

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, BY JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, CAN., AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY

T. T. SHEIELDS, *Pastor and Editor.*

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1: 16.

Address correspondence: The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard Street E., Toronto.

Vol. 3.

TORONTO, SEPTEMBER 11th, 1924.

No. 18

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHY PETER WAS NOT THE POPE.

A Sermon preached by Rev. J. Frank Norris, D.D., of Fort Worth, Texas, in Massey Hall, Toronto, Sunday Evening, September 7th, 1924.

"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Matt. 16: 18.



WANT to be fair to our Catholic friends. In all these discussions, I have read from their own writings and decrees, giving volume, page, and date.

The tenth article of the creed of Pope Pius IV., to which all Romish ecclesiastics are obliged to swear, is as follows: "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all churches, and I promise true obedience to the bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ."

Let their own authorities define what is meant by the Primacy of Peter. James Cardinal Gibbons, from "The Faith of our Fathers", chapter nine, page 95, says: "The Catholic Church teaches also, that our Lord conferred on St. Peter the first place of honor and jurisdiction in the government of His whole Church, and the same spiritual supremacy has always resided in the Popes, or Bishops of Rome, as being the successors of St. Peter. Consequently, to be true followers of Christ all Christians, both among the clergy and the laity, must be in communion with the See of Rome, where Peter rules in the person of his successor."

The Scripture that is used and perverted by our Catholic friends to prove the Primacy of Peter is Matthew 16: 18: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

This was uttered by our Lord at Caesarea Philippi, just outside the boundary of Palestine, the city that was named for Cesar Augustus and Philip the son of Agrippa. It is deeply significant that in this place named for the Emperor of Rome and his viceroy, the three most

important issues of Christianity should be defined, namely—First, the Christ, Who is He? second, the Church, what is it? and, third, the Kingdom, what is it?

Peter's Confession.

The Catholics say the "rock" is Peter; the evangelical or Protestant world say the "rock" is Christ.

No doubt many honest, sincere Roman Catholics are misled by the fact that the same word is apparently used to designate Peter that is used for the foundation of the Church. The word for Peter means "a little rock"; the phrase "upon this rock" means "the rock". The Greek word petros, a little rock, or fragment of rock; while petra, which is the Greek word used in the expression "upon this rock", is "the rock" itself.

But passing this distinction entirely, the question is, What is "the rock"? Was it Peter or Christ Himself?

This question: What was it that Simon Peter confessed? Did he confess himself? or, rather, did he not confess and say, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"? What was it that the Lord meant that was revealed to Peter in the 17th verse?—"And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." This is the important question: Did the Father reveal that Peter was "the rock"? or, did He reveal to him that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God"?

Confusion has arisen because of the failure to understand the meaning of the double name of Simon Peter. Jesus gave us the meaning of both names in John 1: 42: "And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone." His name was changed like Abram's name was changed to Abraham; like Jacob's name was changed to Israel: it was a change in character.

I want to give fifteen Scriptural reasons disproving the Primacy of Peter:

First: Jesus refers to Peter's confession, not the person of Peter. If Jesus had meant that Peter was "the rock" on which He would build His Church, He would have said, "Thou art Peter, and upon thee I will build my church." That would have been the simpler form, the more natural and clearer form; and Jesus always used simple, clear, and natural language. Here is the real meaning, and what is implied: "Thou art the rock apostle, and yet not the Rock on which the Church is to be built. It is enough for thee to have found the Rock, and to have built upon the one Foundation."

Second: The fallibility of Peter, not before, but immediately after his confession—and fallibility, not of conduct, but of doctrine. Matthew 16: 22: "Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee." Now note particularly that Peter erred on the two most important doctrines of the whole Christian faith, namely—First, the atonement of Christ on the cross; second, Christ's resurrection from the grave.

Third: Peter was under the influence of Satan after the confession, not on conduct, but on doctrine, proving clearly his fallibility. Matthew 16: 23: "But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind

me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."

