

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. SHIELDS, *Pastor and Editor.*

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

Address correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

Vol. 4

TORONTO, DECEMBER 17th, 1925

No. 34

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"DO BAPTISTS NEED A POPE OR A PRIEST?"

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, Dec. 13th, 1925.
(Stenographically Reported)

"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."—Acts 4: 12.



THE question which has long agitated religious people, indeed, all thoughtful men and women, is this: What is the seat of authority in religion? When I get on a ship at New York, or somewhere else, to cross the ocean, I want to be sure there is someone in command. I am not a navigator, I should not like to be responsible for its direction myself: I want to be sure there is some thoroughly experienced seaman to whose will everything, and everyone on board that ship, are subject. There must be authority in order to have peace and safety.

There ought to be authority in the home. That is a fine question, as to who is the authority, particularly in these days. Very often it is a case of everyone commands but father. Yet everybody knows there ought to be authority, and there must be authority, if the home is to be well regulated. There is not a business concern in this city that can get on without some central authority: there must be some mind to think, some will to command. Whatever the kind of business, it makes no difference, there must be some control, some government, some objective authority to which, or to whom, all the elements in that organization will be subject. Then all things will work together for good, and the day's work will be well done. The same is true in school: somebody must keep order, somebody's will must be law.

Where is the seat of authority in religion? Are we to be a law unto ourselves? That is the modernist idea, that there is no objective authority at all. Religion is the only department of life, so far as I know, where no objective authority is demanded; no principle of authority is even admitted in this realm nowadays. If you were to go into a bank and ask the clerks, any one of them, the accountant or the manager, by what principle, objective to yourself, by what standard, are the affairs of this bank conducted? He might take a moment to find his answer, but in the last analysis I think he would say, "That is very simple: it is the multiplication table; we cannot violate that. When the inspec-

tor comes to look at our books, he comes in to find out if we have obeyed the multiplication table. If we have, all right; but we have no liberty to vary that standard." Two and two are four—never more, never less. In that realm something is fixed, something is final, there is something objective to my own thinking, by which I am to measure everything I do.

Now in religion, according to some people, there is no authority at all. All depends on what you think to be right yourself, man is a law unto himself. There is a text I have thought much about, and I think I will preach from it sometime. I think it would be a good text: "There was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes." That is the rule of modernist religious thinking. Let me tell you, my dear friends, that the proper name for the philosophy of Modernism is "anarchy": the theological liberal is a reactionary, he is not in any sense a progressive; and if his true character is understood, it will be seen he is an enemy of the home, he is an enemy of the church, he is an enemy of the state, he is an enemy of organized society everywhere; because Modernism at last spells the absolute negation of authority—no outward law, man a law unto himself! Some day we shall wake up to discover that that thing which is called Modernism is nothing less than an advance agent of Antichrist, the Lawless One; yet Christian denominations are supporting so-called Christian colleges to indoctrinate their young people with the principles of Antichrist, which is another name for lawlessness.

Roman Catholicism knows something about authority, an objective authority. Roman Catholicism claims that the Pope is God's viceagent, he is the representative of Christ; and that therefore he is sovereign not only in the church, but that he is above all princes, above all kings, inasmuch as he is the representative of the King of kings. He is regarded as being superior to all governments, to all thrones, to all crowns and sceptres: he is God's representative on earth. That is the doctrine of Rome; and every loyal Roman Catholic obeys the will of the Pope, as registered through the bishop, the decrees of the church, and, ultimately, down to the parish priest who is himself a lesser representative, but still, according to that sacramentarian system, a representative of Christ, clothed with the authority of Christ to send people to Hell, or admit them to Heaven.

What is the view of Protestantism? Protestantism recognizes the necessity of some authority, and Protestantism has ever claimed that that authority resides in the Word of God, that not an infallible pope, but an infallible Book, the infallible Word of an infallible God, is our authority; and we are to be guided by what the Book tells us. I am glad to have some authority other than my own, it is a great comfort to be assured that there is Someone Who assumes responsibility for the direction of these poor lives of ours; and that it is Someone Who knows the end from the beginning, and has given to us an infallible Bible. I have no hesitation in taking my position there: to me this is the infallible Word of God, the Word of God that liveth and abideth for ever.

Well, because that is true, we do not need a pope. I suppose you have all heard of "the Baptist pope"! My objection to that notion is, that they do not all obey the "pope"! (Laughter). I have observed that the people who invent the idea of a "Baptist pope", as a rule, are the people who want to be a Czar themselves! What is dignified "firmness" on my part, is just stubbornness in you; that is to say, the virtue which we claim as "firmness" for ourselves, we are disposed to describe as mere "obstinacy" in somebody else. Well, that is a little on the side. If there is a "pope" in Jarvis St., the people seem to so enjoy the papacy as to be unconscious of it.

But the question I want to ask this evening is, Do Baptists need a priest? Somebody will say, "No". My answer is, Yes, we do need a Priest; we do not need a pope, but we do need a Priest. Modernism has no Priest, it has no altar of sacrifice, it has no place of expiation, no place of atonement, no place where my sin may be put away. Do you remember that complaint of Job's in the long ago, "Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both"? He felt himself to be so far away from God, and he said, "If there were only someone between us, who could lay hold of God with one hand, and of this poor bankrupt life with the other, and just bring me to God, how happy I should be!" Oh, but we have a Daysman, Who, with His Deity, lays hold of God, and with His humanity lays hold of us,—a Priest touched with the

feeling of our infirmities, One Who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin: "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

I.

