily must devolve upon me to believe the testimony of that

witness if I am to be benefitted by his service. If that be true, let us hold ourselves true to that logic and answer this question if we can: If it is also true that God gave him as a commander to the people, what part was he to perform as a commander. You say it was his business to command. Well, did he understand his appointment in this sense? Yes. He said: "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."—John 12: 49, 50. Read the sermon on the mount and see how he performed the work of commander. He bore testimony to the truth in revealing the divine purpose, and commanded obedience to that truth; and in this he acted in the role of a commander or-

dained of God. Notice further than this, that after he had been resurrected, and just prior to his ascension to heaven, he said to his chosen ministers: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." There he officiates as a commander. The time had arrived for him to return to the Father, and he delivered unto those who were to continue the divine representation among men, by preaching the gospel, the charge to observe "all things whatsoever he had commanded them." Go still further in examing his appointment. He was announced as a leader. This evidently was with the intention that there should be a response on the part of the people for whom he was to act in that capacity; and when he acts his part, or fills his mission as a leader, what is the in-

tention with reference to those whom his mission was designed to influence? Is it not that they should follow? Oh yes. Since the days of eighteen hundred years ago, when Jesus made his history, have you recognized any leader other than him? The answer, I take it for granted, will be, No. Then I want to know why it is that men today in pursuit of religious theories are moving in a direction that is the very opposite of that in which Jesus Christ moved as a leader—why is it? Who are they following? Why is it that when he says, “Come this way, follow me,” men will follow, instead, theories, and support philosophies the very tendency of which is to draw them in a direction for which there is no warrant for the belief that Jesus Christ ever moved? What shall I do with this Jesus which is called Christ? The answer of the Scriptures will be, Accept Christ—that is, in this sense: Believe him in all that he

testifies as a witness, obey him in all his counsels as a commander, follow him wherever he went as a leader. That is the meaning of it. Now, I want to put two passages of scripture together, the one that says: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish but have everlasting life;" and the one that says: "I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and a commander." And when I join the two together they read: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, to be a witness, a leader and a commander to the people, that whosoever so honored him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And when I put these two texts together, I occupy the position taken by our brother this morning, when he presented the mission of the Son of God as it is accepted by the Latter Day Saints, and ask where is there a single fragment of

testimony upon which you can expect to base a claim against such argument as this?

Zachariah, the prophet, foretells a time when the discovery of wounds in the hands of a certain individual is to be the cause of surprise and sorrow to the Jews. He had been wounded in their house—the house of his friends. Think of this, and when you join with the rest of the religious people of this modern age in denouncing the act of the Jew in crucifying Christ, let me suggest to you that there is equal need for considering the counsel of the apostle Paul where he says: “Dost thou condemn other men, and dost the same things thyself?” What do I mean by this? I mean simply this, that there is a day coming to the Gentile christian world, in which a revelation will be made that will be just as astonishing to them as the revelation to the Jew of the wounds in the hands and feet of Jesus Christ. What is that rev-

elation? That he was wounded in their house—the house of his professed friends. That they built churches to his honor; that they made steeples to his glory; and yet they crucified his philosophy; they murdered his system, they robbed it of the grandest thoughts connected with it. They taught that all that was necessary to do was to believe on him, the historical man, and rejected him as a commander, and dishonored and ignored him as a leader. That is the revelation that is to be made. Paul spoke of the possibility of crucifying Christ afresh, and that could not mean a murdering of his body again—it meant his doctrine and counsel. To give you an illustration of this I will relate an incident that occurred some few years ago. Coming through from the New England states, I visited my native city, Toronto, Canada. While there I had occasion to make some purchases, to the extent of just one hundred

cents worth. I put down in payment one of our American dollars, I thought that would be all right. The clerk required a dime more. I asked him if I had not purchased just one hundred cents worth, and if that was not a dollar. "Yes," he said, "but it will not bring it in this market." I asked, "Why?" He said, "That money is at a discount." "Yes," I said, "I understand that I am in Canada, I am not in the United States." Then he said, "You are under a different government, and we are under no obligation to accept at par that which is issued from the mints of a foreign government." "All right," I said, and I paid the difference. If that had occurred after I had crossed the line, into Uncle Sam's dominions, I would have been surprised. Why? Because I would then have been under the dominion of the very government that issued the coin.