Fourth: The Scriptures clearly teach, without any question, that Christ is the Rock, the only Foundation. I. Cor. 10: 4: "And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." I Cor. 3: 11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." In the Old Testament Scriptures, which are accepted by our Roman Catholic friends with equal authority as the New Testament Scriptures, the term "rock" is used to represent divinity, and not humanity. Deuteronomy 32: 4—"He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." Verse 18: "Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee." II. Samuel 22: 3—"The God of my rock; in him will I trust: he is my shield, and the horn of my salvation, my high tower, and my refuge, my saviour; thou savest me from violence." Chapter 23: 3—"The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Psalm 18: 2—"The Lord is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer; my God, my strength, in whom I will trust; my buckler, and the horn of my salvation, and my high tower." Verse 31: "For who is God save the Lord? or who is a rock save our God?" Verse 46: "The Lord liveth; and blessed be my rock; and let the God of my salvation be exalted." Isaiah 17: 10—"Because thou hast forgotten the God of thy salvation, and hast not been mindful of the Rock of thy strength, therefore shalt thou plant pleasant plants, and shalt set it with strange slips."

"My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus' blood and righteousness.
I dare not trust the sweet refrain,
But wholly lean on Jesus' name.
On Christ, the solid rock, I stand;
All other ground is sinking sand."

The Keys: But our Catholic friends say, "But did not Christ give to Peter the keys of the Kingdom; and was not committed to him the right to bind and loose, to forgive and to remit sins?" In any sense? Yes. But in what sense? Let the Scriptures answer: Acts 14: 27 says, "how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles". But the key representing authority over the Church, the Head over all things, is in the hands of Christ Himself. Revelation 3: 7—"And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write: These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth." On the proposition of binding and loosing and absolving, it can only be used in a symbolic sense, and could not mean personal or official authority. Of a similar meaning is the Scripture, James 5: 19-20—"Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." In this Scripture James does not mean that one man has the power to save another, but only as a representative of Christ, His ambassador. under the direction of the Holy Spirit, is he used as a

messenger to save a soul from death. That is exactly what the great commission means (Matthew 28: 19), when He says, "Go ye therefore, and teach (make disciples of) all nations." The authority is in the Head of the Church: "All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth." And we go representing Him, guided by the Holy Spirit, to make disciples.

Besides, if authority or power rested in a man to forgive sins, bind or loose,—that is to say, if it were actual rather than symbolic—it would mean that salvation was conditioned upon human agency; that it is a part of the work of man as well as a part of the work of God—and this is contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures. Furthermore, whatever is meant by the privilege or right given to Simon Peter, the same was given to all of the apostles, to the entire Church. Matthew 18: 17-18—"And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Therefore, let Scripture interpret Scripture; and we shall see how utterly impossible it is for Peter to have had more authority than any other apostle.

And besides all this, instead of perverting and corrupting the happy privilege conferred upon all the apostles, upon the churches, in order to establish and build a paganized, ecclesiastical system, let us see the Scriptures conferring absolute authority on the sovereign and independent churches of Christ, as believed and held by Baptists throughout the world, as follows: "We hold that the local church has the absolute right of self government, free from the interference of any hierarchy of individuals or organizations; and that the one and only superintendent is Christ, through the Holy Spirit; that it is scriptural for true churches to co-operate with each other in contending for the faith and for the furtherance of the gospel; that every church is the sole and only judge of the measure and method of its co-operation; on all matters of membership, of polity, of government, of discipline, of benevolence, the will of the local church is final."

Sixth: An unanswerable argument against the Primacy of Peter are the words of Peter himself. He made the great confession in Matthew 16: 18, that has been perverted by Romanism. He heard the Lord speak; he is, therefore, thoroughly qualified to give testimony on the issue as to whether or not he was the first Pope, namely, whether he was the rock on which the church was built, or whether Christ is the Rock. Acts 4: 11-12—"This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." I Peter, 2: 4-8—"To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is

made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed."

Seventh: The other apostles did not understand nor agree that Peter was first, or had the primacy over them. Luke 22: 24—"And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest." If Peter was the Pope, wherefore would there have been any strife, any controversy, any dispute, as to which was the greatest. Mark 10: 42-44—"But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." In this Scripture the Lord is contrasting Gentile lordship with the humble service that should characterize all of His apostles. He plainly says, "But so shall it not be among you." Matthew 23: 8-10—"But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ." In this Scripture the Lord plainly says, "All ye are bretheren"—there is no Master but One; no Head but Christ; no Lord but Him; no room for any Pope.