No salvation in any other! Let us examine that a minute. That being so, my unsaved friend, your own abilities are excluded. There is *no salvation in yourself*; it is impossible for you to save yourself. Salvation is in Jesus Christ, and not in you. My text says there is no salvation in any other. The Bible gives a very striking—and not very complimentary—description of you and of me: it says that the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; it says that the mind is enmity against God—not that it is *at* enmity, but that in its very warp and woof, in its nature, in its constitution, it is so possessed by sin that the mind itself is opposed to God, is enmity against God. The Bible tells us that the conscience is defiled. You have said, "I am all right as long as I have a clear conscience." It is a commonplace to remark that many of the greatest crimes of history have been committed in the name of conscience. The Apostle Paul was one of the most religious men of his day, and in his religious zeal he was wholly conscientious, for he said, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." Saul of Tarsus was thoroughly conscientious when he was "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord"; he thought he ought to do it. The conscience of the unregenerate is not a safe guide. Conscience needs the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost just as much as the heart, or the mind.

Then there is the memory. If I had time I would like to take you through and examine every faculty of the mind, but I will merely throw you back upon your own experience. I have heard a great many people talk about Billy Sunday's services, and I have observed that the things people remember about Billy Sunday are the things we all wish he would not say. The things you can most easily remember are the things you ought to forget; and the things you ought to remember are the things you most easily forget. You have only to think for a few moments to be assured that there is something in the memory of the natural man that is against God, against holiness. There are some things we had better not hear, because, hearing them, we remember them for ever. There are some hymns I can never sing with enjoyment, they have been ruined for me by someone's jest; I wish I had never heard them. Memory is not on God's side until He puts it on His side. "The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations"—what does it say—"and all the nations that forget God." People forget God and everything about God.

The will is not on God's side: "How to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me." The natural man says that the things he does, these are the very things he ought not to do; and until the will of man is reenfranchised and energized by a Power superior to his own, a man cannot make his way Godward.

And so, my friends, notwithstanding a recent great authority, I still hold by my interpretation that the Bible means exactly what it says, when it says, "In me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing." It is quite true that there is no good thing in the liver—I refer apologetically to a very coarse remark. I protest that that is not the meaning of the Word of God. There is the mind of the flesh, and there is the law of sin and death in my members, and in the members of everyone. And I declare to you that when any man says, in the name of the Lord, that there is in the natural man an indestructible element, and that salvation consists in the development of that divine spark, he preaches "another gospel which is not another": "Neither is there salvation in any other." The whole man is against God; and you must have a salvation outside of yourself if you are ever going to be saved. That is the teaching of God's Word, and I know it to be true in my own experience. It may be that I am a great deal worse than the rest of you, but I know it is true anyhow!

Well, that means *there is no salvation in the church*. No; you cannot be saved by joining the church. I rejoice that the Lord has blessed us in this way, that we have had many Roman Catholics converted in this place. I have

nothing to say against Roman Catholics, nor against modernists: I have a great deal to say against Roman Catholicism, and against Modernism. It is, as someone said to me in a note left on my desk, against principles and not against personalities we protest." But if you have been taught there is salvation in the church, I tell you, in the name of the Lord, that it is a mistake. There is no salvation in the church. Salvation is in the Person of Christ: "Neither is there salvation in any other"—not in the Roman Catholic Church; and, let me whisper in your ear, there is no salvation in the United Church either, any more than there is in the Presbyterian Church, or in the Methodist Church, or in a Baptist Church. You cannot be saved by church membership, this text absolutely excludes that.

I will tell you another thing: *there is no salvation in the lodge*. I wonder if there are any Masons here to-night? "Masonry is my religion", someone may say. Well, it will not save you, my friend; there is no salvation in Masonry. I know a man who used to be a fairly active Christian, who joined the Rotarians, and he used to hold up, after that, the creed of the Rotarians. You might just as well take one of those touched-up photographs of yourself that are hanging in your parlour and say, "That is a picture of me." It is nothing of the kind, it is not like you at all. You know very well that no camera would make you as good-looking as that! (laughter). The artist had to work on that negative and make it something else. The most moderately complimentary thing one could say of it is that it is a photographic exaggeration! Anyone going into your parlor when you are not there would say, "The lady of this house must be a very handsome woman", or, "The man of this house must be a very fine-looking man", as the case may be. Well, you had better stay out, and let the photograph speak for you! That is how some people do with their lodge creeds, their lodge standards. They say, "See what it is to be a Rotarian!" The standard is not very high, but you are not half as high as the creed.

I have gone over this continent a good deal, and I tell you frankly I believe these things are becoming a menace to the religion of Jesus Christ. I find people who are Masons, and Rotarians, and Lions—real Lions!—I went into a store down in Kentucky one day with Dr. Ragland. It was a large store, and a man walked down and greeted us very cordially, and Dr. Ragland introduced me as Mr. Shields from Toronto. "Toronto, Canada?" I replied in the affirmative. "Do you know Mr. So-and-So?" And I said, "No, I have not heard of the gentleman." And he said, "Why, he is the President of the Lions' Club!" When we got out on the street Dr. Ragland said, "That is the end of that man's life, he has no higher ambition than to be President of the Lions' Club! He never goes to church, he has no religion at all." I do not say that these organizations do not effect some good—they may effect some good. I do not know enough about them to condemn them. But let us assume that they are good: they are not good for salvation—they cannot save you, that is the point. There is no salvation in them; and if your Masonry, or your membership in any of these clubs, stands between you and God, that is the thing that will take you to Hell, my brother. Put everything out of the way that you may get to Christ. "Neither is there salvation in any other"—in any kind of organization—"for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

II.

I said to Brother Brownlee just now, "I am going to preach an A.B.C. sermon to-night. It is going to be the most elementary thing I know how to preach." What I meant was this: I want to shut you up to Christ. There is no salvation in any other person, in any other organization. I do not care where it is, nor how good it is, the Scripture says that salvation is in Christ, and in Christ alone. And of all the names under heaven given among men there is only One that can save you ("Hallelujah!" "Praise the Lord!"). I could call a good many names—and I fear that if I were to talk to you for an hour on that one point alone, to try to make it as plain as I could, and if, at the close of the service I should meet some man down there and say to him, "Are you a Christian?" he would say, "I am a Presbyterian"; or somebody else would say, "I am an Anglican"; or someone else might say, "I am a Roman Catholic." But hear what God says, "There is none other name"! The name of

Presbyterian will not save you, nor the name of Anglican, nor Baptist, nor any other name—I do not care what it is, this scripture sweeps them all aside.