Well now, allow me to carry this illustration into effect in fix-

ing the thought I have already called your attention to: On one occasion Jesus, when talking to some of those who were finding fault with him, was asked the question "Is it lawful for us to pay tribute unto Cæsar?" Knowing their hearts, he did not reply directly, but asked, "Have you a penny?" "Certainly," the questioner said, and took it out. Jesus pointed to it and said, "Whose image and superscription does it bear?" The answer was "Cæsar's." Jesus said: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and render unto God the things that are God's." Honor this government with the tribute that it exacts, while you are under it; and honor God with that which his law, issued by his authority, exacts of those who are under its dominion. That was the thought embodied in a couple of passages of scripture quoted in your hearing. One was this, which you will find recorded in John 3. Jesus, on

one occasion, was visited by a man named Nicodemus, who complimented him on having been favored of God, saying, "We know that no man could do the miracles that thou dost, except God was with him." Jesus turned himself to the man and said, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of heaven." Nicodemus asked, "How can a man be born again when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water, w-a-t-e-r (that does not spell spirit) and of the Spirit—S-p-i-r-i-t—except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot—*cannot* enter into the kingdom of God. The other statement was this, found in the sixteenth chapter of mark, sixteenth verse. Christ delivered a commission unto his properly appointed ministers. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the

gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; and they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." Now I come to you as a man worshiping at some religious shrine in this world, and I point my finger to these passages of scripture and say, "Whose image and superscription do they bear?" After reading the context, you say, "That is the language of Jesus Christ." Then I say, "Render unto God, the things that are God's." I say you ought to accept this coin issued from the divine mint, and that without discount, because you profess to be under the same government, the divine government, and under

that government, you have no business to refuse or discount the coin that bears the divine superscription. If Jesus uttered those words, they are true. If you do not believe them today, shut up your churches, close your Bibles, and pronounce Christ an imposter. If the divine superscription is upon that statement of Jesus Christ, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," then every single time you hear one say that a man CAN enter into the kingdom of heaven, who has not been born of water and of the Spirit, you see one openly discounting Christ. You cannot take the sword now and thrust it into his physical side; you cannot take the nails and drive them into his fleshly feet and hands; but you can stab his word. The only way you can crucify Christ now is to say that that part of the work that is here testified of in the word as representing the

- fullness of his mission as a missionary sent of God, is unnecessary. In that you crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. And you do that when you say that all that is needed is to believe in the historical account, and leave out the claim that I referred you to, that he came as a leader and commander. Latter Day Saints cannot afford to do this, and then hope to stand as honest men and ask Jesus Christ to be their advocate with the Father and certify to their right to be admitted into his kingdom, to receive celestial glory at last. They want to be consistent, and for that reason they honestly tell you that Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever. There was no discount on him eighteen hundred years ago, and there is no discount now. He is at par with the church of Latter Day Saints, unless we are apostate to the profession we make, unless we are false to the truth, unless

we are inconsistent. And we are forced in all places where these scriptures are being discounted to believe that a foreign government is represented there—no matter how high the steeples tower, nor how big a label, with Christ's name on, is tacked on their doors.

Some people have asked us strange questions in this connection. I have been asked, if I really could be so simple as to believe that that part of our teaching, viz: baptism in water for the remission of sins, could be true. I have answered that I honestly believed it. Then comes the next question, How can water wash away sin? I answer, I don't know. I cannot answer you more plainly than that. I will ask you a question. In the ninth chapter of John it is said that Jesus on a certain occasion, while traveling, came across a man who had been blind from his birth. When he met the man his sympathy went out for him.