Eighth: The Scriptures command all pastors, and not Peter only, to feed the sheep. The duty that is enjoined upon him is enjoined upon all pastors. Acts 20: 28—"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made your overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." In this Scripture the apostle Paul is delivering his farewell address to the elders of the church at Ephesus; and the same right, authority, and privilege that the Lord conferred upon Peter when He said to him three times, "Feed my sheep", "Feed my lambs", is the same identical authority and word that was conferred upon the elders of the church at Ephesus. Surely Peter himself is a competent judge and witness as to whether he alone had the exclusive right as pastor, or whether the other elders or pastors shared the same privilege. Let him speak. I Peter 5: 1-4—"The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples of the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." Notice several things in this Scripture: First, the elders feed the flock; second, not by constraint but willingly; third, not for filthy lucre; fourth, not as being lords over God's heritage; fifth, there is but one chief Shepherd—and that is not the Pope, but Christ the Lord.

It is very evident that Peter was especially inspired to write aforetime against the false teachings that should be gathered around His Name.

Ninth: Another reason why Peter did not have the authority of Primacy conferred upon him is, that he was not always named first.

Mark 16: 7—"But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you." John 1: 44—"Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter."

Tenth: In the first important ecumenical Council held on matters of doctrine at Jerusalem, Peter was not the first to speak. Acts 15: 7—"And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe."

Notice that after "there had been much disputing, Peter rose up." Paul and Barnabas and other apostles had already discussed the matter with the Judaisers; and Peter joins in at the close of the discussion.

Eleventh: If Peter had occupied the place of Primacy among the apostles in the early church, he would have pronounced the verdict at the Jerusalem conference instead of James. Acts 15: 13—"And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me." This is exceedingly important, and shows very clearly and in no uncertain sound that Peter was only one of the many at the conference, and did not speak *ex cathedra*; did not occupy the place of primacy, or chiefest in that first Council on doctrine.

Twelfth: Peter only shared the government of the churches with the other apostles: Galatians 2: 9—"And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." Notice here that James and John are pillars equal with Cephas; and that these three, on the same plane of equality, extended hands of fellowship to both Paul and Barnabas, who were equal with them.

Thirteenth: If Peter was the Primate, or chiefest in authority, he would have sent the other apostles, but, instead, the other apostles sent him. Acts 8: 14—"Now when the apostles, which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." Notice the apostles at Jerusalem here send two of their number, Peter and John, which means that the local church at Jerusalem had supreme authority over all the apostles, Peter included.

Fourteenth: Both Romanists and Protestants agree that the apostle Paul is an authority on all matters of doctrine and practice. He says that he was not inferior to Peter or any of the apostles. II Corinthians 11: 5—"For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." If anybody had known that Peter occupied the primacy among the apostles, surely the apostle Paul would not only have known it, but recognized it.

Fifteenth: The last, and exceedingly important, is the rebuke that Paul administered to Peter, not for Peter's personal conduct, not a moral question, but on the question of his dissimulation with the Judaisers. The Judaisers corrupted pure, evangelical Christianity just exactly like the Romanists do now—by adding to it. Galatians 2: 11-14—"But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from

James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; inasmuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

The Romanists endeavoured to explain this Scripture by saying it was a matter of personal conduct, and not doctrine—and they say this in the face of the plain, unequivocal, statement of the apostle Paul, namely, "When I saw that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter." What was the issue? Not conduct, but "the truth of the gospel".

Three historical reasons why Peter could not be the first Pope. We have seen that the Scriptures are overwhelming and unanswerable, showing that no man, Peter or any other man, could have been the Pope, exercising lordship over the Church. But in addition the Romanists must prove three historical facts: First, that Peter was at Rome; second, that he transmitted his authority to his successor; and, third, that the present Pope, with all the two hundred and seventy-two other Popes, are the genuine successors of Peter.