"Well", some young man says, "I have been going to university, sir, and I have a lot of books on my shelves written by distinguished scholars; and many of these books discuss great religious problems, and I have been much influenced by the opinions of these distinguished authors." Let me inform you, my dear young friend, that so far as the knowledge of salvation is concerned, there is none other name but the name of Jesus that has any value. "Well", you say, "what about the Old Testament?" The only One that ever lived Whose opinion on the Old Testament is authoritative is Jesus Christ Himself. He is the Authority from Genesis to Revelation. He said, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven." He said, "I am the only Pilot, I am absolutely the only One Who has any knowledge of that other world; and if you want to know how to get from this world to that world, listen to Me." That is what Jesus said. "There is none other name" in all the realm of spiritual knowledge. You may search the libraries of the world, you may be honoured with a diploma from the greatest universities of the world, you may have all the degrees which stand for academic recognition, you may attain—some young man here—to a position in some department of knowledge where you will be recognized as the greatest human authority in that particular subject in all the world, but I tell you that with all you may learn, with all you may read from all the books that ever were written, from the books that are now extant, from all the books that ever shall be written—altogether it amounts to absolutely nothing. The name of Jesus is the only name to which Heaven pays any attention.

Oh, no! it does not give you high standing in Heaven to have high standing among men; and blessed be God, it does not necessarily mean that you are not going to get there because some people do not like you—not a bit of it.

"Neither is there salvation"—where? where? Is there not just a little corner somewhere where some expert may be found? Is there not some place let us say in England where you can find a man whom you can bring to Canada to tell us some things we did not know—is there not? Listen: "There is none other name"—not in Canada, nor in the United States, nor in Great Britain, nor in Europe, nor in Asia, nor in Africa,—there is NONE OTHER NAME UNDER HEAVEN anywhere. You might just as well save your travelling expenses. Do not go looking for it, for there is no such name under heaven given among men.

If you had some names signed to a cheque, you might be very rich, you might have millions; but, do you know, there is a Bank up yonder, and there is absolutely only one Name that is honoured at that Bank. You cannot get a thing from Heaven's Bank unless you have that Name on your cheque. "Oh, sir, but you can not mean to say that Christian parentage cannot insure one's future?—my mother was a very pious woman, a very good Christian—" "There is none other name," not even your mother's, good and gracious as I trust she was—"You do not mean to say that I am absolutely without standing, a mere nobody, a nameless waif?" That is all you are. No name will ever be honoured by Heaven's Bank or at Heaven's gate but the name of Jesus. You must have His name on your cheque or remain poor, utterly bankrupt forever.

I remember during the war being sent a complimentary ticket which was to admit me to a certain important event, where there were a very limited number of seats. Some very good friend was interested in me, and sent me a complimentary ticket. It had on the bottom the name of a very important person; and no one entered through that door—no matter if he were a major-general, or an ambassador, or any other great personage—no one entered through that door who did not present a pass with that name on. Just so, there is none other name, my friends, that is accepted in Heaven; you must get your ticket signed by Jesus Himself—there is no deputy, no pope, no priest, no minister, no church authority, no scholastic authority, no man of wealth anywhere who can take His place; there is only that one name, the name of Jesus.

Is that not a glorious thing—is that not a glorious thing, to be shut up to one Name? We cannot make a mistake if we take that one Name, can we? What is your name? You remember what the angel said to Jacob, "What is

thy name?" And he said, "Jacob!"—as though he would say, "You go and ask Esau, and he will tell you what my name is; ask Laban, he will tell you what my name is,—ask anyone with whom I ever had any dealings, and they will say to you, 'His name is Jacob, and it means supplanter—and he is well named'." And you remember the angel said, "I will give you a better name than that. Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed."

What is your name? I can tell you what it is, it is "sinner". "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief"; "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Now you cannot sign a cheque with any hope of its being cashed yonder, with your own or any other name. You cannot sign "Jacob", you must get another name than that; and the name that is offered to you is the name of Jesus. And I will tell you why that has value; it is because He took your place—lived your life for you, died your death for you, was raised again from the dead for you, ascended into heaven, is seated on the right hand of God the Father, and He pleads your cause for you. And when anyone of us shall come to God—our hands empty, as we were singing just now:

"Nothing in my hand I bring:
Simply to Thy cross I cling"—

no trust in ourselves, our church, our minister, our own knowledge, our own works of righteousness which we have done, no trust anywhere but in Jesus alone, then the Lord will honour the name of Jesus, and He will take away that name of sinner, and you shall be no more a stranger and a foreigner, but a fellow-citizen of the saints, and of the household of God. He will admit you into the royal family, and when you are admitted into the royal family, He will give you His name. "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." We take the name of Christ. That is very natural, is it not? When a woman marries she takes her husband's name, and ever afterward she answers not to her own name but to his, because she is one with him. And we are members of the Bride of Christ; and when we receive Him, He puts His name upon us, He puts His nature within us, and makes us one with Himself forevermore; and "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Will you take that Name this evening? Will you take that Name? "Do I not need anything but a name? Do I not need anything but a name?" No, nothing but a Name. "I do not need any works of righteousness? I do not need to do anything at all, but just come with a name?" That is all, just with the name of Jesus. You do not need anything else. And when you pray in the name of Jesus, God hears His Son pray; and for the sake of His dear Son, the doors are thrown wide open, and He will receive you to Himself, and save you with an everlasting salvation.