Stooping down he spat upon the ground, made spittle, put it upon the man's eyes, and said, "Go to the pool and wash, and receive your sight." The man went down to the pool, washed the clay off his eyes, and came back seeing as other men. Will you please tell me, was it the water of the pool of Siloam that possessed the virtue of healing a man of his blindness, or giving sight to the sightless? Oh no, you will not claim that, because you would be forced then to admit that any one might have gone and washed in the waters of Siloam and have received like blessings. Will you please tell me then, after Jesus had commanded him to go there and wash in that pool, if he had failed to do so, would he have received his sight, in any reasonable probability? Oh you say, No. Well then, if it was not the water that cured his blindness, and if the blindness would not have been cured without the water after

Christ had commanded it, in the name of faith what cured it? Somewhere between the uttering of that command by Christ, and the compliance with its details on the part of the man, there was revealed the operation of a power by which sightless eyes took on a power that they had never possessed; there was a manifestation of divine energy that made those orbs, or those pupils, take on a virtue and a vitality that they had been strangers to before. Explain it if you can. When you have explained just how that was, you have explained how water can wash away sin after Christ has commanded it.

There is an account in this book, in the Old Testament portion of it, of a command having been given to certain men to march around the city of Jericho. It was protected by walls that would probably resist their severest attacks, but they desired it should fall. The Lord told them how to attain this end. He

told them that they should march around it once a day for six consecutive days, and that on the seventh, rising early in the morning, with the priests in their lead carrying certain instruments in their hands, and rams' horns, they should march seven times around the city, and that when they had marched around the seven times, then the priests should blow upon the rams' horns, and instantly the rams' horns were heard, the people were to shout. It seemed a very ridiculous and absurd thing; but in their simplicity they went forth and did what they were told. For six days, once a day, they marched around the city. On the seventh day they walked around six times. The seventh time they moved around, and still the walls were unmoved. The priests blew upon the rams' horns, and immediately upon the sound of the rams' horns, there was a shout raised in Israel, and no sooner did this occur, than

the walls began to tremble and fall, and there is not a man in this place who will dare to say that it was done by the noise of the rams' horns, or the shouting of Israel's hosts, and yet you must admit that if they had not gone around those walls the required number of times, and had not blown upon the rams' horns, and had not shouted, the walls never would have fallen. Now, if the walls would not have fallen without doing that, and that was not what made them fall, what did it? When you have answered that question, you have answered the question you asked of me, How can water wash away sin? There was not a man on earth who would have suggested a procedure of this kind; but shall I discount God by substituting my judgment and my wisdom for what he has said? "My thoughts are not your thoughts; my ways are not your ways; and as heaven is above the earth, so are my thoughts above your thoughts,

and my ways above your ways," said he.

Naaman, the leper, captain of Syria's host, was commanded to go down to Jordon and dip seven times, and he was indignant. "Why," he said, "Are not the waters of Damascus better than the waters of Israel? Can I not wash in them and be clean?" His servant suggested to him that if some wonderful thing had been asked of him he would have done it, and why not do this, when he was asked only to wash? He went down and dipped once. Still he was a leper. He dipped two, three, four, and five times, still he was a leper. When he had dipped the sixth time he was still a leper, and would have remained so if he had not dipped the seventh time. The seventh time he came out clean. Was it the water of the Jordon that cured the leprosy? If so, why wasn't every leper clean who dipped in it? The virtue was not in the water, and yet he never

would have been cured if he had not obeyed the prophet. If the virtue wasn't in the water, and he would not have been healed without the water, what did it? You answer this question, and I will use your answer in telling you how water can wash away sins.

Now I leave these thoughts with you. I do not know when I shall meet you people again, or if ever again in this life, but of one thing I am sure, and that is, that by and by I shall be required to answer to God for the use of the opportunity granted me tonight to talk to you. The question will be, Did you improve it? And if I can prove that I did, then the question will be to you, Did you understand him? If you say Yes, then your responsibility began there. Are you going to get ready to bear that responsibility? That is your business. May God in his infinite mercy so impress upon you the importance of deciding with reference to this mat-

ter that you may be willing to seek the way that will be most approved by him, walk according to his counsel, and that receiving the divine Spirit you may be enabled to move forward in the manner that will be most pleasing to him; and that at last, he may be able to see in your character the reflex of his, and because you will be like him, he will permit you to see him as he is. If that is not inducement enough we have nothing to offer. It was enough for Paul and Peter; it is enough for us. In answer to the question of our text, "What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ," we say—Believe him throughout as a witness; obey him implicitly as a commander, and follow him unquestioningly as a leader. Where his work led him, your obedience will also take you, and in his company, sharing his glory you will find infinite satisfaction and perpetual delight.