In the first place, there is absolutely no proof that Peter was ever at Rome, or that he was Bishop there. He is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, although Paul salutes a great many by name—(Rom. XVI.) Nor is he mentioned in any of the epistles from Rome. He was, besides, the apostle of the Jews, or circumcision, and not of the Gentiles (Gal. II. 8); whereas it was Paul who was the great apostle of the Gentiles, and who especially preached at Rome, and "dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him"—(Acts XXVIII., 30, 31). Secondly, they would require to prove that his office, with all its peculiarities, was transmissible, and was actually transmitted to the future ministers of Rome, which is impossible. Thirdly, it would be necessary to establish clearly that the popes of Rome, and the present Pius XI, are the genuine successors of Peter. Merely to rise up in a man's place, and to call ourselves his successors, is of no value. Paul tells us, in regard to one of the churches, that he knew that, after his departure, "grievous wolves would enter in among them, not sparing the flock". And, even if we could prove that Peter ever was a minister of Christ at Rome, it would be impossible to convince us that the triple-crowned monsters who have since reigned there, have had the slightest claim to be regarded as his successors.

Therefore, we conclude the supreme need of this hour is, that believers in Christ shall make the same confession that Simon Peter made:—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God". The world's only need, and its only solution for all its ills, is to know the two great truths in this confession, namely,—*"how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures"*; and *"how that Christ rose from the dead according to the scriptures"*. This is the one and only mission of the Church—to give this great confession to the whole lost world.

The publication of this paper as a missionary enterprise is made possible by the gifts of members of Jarvis Street Church and others, and is sent to subscribers by mail for \$2.00 (under cost) per year. If any of the Lord's stewards who read this have received blessing, we shall be grateful for any thank-offering you may be able to send to The Witness Fund at any time; and especially for your prayers that the message of The Witness may be used by the Holy Spirit for the defence of the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the exaltation of Christ. As our funds make it possible, we hope to add to our free list, from time to time, the names of ministers at home and missionaries abroad.

EDITORIAL

CHRIST THE DIVIDER.

On every hand, we hear the glories of "unity" proclaimed. There are unions of capital and of labour. In the realms of industry and commerce, it has been abundantly shown that one can chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight. No sane person will question the advantages of legitimate unions. There is, too, a spiritual unity of which the Bible has much to say: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard; that went down to the skirts of his garments; as the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion: for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore." There is a unity of which Paul speaks, when he likens the Church to a body having many members. And, above all, there is a unity for which Christ prayed in His last High-Priestly prayer. But the unity of the body is conditioned upon its life. When that departs, the body crumbles, and its members are separated one from another. The unity for which Christ prayed was not a unity of form,—that is, not uniformity, but a unity of spirit and essence. Christ prayed, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou has sent me." The oneness of Christ with the Father and the Spirit was certainly not one of form, but of nature.

No one will deny that Modernism, in its various forms, has made serious inroads upon all evangelical churches and institutions. There are, it is true, degrees of Modernism as of diphtheria. But any kind of Modernism is dangerous. The majority of Baptists everywhere are confessedly opposed to that which would rob the Bible of its authority, and Christ of His deity, and the Blood of its saying power. Many also will admit that the theological views which involve the denial of these very things, are not uncommon among Baptists. But too many insist that it is wiser to tolerate these heresies within our ranks than to imperil the unity of the Denomination. When this view of things is analyzed, it will be found that what is called "denominational unity" is greatly desired, because it is supposed to be essential to denominational solvency. In other words, the need of money is so great, that it is thought we can better afford to sacrifice our faith than our money. Such a decision is, of course, not expressed in so many words, but that is the implication of the position many take.

In the newspaper world, the advertisers very largely either control or modify the editorial utterances of the paper. In the local church, those who are thought to be the largest givers are supposed to have a special claim on the consideration of the pulpit. In denominational affairs, men are sent as delegates to Conventions, and are elected to membership upon the various Boards, very often for no other reason than that they have succeeded in making money; it is believed that the shortest way to their bank account will be found by elevating them to some official denominational position. When once such men are established in office, denominational policies are considered and recommended always with an eye to the approval of the monied men, generally disguised in the term, "business" men of the Denomination.