Have I made it plain? Is there anyone who does not understand? That is all I am concerned about, that you should know there is no salvation anywhere but in Christ, but all the salvation you need in Him, to be had as you come in His name. May the Lord lead many to Himself to-night.

Before we give the invitation shall we bow a moment in prayer:

O Lord, we have tried to make the way of life plain, and yet how well we know that only the Spirit of God can give the hearing ear, only the Spirit of God can open the understanding! Thou didst open the heart of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. We have asked Thee to open these hearts; and now, O Lord, we pray for strength and grace for those whose hearts have been opened. There are men and women here who have been long desiring salvation, and to-night, by this simple word, Thou hast opened their hearts and they see it is all of grace and grace alone; and we pray that the Holy Spirit may give them courage to confess Christ. Give Thine own people direction in this service; make them responsive to Thy Spirit, and as Thou shalt tell them to go here or there to speak a word, we pray that grace may be given that they may all obey. So may there be a great turning to God to-night; may great numbers come pleading the Name, just the Name of Jesus. We ask it in His Name. Amen.

(When the invitation was given a large number came forward confessing Christ).

EDITORIAL

THE DENOMINATIONAL BUDGET

Last week several group meetings, to which pastors and certain laymen were invited, were held in Toronto, to discuss the financial affairs of the various Boards. We were out-of-town, and thus were unable to be present; but we have been informed that the brethren were given rather a gloomy report of the state of the various treasuries.

We are exceedingly sorry that this should be so. Hitherto we have supported, with the utmost heartiness, our Home and Foreign Mission work. We believe Jarvis Street Church was the first in the Convention to adopt a denominational budget; and this was done on the initiative of the Editor of this paper. In that budget we included Home and Foreign Missions, Western Missions, Education, and Grande Ligne.

In order that it may be seen that we endeavoured, up to a certain point, to support McMaster University, we quote the following facts: The present pastorate began in May, 1910, The Year Book of 1910 gives the financial statistics up to the Associations of that year; therefore, the Year Books up to 1910, statistically, give the record of Jarvis Street prior to the beginning of the present pastorate. We have a record of contributions for Christian Education in the Year Books back to 1904 (Christian Education is omitted from the issue for 1905). The amounts contributed by Jarvis Street Church for these years follow: 1904, \$159.77; '06, \$213.63; '07, \$187.00; '08, \$224.76; '09, \$261.89; '10, \$372.95. The Year Book of 1911 covers the first year of the present pastorate, and the contributions from that date forward have been as follows: '11, \$372.34; '12, \$830.65; '13, \$1,854.89; '14, \$1,556.09; '15, \$1,231.26; '16, \$2,743.34; '17, \$2,532.39; '18, \$976.80; '19, \$755.04; '20, \$781.21; '21, \$1,130.60; '22, \$279.04; '23, \$208.72.

The Budget plan was introduced about 1912, after which it will be seen the contributions greatly increased. From 1913 to 1921, as everybody knows, were very difficult years following the war. April to September, 1921, was the period of the Jarvis Street revolution. It took Jarvis Street some years to recover from the terrific shock of that experience. Notwithstanding, we did not change our budget, and up to 1923 continued to support Christian Education, giving in 1922, \$279.04; and in 1923, \$208.72.

Some years ago we were asked to write an article for *The Canadian Baptist* in support of Christian Education. This we did, and the article was published on the front page of *The Baptist*. At that time Professor Matthews was still in McMaster University; and, as we recall the article, (we have not a copy before us, but our statement may be verified by referring to the files of *The Canadian Baptist*) we said we were not satisfied with everything in McMaster, but that we continued to support it in order that we might be qualified to make our influence felt in endeavouring to effect a change for the better. About 1923 we dropped Christian Education from our Church Budget, and put it on a special list for which contributions might be taken at any time, according as the object merited support; and we advised the University to this effect. Our reason for doing that was as follows: up and down the Convention everywhere the representatives of the University quoted the increase of contributions to Christian Education as an evidence of growing satisfaction with the McMaster administration. We waited upon the then Secretary, the late Dr. S. S. Bates, and suggested to him that this was a very unfair argument. We reminded him that McMaster University had been foremost in promoting the Denominational Budget, that it had begun with a very small percentage, and had, from the beginning, been a regular Oliver Twist—always asking for more; and with the increase of the percentage, and the increased number of churches adopting the Budget, very naturally McMaster had received an increased revenue, but that, in very many instances, the people had given to the Denominational Budget without special reference to McMaster—merely as a matter of convenience. And we said to the Secretary, "If you challenge us to register our opinion by our financial action, we shall simply have to cease to support the University until conditions are improved."

The action of Jarvis Street Church to which we have referred, followed; and from that time Jarvis Street Church has not contributed to Christian Education. We still, however, maintain our right to discuss its affairs, for the reason that the McMaster estate was left to the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec. And for many years no church in the Convention contributed regularly to Christian Education; yet all the churches, through their delegates to the Convention, register their approval—or disapproval—of McMaster's administration. Every member of every Regular Baptist Church within the Convention of Ontario and Quebec is virtually a shareholder in our Educational Work, whether he makes a contribution to Education or not, and has, by virtue of that fact, a right to express himself respecting the conduct of its affairs. We would remind our readers that the argument to which we objected is still being used, and therefore the only way effectively to express one's judgment on the present McMaster regime is absolutely to refuse to contribute to its support. This can be done only by every church making its own Budget, by dropping McMaster University from the Budget of the local church, and making it necessary for McMaster to appeal to the church for support on its own merits.

McMaster and The Boards.

We desire now to call attention to the place McMaster University is taking upon all of our denominational Boards: the Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board, Mr. S. J. Moore, is a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster; the Chairman of the Home Mission Board, Mr. James Rylie, is a member of the Board of Governors; the Chairman of the H. M. Board Finance Committee, Mr. Albert Matthews, is also Chairman of the Board of Governors of McMaster; the Chairman of the Board of Publication, Mr. George S. Matthews, is a member of the Board of Governors, and a brother of the Chairman of the Board of Governors; the Chairman of the Board of Religious Education, Mr. Harry L. Stark, is a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; while five of the twelve members of the Board of Publication (1924 Year Book) are members of the Senate of McMaster University; the President of the Women's Foreign Mission Society of Ontario West is the wife of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of McMaster; and the Vice-President is the wife of one of the professors; the recently elected President of the Women's Home Mission Society of Ontario West, Mrs. Zavitz, has, for eight years, been a member of the Senate of McMaster University, and shared the responsibility of the University's action in honouring Dr. Faunce, and in appointing the modernist professor, Rev. L. H. Marshall. The 1924-25 Year Book (the last issue) shows that the Executive Committee of the Convention is composed of twenty-four persons, eleven of whom are members of the Senate of McMaster University—the eleven including seven members of the Board of Governors.

Is McMaster A Jonah?

It will thus be seen that every Board of the Convention is subject to a very direct influence of McMaster, if not directly under its control. It follows, therefore, that when the Denomination's confidence in the University is shaken, it is bound to react upon all the Boards of the Convention; and while it remains true that the Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board, Chairman of the Home Mission Board, Chairman of the Publication Board, Chairman of the Sunday School Board, President of the Women's Home Mission Society West, support the appointment and retention of a professor whose teachings are directly in opposition to everything for which the Denomination stands, our Baptist people will simply withhold their funds from the Boards whose leaders are responsible for this deplorable state of affairs.

Against this, some may say, But did not the Convention, as such, approve the action of McMaster University? We answer that question by asking another: Do not the facts above stated show that the Convention is absolutely subject to the control of McMaster University? And the new President of the Convention is none other than the Dean in Theology, who, by the position taken in his speech at the Convention, opens wide the door for admission to McMaster of the most extreme modernists in the world. What else could be expected than that the Convention would vote as it did—in view of the fact that McMaster University absolutely controls it?

The Convention Is Not The Churches.

We remind the various Boards, however, that the Convention is one thing, and the churches of the Convention represent something else. McMaster may control the Convention assembly, but it cannot control the churches that compose the Convention; neither can it command the members of the churches to entrust their money to those in whom they no longer have any confidence. Once again we cite the facts reported from the South. Repeatedly the Convention managers in the South have secured a vote in their favour—but what are the facts? Practically every Board in the Southern Convention is up to its eyes in debt; and, according to their own official statistician, of twenty thousand churches which compose the Convention, not more than five thousand have adopted the Denominational Budget; and of the three and a half million church members, not more than five hundred thousand are giving financial support to the denominational programme. Thus it will be seen that while the political managers of the Southern Convention secured a majority vote for the endorsement of their programme, they have lost the support of three-quarters of their churches, and of six-sevenths of their members. We predict that unless McMaster University brings forth fruits meet for repentance, and that Institution is submitted to a thorough house-cleaning, in the next few years we shall go to the Convention to listen to the story of debts, and still more debts.

We are sorry to have to take this position, but we have the terrible example of the Northern Convention before us—sending out Unitarian, and almost agnostic missionaries—and until the Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board repudiates his own action in supporting Professor Marshall's appointment, we have no guarantee that one who could endorse Mr. Marshall as a professor, would not endorse a man holding like views as a missionary.

The same applies to the Home Mission Board, and to the Publication Board, and to the Sunday School Board, and to the Women's Home Mission Society West.

This is a gloomy prospect, but we can see no other if the present policy is persisted in. *The Gospel Witness* is absolutely determined, at all costs, to use its influence to oppose the progress of the deadly heresies of which Mr. Marshall is so conspicuous an exponent.

SPIRITUAL DIAGNOSIS.

We have received a copy of the Calendar of the Talbot Street Baptist Church, London, dated December 6th, 1925, in which the following paragraph was marked:

"REV. PROF. MARSHALL—Prof. Marshall's educational address at the Convention in Hamilton, gave us much joy. But his sermon in last week's 'Baptist' has caused us great grief. He asserts, without a particle of proof, that 'Christ Jesus knew, that, at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, 'sparks of celestial fire,' like 'the germ of life in some seeds, which cannot be destroyed, without destroying the seed itself.' This means universal salvation.

"Christ taught the necessity of the new birth, of being 'born of God,' of vital union with Christ by faith. That man has no life in himself—'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of the spirit is spirit.' That the believer in Christ only, 'hath passed out of death into life'."

We have no doubt that the change of mind and of attitude toward Professor Marshall's views which the above paragraph indicates, is becoming very general. In fact we are receiving assurances of that fact every day. Notwithstanding, we are sorry for one line in the paragraph referred to, namely: "Prof. Marshall's educational address at the Convention in Hamilton, gave us much joy." To one instructed in the tricks of the modernist, and familiar with their weasleword terminology, Professor Marshall's educational address was seen to be as full of poison as the sermon referred to.

We are, however, gratified that the editor of the Talbot Street Calendar is able to recognize the poison contained in the sermon printed in *The Baptist*, and which was preached at the First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto. We

have wondered a great deal how the Pastor of First Avenue was able to sit through that sermon. We have always looked upon him as a thoroughly orthodox man. He is too good a theologian to accept that teaching. Once during the war we had Ralph Connor in Jarvis Street, and he preached salvation through death on the battlefield; but we found it impossible to allow it to pass, and though he was our guest, we found it necessary to tell the congregation that we did not believe what he said—and that in his presence. We should be sorry if the readers of *The Canadian Baptist* were to identify Dr. Graham with the deadly teaching of the sermon preached in his pulpit; and yet if Dr. Graham does not himself repudiate that teaching, what conclusion must the people draw? Personally, we feel convinced that the Pastor of First Avenue Church must have found everything within him protesting against that which Mr. Marshall preached. But why did he remain silent? Why does he remain silent still? We would gladly open the pages of *The Gospel Witness* to Dr. Graham, to give him an opportunity to express his views on Professor Marshall's sermon.