This cold, calculating, often compromising spirit, is fatal to denominational and spiritual progress. There is, in fact, no place for the Spirit of God in such programmes. And when the necessity of loyalty to the truth, which being interpreted is, "the faith once for all delivered to the saints", is

urged, those who thus speak are generally denounced as men who are imperilling the "unity" of the Denomination. And even as they talk of unity, they are advocating the very opposite of that for which Christ prayed, when He asked "that they all may be one".

There are three passages in John's Gospel alone, in which we are told that Christ caused division: The first is in the seventh chapter, forty to forty-third verses: "Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Beth-lehem, where David was? So there was a division among the people because of him." The second is in the ninth chapter, sixteenth verse: "Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them." And the third is in the tenth chapter, seventeenth to nineteenth verses: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. There was a division therefore again among the Jews for these sayings."

In the first instance, the people were divided on the question of His origin; in the second, on the question of His miracles; and, in the third, on the prophecy and purpose of His death. And from then until now these great questions have been a cause of division—His supernatural Person, His supernatural power, and His supernatural death: it is impossible to insist upon the Scriptural teaching respecting these matters without causing division.

Had we space in this article we could multiply illustrations to show that the truth of Christ's Deity, of that which flows from it—His supernatural power, and the vicariousness of His death, always cause division.

We ask, therefore, Did Christ come to unite or to divide? Is it the mission of the Church of Christ to absorb and unite everything and everybody? Is the divine programme—to use the phrase used by the Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board of the Northern Baptist Convention—an "inclusive" programme? The answer seems to be so perfectly obvious that one feels like apologizing for further arguing the case.

In the record of the material creation, we read, "God divided the light from the darkness". We are further told that He "divided the waters". He later divided the sea from the land. When God would choose a nation to whom He should commit His oracles, He separated Abraham from the rest of his kindred. In Egypt, Moses was sent to separate God's people from the Egyptians; and, in the process, when the plague of darkness was sent, God put a difference between the Egyptians and the Israelites. And all down through the Old Testament, God wrought as One Who separates the wheat from the chaff.

The teaching of the Lord Jesus Himself was to the same effect. The Sermon on the Mount finds its climax in the houses built upon the rock and upon the sand. Between these two and the people they represented, there was a difference and a division. In all His parabolic teaching, the same principle finds expression. The pregnant and prophetic words of Genesis I: 4, find repeated fulfilment in the history of all ages: "And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness." Christ also declared that He would come again and assemble before Him all nations; and "he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."

What is the meaning of the Christian Church if there be not a body of people called out to a separate life? And if faith is to be sacrificed in the interests of carnal wisdom and worldly practices within the Church, why should the Church be separated from the world at all? The truth is, while we fear division and separation, and put a premium upon such unity as can be expressed in terms of money and outward human action, and are reluctant to incur the displeasure of men for the Truth's sake, faithfulness to the gospel and to the great Head of the Church is an absolute impossibility. The need of the hour is not the unity of any particular church or denomination; but such unity of the believer with Christ as will enable him always to say, "We labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him".

Had we time and space, we should like to dilate somewhat upon the blessings of separation. As for instance: "And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever." It was after the Israelites were separated from Egypt, they were fed with manna from the skies. Separation meant to the Hebrew children, the fiery furnace; but it meant the companionship of the Son of God and a miraculous deliverance. Separation meant to Daniel the lions' den; but it meant also an intimate acquaintance with an angel hitherto unknown, and afterward, still higher promotion in the kingdom. Separation to Mordecai meant sackcloth and ashes for a while, but later a white horse and a golden chain about his neck. Separation to the early church meant Pentecost, and the power to bring blessing to multitudes. Separation unto Christ, in a word, means; superabounding grace and ever-increasing glory. Why should we be afraid of it?

DR. NORRIS' LAST SUNDAY IN TORONTO.

On Sunday evening, September 7th, Dr. Norris closed a glorious five weeks' Mission in Jarvis St. Church. The large attendance at the week-evening meetings was maintained up to the end; and Sunday the tide of blessing was at the flood. In the morning the attendance at the Bible School numbered eight hundred and twenty-nine, and in the Pastor's class, four hundred and thirty-nine. Although the total figures were slightly less than the Sunday before, the report represents a substantial improvement. The Sunday before our numbers were swelled by the attendance of many visitors: the numbers of last Sunday represent an attendance that can be relied upon. This was a great showing; and we confidently expect soon to see a thousand in the Bible School.