Little by little it is dawning upon our Baptist people that in the person of Professor Marshall the most virulent form of Modernism with which Canadian Baptists have had any direct connection has established itself in McMaster University.

A doctor is called in to examine a man who is ill, and, after the examination, he pronounces the disease to be smallpox. But the friends are not satisfied, and they call in another doctor. He looks wise, and says there is a slight indisposition without doubt, but nothing so serious as that, and he will see the patient in the morning. He comes the next day, and without committing himself, promises a third visit. When he comes again and finds his patient covered with scabs, he at last pronounces it smallpox. When the first physician hears it, he smiles sadly and says, "I told them that in the beginning."

There are some doctors who seem unable to diagnose a disease until the patient is dead. We should be delighted to discover that we were mistaken in our diagnosis of the disease brought to McMaster by Professor Marshall; but in the light of such deliverances as the First Avenue sermon, the whole Denomination will soon recognize that the Dean in Theology, now President of the Convention, refused a quarantine order to stay the progress of a disease a thousand times worse than smallpox,—one kills the body, the other destroys the soul.

A THEOLOGICAL PHARMACY.

Once upon a time there was a theological pharmacy which did business under the name of, "The Orthodox Baptist Medical Company." The store was managed by a certain gentleman named, Mr. Conviction-of-Truth. To this store many messengers came from many people who were ill, bringing prescriptions taken from a Book written by the divine Physician; and these prescriptions were said to be carefully drawn, and verbally accurate. Whenever such a prescription was brought to Mr. Conviction-of-Truth to be compounded, he made it a rule to follow the directions of the divine Physician as given in the Book, to the very letter.

As long as Mr. Conviction-of-Truth managed the establishment, it was found that the medicine obtained at that store never failed to effect a cure. After some years, however, The Orthodox Baptist Company admitted to its directorate, men who were utterly uninformed as to the nature of the commodities the store contained, and equally unskilled in their use. This eventually resulted in a change of policy, and Mr. Conviction-of-Truth was superseded in the management by a gentleman named Mr. Tolerance. The name of the company was also changed: the great sign still held its place outside the Orthodox Baptist Medical Company, but just above it, in small letters, discernible only on close examination, was the word, "formerly"; and underneath the sign, in equally small letters, were the words, "Now operated by Expediency and Co.—Mr. Middle-of-the-Road Baptist, President." So that the sign read:

Formerly

THE ORTHODOX BAPTIST MEDICAL COMPANY

Now operated by Expediency & Co.

President: Mr. Middle-of-the-Road Baptist

Manager Tolerance had an associate in the management whose name was Mr. Indifferent-to-Revealed-Truth; among the men behind the counter was Mr. Evolutionist, Mr. Liberal-Opinion (a new-comer), and some others who were chiefly engaged in wrapping up parcels of imported ready-made opinions. There were some experienced attendants who had been engaged by the Orthodox Baptist Company, and whose long service in the store would have rendered their summary dismissal most unseemly.

Mr. Tolerance was more than a supervisor, for he dispensed many prescriptions himself; and whenever he did so, he was wont to expatiate upon the value of the great Book from which they were taken, and of the authority of the great Physician who was the Author of the Book. So that the customers who dealt directly with Mr. Tolerance assumed that the firm dispensed its prescriptions in the same way as it had always done. But to his colleagues, Mr. Tolerance made it quite clear that he did not insist that everything should be done according to the Book, while he personally preferred the old standards, he recognized that there were many who did not; and he believed the people should be permitted to have the medicine they wanted.

It was natural, therefore, that Mr. Evolutionist should put his own interpretation upon the Great Physician's prescription; and that which the Book regarded as the symptoms of a deadly disease, Mr. Evolutionist thought was nothing more than the "vestigial remains" of an earlier stage of existence which the patient would naturally outgrow.

Mr. Liberal-Opinion seemed to think that the Prescription Book greatly exaggerated the nature of the disease it undertook to cure. Hence he consulted Mr. Tolerance as to the advisability of changing some of the ingredients which the Book prescribed. Mr. Tolerance replied that, while personally he would, of course, abide by the Book, he did not know where to draw the line; and left it to Mr. Liberal-Opinion to exercise his own judgment. The result was, the store became very popular for a while, for the prescriptions were so dispensed as to make all medicines taste like a summer soft drink. They had a certain sedative effect, and made the people feel better for a while; but because it did not touch the disease, the deadly plague was allowed, unhindered, to ravage the community. The death rate of the neighborhood, therefore, became very high. Fewer messengers came for prescriptions, and the trade so fell off that at length the shutters were put up, and Expediency and Co. went out of business; and what had been called by some a "seminary" became a "cemetery." One day a traveller, passing this religious wilderness, observed that someone had set up a sign in the midst of it on which was inscribed a word from the old Prescription Book, "Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off."

THE STORY OF A PACIFIC POLICEMAN.

Once upon a time there was a policeman who was noted for his amiability and his determination to keep the peace. He was, of course, sworn to uphold the majesty of the law, and to be absolutely impartial in safeguarding the interests of the community he served. But he was a Baptist, and hence believed in "Baptist liberty," and he exercised that liberty by putting a very liberal interpretation upon his oath of office.

One beautiful moonlight night he was patrolling his beat. It was summertime, and everything about him was delightfully quiet. As he walked quietly along through street after street his generous disposition led him to reflect, with great satisfaction, on the fact that the citizens whose lives and property he was charged to protect, were enjoying a comfortable sleep. Being a Baptist, and a great lover of peace, he felt that this was just as it should be; and he resolved that he would allow nothing to occur on his beat that would disturb their peaceful repose. But as he turned a corner he noticed two men going down a back lane whose actions seemed to be somewhat suspicious. He followed them quickly, but, on reaching the end of the lane, the men had disappeared. He walked quietly down the lane, only to be arrested by a noise that sounded very much like someone chiselling wood. On investigation he discovered that these men were cutting their way through a door, obviously intent upon gaining admission to one of the houses. When he came upon them he said, "Gentlemen, you should not make so much noise at this time of night. As I have been

patrolling my beat this evening, I have been admiring the serenity of everything about me, and delighting myself in the abundance of peace, and now I come upon you engaged in this noisy piece of work. I am greatly afraid that you will wake somebody up in that house! I happen to know that there are some young children within, and if they should hear you, it would disturb the whole family, and so the peace of the household would be broken. Now, gentlemen, if you must out your way through that door, try to do it quietly. Do not make too much noise! I am a peace-loving man, and I cannot allow the people who live on my beat to be robbed of their night's rest." The night workers expressed their regret that they had not been more careful, and assured him that they were able to go on with their work in such a way that even the lightest sleeper would not be disturbed. To which our genial policeman replied, "So long as you do not make a noise and disturb the peace, I have no objection." He therefore left them, and resumed the patrol of his beat.

The next day the newspapers reported that a whole family had been chloroformed while they slept, and that the house had been stripped of everything of value that could be removed. When the policeman read it he said, "Well, it is true a family lost their lives, and their heirs a lot of property; but it is gratifying to know that the next-door neighbours were not disturbed, and that the people themselves, though they lost their lives, did not lose their night's sleep.

Of course, this is a parable. The only interpretation we need to offer is that the policeman was not a member of Jarvis Street Baptist Church.

THE WHOLE BIBLE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON COURSE

We reproduce below the exact lesson leaflet issued by the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and published by the Union Gospel Press, Cleveland. They speak for themselves. We publish two weeks' lessons in this *Witness*, and shall publish two more next week, and after that, one a week. By this means after next week the lessons will appear in *The Witness* four Sundays in advance of the day of their use. The advertisement of the Union Gospel Press is printed at the bottom of the lesson, in order that schools desiring to use these lesson leaflets may know where to order them.

THE WHOLE BIBLE S. S. LESSON COURSE of the BAPTIST BIBLE UNION of NORTH AMERICA

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

NO. 1.

Lesson 1

FIRST QUARTER

Jan. 3, 1926

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST

LESSON TEXT: First chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Luke 2: 4-7 and Luke 3: 23-38.

The lesson notes in this series, while designed to be useful to scholars, are prepared specially with a view to helping the teacher. As the question of the Virgin Birth of our Lord is being much discussed nowadays, it is important that all teachers of the Word should be thoroughly fortified on this point. The genealogical tables in Matthew and Luke have a direct bearing on this discussion, and we have therefore thought it wise to give an extensive quotation:

Genealogy of Jesus Christ

Needed, to show that redemption was no afterthought, but designed from the first. Abraham and David in Matthew's Gospel are singled out to prove the fulfilment in Christ of the promises made to Abraham 2000 years previously, and to David 1000. The O. T. begins with "Genesis" (generation); so also the N. T. begins with the genesis ("generation" *Matt. 1: 1*) of Jesus Christ. Matthew's Gospel contains, not Joseph's direct ancestors, but the succession of heirs to David's and Solomon's throne. The tracing of Christ's

descent through Judah's royal line harmonizes with the kingly aspect of Jesus Christ in Matthew's Gospel. The steps of Joseph's direct parentage did not coincide with those of the succession to the throne. Solomon's line failed, and Nathan's and Neri's succeeded as legal heirs. Hence the need of two genealogies, one (Matthew) of the succession, the other (Luke) of the parentage. Jeremiah (22: 30) declares Jeconiah, Coniah, or Jehoiachin was to be childless. He cannot therefore have been lineal progenitor of Jesus Christ. It is at this point in the genealogy, i.e. after Jehoiachin, the same names occur in both lists, Salathiel and Zerubbabel taken (in Matthew) from the line of Nathan (Luke) to supply the failure of Jehoiachin's issue. The promise was, Messiah was to be "of the fruit of the loins of David" (Acts 2: 30), but to Solomon only that "his throne should be established evermore" (1 Chron. 17: 14). So a double genealogy of Jair is given, one of the inheritance, the other of birth (1 Chron. 2: 4, 5, 21, 22; Num. 32: 41). Matthew appropriately, as writing for Jews, gives Christ's legal descent; Luke, for Gentiles, the natural descent. Matthew downwards, from Abraham the father of the Jews (naturally, but of the Gentiles also spiritually: Gen. 17: 5; Rom. 4: 16, 17); Luke upwards, to Adam, "who was the son of God" and the father of Gentiles and Jews alike.

The words "as was supposed" (Luke 3: 23) imply that Christ's sonship to Joseph was only a reputed not a real one. Yet He was God's extraordinary gift to Joseph through his proper wife Mary, and the fruit of his marriage to her, not as natural offspring of his body but as supernatural fruit. Hence attention is drawn to Joseph's being "son of David" (Matt. 1: 20), "of the house and lineage of David" (Luke 2: 4, comp. 1: 32).

Matthew omits three links of the pedigree. "Joram begat Ozias", i.e. Uzziah. But Joram really begat Ahaziah, Ahaziah Jehoash, Jehoash Uzziah. If the two genealogies contained anything false or mutually contradictory, Christ's enemies would have convicted them from the public documents. Clearly men in that day saw nothing irreconcilable in them. From Abraham to David both agree, thenceforward the names differ. Luke has 42 from David, Matthew only 27. The less number in Matthew is intelligible, if he be only tracing the heirs to the throne; for "the heir of my heir is my heir". So intermediate heirs are omitted without risk of misconception, for spiritual reasons; e.g. Simeon is omitted in Moses' blessing (Deut. 33) on account of cruelty, Dan in Rev. 7 for his idolatry. The full number is given in Luke, as naming the natural line.