At the public service the church was packed to its capacity. Dr. Norris preached another great sermon from I Corinthians, 15: 58, urging steadfastness of purpose and abounding service, on the ground of the certainty of such labour being profitable in the Lord. There was a large response to the invitation at the close of the service.

Sunday evening, Massey Hall was crowded with an audience profoundly interested and reverently attentive. Dr. Norris' sermon in Massey Hall is printed in this issue of *The Witness*, and will speak for itself. It was a great deliverance on an important subject. We have made it a rule not to report numbers, because it is always difficult to say how many of those who come forward are genuinely converted. It is sufficient to report that in response to the invitation, a large number came to the front and went into the enquiry-room; and we have reason to believe the great majority were soundly converted. Thus Dr. Norris maintained to the last service the high standard set from the beginning; and at every meeting of the five weeks the presence of the Lord was profoundly felt.

RESULTS OF THE MISSION.

Many will enquire, What of the permanent results of the five weeks' services? We answer: In the first place, great emphasis has been laid upon the fundamental doctrines of Evangelical Christianity. For more than a generation many preachers have been seeking to tell some new thing, so that we have come to a day in which the "old, old story" is the newest thing in the world. The present generation are ignorant of the fundamental truths of the Gospel: Dr. Norris' Mission has served to bring these great doctrines of the faith to the front; putting a special emphasis upon them.

Once more: The doctrines of Protestantism, in contradistinction to the doctrines of Rome, have been emphasized. We are aware that Dr. Norris' messages on these subjects stirred up a good deal of opposition in some quarters. That was to be expected. Dr. Norris repeatedly emphasized the principle, that it is error and not truth that suffers from discussion. Several Roman Catholics were converted; and multitudes of Protestants were led to a new appreciation of the great principles of the Reformation.

Dr. Norris' ministry in Toronto has served also to emphasize the Baptist

position. We often wonder why so many Baptists seem to apologize for their position. The things which are most certainly believed among us, ought to be proclaimed from the house-tops. Baptists should be propagandists. In response to the enquiry, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" the Apostle Peter answered on the day of Pentecost, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you." Too often Baptists enquire whether those who come seeking salvation belong to a paedo-baptist family; and the truth of baptism, and other distinctive principles of the Baptist position, are kept in the background. Baptists will make progress just in the measure in which they aggressively proclaim their distinctive principles. If we have no Scriptural foundation for the faith we hold, let us change our coat and change our name; but if we are convinced of the scripturalness of our position, let us publish it to the whole world! We have for some time been trying to do this in Jarvis St. Church, and in this respect, as in many others, we have found Dr. Norris a preacher after our own heart.

Another of the indirect benefits of Dr. Norris' Mission is to be found in the fact that his ministry has served to bring the testimony of Jarvis St. Church before the City of Toronto in a large way. Before he came, we put a copy of *The Gospel Witness*, bearing a message from the Jarvis St. pulpit and the story of Dr. Norris' remarkable career, into more than fifty thousand Toronto homes. But the printed page might have become a dead letter but for the vital ministry of Dr. Norris, which commanded the attention of the multitude; and compelled people to enquire whether God was in this work.

As to the direct results: At this writing over one hundred have been baptized; and there are visible prospects of a great procession of hundreds moving toward membership in Jarvis St. Church.

As to the future of the work: We fear no reaction. It is established upon a solid foundation. The organization existing when Dr. Norris came, has been extended and brought to a higher state of perfection; and a great host of additional workers have been enlisted. We shall have much to say of Dr. Norris work for many weeks to come. It is enough to remark for the present that his Mission was by far the most successful of any with which we have ever had connection.

The Whole Bible Sunday School Lesson Course.

LESSON LI.

September 21st, 1924.

THE APOSTASY OF SOLOMON.—I Kings, 9-11.

I. Solomon is Warned of God.

(1) The Lord appeared to Solomon the second time. It is His way to repeat His mercies; not once but many times does He speak to us. And on this occasion He gave him the assurance of answered prayer. Thus we may find in the Word of the Lord many appearances; and each such appearance is a revelation of the divine faithfulness. (2) God's continued presence was promised to Solomon upon condition of his obedience. We are saved by grace, our sins are freely forgiven us; but the condition of fellowship with God is always obedience. (3) God always forewarns His people of the consequences of sin. The condemnation into which men fall is always this, that light is come into the world and they love darkness rather than light. If such an one as Solomon needed such admonition, how much more do we!

II. Solomon and the Queen of Sheba.

We have New Testament warrant for regarding Solomon in this relation as a type of Christ (Matt. 12: 42; Luke 11: 31). (1) Solomon's fame was spread abroad; and it was a fame "concerning the name of the Lord". Somebody published the story of the wisdom and wealth of Solomon. It is the business of Christians to spread abroad the fame of Jesus Christ. (2) By this means a queen was attracted from a far country, who came to see the wisdom of Solomon; but the attractions of Solomon are as nothing compared with the wisdom and grace of Him Who is the Chiefest among ten thousand. And chiefest of all His glories, is the glory of the cross; and by His lifting up upon the cross He has promised He will draw all men unto Himself. (3) The Queen of the South came to prove him with hard questions, and she

did not come in vain: "Solomon told her all her questions: there was not any thing hid from the king, which he told her not." So all the problems of life find their solution in Him in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. (4) Solomon's glory surpassed the utmost expectation of faith. The queen had to confess that the half had not been told. How much more wonderful are the glories of our Lord; how impossible to describe the unsearchable riches of our Christ! (5) The action of Sheba's queen is a witness against all who ignore the greater attractions of Christ.

III. Solomon's Backsliding.

(1) He made alliance with the ungodly. He loved many strange women, with the result that "his wives turned away his heart after other gods". One ungodly wife is one too many. Teachers should impress, especially upon the young people, the folly, as well as the sin, of being unequally yoked with unbelievers. (2) His conduct incurred the Lord's displeasure. In this connection the first Psalm is most instructive, as it shows the inevitable consequences of Solomon's course. (3) The Lord providentially ordained many a rod of chastisement for Solomon's back. Read chapter eleven from the fourteenth verse to the end. Hadad the Edomite, Rezon the son of Eliadah, and Jeroboam the son of Nebat, were all used to chastise Solomon for his folly. (4) The application of this story is, that, spiritually interpreted, our circumstances will often testify against us; and we may find in the adversaries with which we are surrounded, messengers of mercy divinely sent to scourge us back to God. It is the way of the Good Shepherd when His sheep wander so far as to be no longer amenable to the Shepherd's crook, to send His dogs after them. The story is an illustration of what it means to "be saved, yet so as by fire."

THE BIBLE SCHOOL.

Our attendance last Sunday was eight hundred and twenty-nine, including four hundred and thirty-nine in the Pastor's class. We shall grow by the co-operation of all our members. Let Sunday be bigger and better still!

MASSEY HALL MEETINGS.

On the first available date, which will be the first Sunday in October, our Sunday evening service will be held in Massey Hall. We believe there is a great opportunity, right in the heart of the City, to gather thousands every Sunday evening to the hearing of the Gospel. By every member of the church working to this end, there need be no doubt as to the success of the venture. Further particulars later.

THE GREATEST OF ALL COMMUNION SERVICES.

On Sunday the Pastor will preach at both services. Sunday evening there will be a large number baptized; and at the Communion Service probably well over a hundred will be welcomed into the fellowship of the church. The public service will be brief; and the important part of the evening service will be the Communion. We venture to urge upon every member of the church the importance of being present at this, which will, beyond doubt, be the largest Communion Service ever held in the history of Jarvis St. Church. We urge the entire membership of the church to be present to welcome this large number of new members into the fold.

CHINA INLAND MISSION CONFERENCE.

Annual Autumn Meetings in Knox Church, Toronto, September 15th to 17th, 3 and 7 p.m., daily. Dr. H. W. Frost and Dr. and Mrs. F. Howard Taylor, and others will speak. All who are interested in the preaching of the Gospel in China are invited.

The Young Women's Mission Circle will hold its opening meeting in the Church Parlor Monday evening, September 15th, at 8 o'clock. Fuller pulpit announcement.