Mary must have been of the same tribe and family as Joseph, according to the law (Num. 36: 8). Isa. 11: 1 implies that Messiah was the seed of David by natural as well as legal descent. Probably Matthan of Matthew is the Matthat of Luke, and Jacob and Heli were brothers; and Heli's son Joseph, and Jacob's daughter Mary, first cousins. Joseph, as male heir of his uncle Jacob, who had only one child, Mary, would marry her according to the law (Num. 36: 8). Thus the genealogy of the inheritance (Matthew's) and that of natural descent (Luke's) would be primarily Joseph's, then Mary's also.

The number 14 has some mystic signification (comp. Num. 29: 13; 1 Kings 8: 65). It is the double of seven, the number for completeness; the periods of 14 in Matthew are the sacred three. The period from Abraham to David is that of patriarchs; from David to the Babylonian captivity that of kings; from the captivity to Christ private individuals. The first and second tessaradecade have an illustrious beginning; the third not so, that its ending in Messiah might stand forth pre-eminent above all that went before. The first is that of promise, beginning with Abraham and ending with David, the receivers of the promise; the second adumbrates Christ's eternal kingdom through the temporary kingdom of David's line; the third period is that of expectation". ("The Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopaedia", by A. R. Fausset, D.D.).

I. LESSONS FROM THE GENEALOGY OF JESUS.

1. Luke traces our Lord's descent direct to Adam in an unbroken line. Thus His coming into the world fulfils the promise of Gen. 3: 15, and our Lord is shown to be of one flesh with all mankind, and truly the Son of man. 2.

Matthew traces our Lord's genealogy through David only back as far as Abraham. (Luke also, of course, includes Abraham and David in the chain). But in this, two special promises are fulfilled: (a) The promise to Abraham: Gen. 12: 3; Acts 3: 25-34; Gen. 12: 7; Gal. 3: 16; Gen. 17: 7. (b) The promise to David: II Sam. 7: 12, 13; I Kings 3: 25; Psalm 89: 3, 4; Psalm 110; Psalm 132: 10, 11; Matt. 22: 44; Acts 2: 34-36. 3. The representative character of Christ as One Who has identified Himself with all sinners is suggested by some of the names included in the list of His human ancestors. There are Tamar, and Bathsheba, Rahab, and Ruth the Moabitess—these are the only women mentioned save Mary; and it was to the woman the promise was made that her Seed should bruise the serpent's head. 4. All this that we might claim a holier Ancestry, and by being born again become the children of God through faith in Christ Jesus.

II. CONCERNING THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST.

The divine inspiration which we recognize in Scripture does not preclude the use of such actual truth as may be obtained from human sources. Hence it appears obvious that Matthew derived his information respecting the events preceding the Birth, from Joseph, and Luke from Mary—the only two competent to speak. 1. It is obvious Joseph believed in the virgin birth of Jesus as it was told him by an angel; and he proved it by taking Mary to wife. 2. Luke's account shows us that Mary also knew her Son to be supernaturally born. 3. Both Joseph and Mary saw in His advent a fulfilment of prophetic and angelic prediction.

III. THE PURPOSE OF THE PROMISED ADVENT IS COMMUNICATED TO JOSEPH.

1. The Child is to be called Jesus—Saviour, the Antitype of Joshua, to lead His people into an inheritance of richer promise; 2. and to save His people from their sins. Named before His birth by the angel—it were wiser to accept that heavenly announcement of the fundamental purpose of His coming than the vain proposals of humanitarian philosophies. The fundamental trouble of mankind is sin, and Jesus came to deal directly with that.

Published quarterly in weekly parts by the UNION GOSPEL PRESS for the BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA—Publishing office, 2375 Thurman St., Cleveland, Ohio.

TERMS: Each set, a quarter, 4 cents; a year, 16 cents.

ADDRESS UNION GOSPEL PRESS, P. O. Drawer 680, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Lesson 2

FIRST QUARTER

Jan. 10, 1926

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST

LESSON TEXT: Second chapter of Matthew.

In harmony: Second Chapter of Luke.

I. THE UNIQUENESS OF THE BIRTH OF JESUS.

1. He had no human father, but was begotten of the Holy Ghost and born as no other man was ever born (*Matt. 1: 20; Luke 1: 31-35*). The truth of the virgin birth of Christ is inseparably wrapped up with the truth of His Deity. The only accounts we have of His birth are given to us in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. If the record be accepted at all, it should be accepted altogether. Be it remembered, no one can deny the virgin birth of Christ without denying the divine authority of Scripture. Moreover, the resurrection of Christ was as miraculous as His birth. The denial of one invariably leads to the denial of the other. The new birth of which Christ speaks in the 3rd chapter of John, and which the entire New Testament insists is a prerequisite to fellowship with God, is as great a miracle as the virgin birth or the resurrection. To deny the supernatural character of Christ's birth leads to a denial of the supernaturalness of conversion. 2. The birth of Christ was foretold in the Scripture (*Isaiah 7: 14; Matt. 1: 23; Matt. 2: 5, 6*). Thus the entire life of Christ, from His supernatural birth to His supernatural resurrection, was "according to the scriptures" (*I Cor. 15: 3, 4*).

II. THE SUPERNATURAL ACCOMPANIMENTS OF THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

1. It was announced to wise men in the east by the appearance of a star

(*Matt. 2: 2*); and to the shepherds in the fields by a chorus of angels (*Luke 2: 8-15*). 2. The announcement of His birth by the angels to the shepherds in the fields was attended by a manifestation of the glory of the Lord. These public manifestations of the supernatural were in keeping with the supernatural character of the birth itself which, of course, was known at the time only to Joseph and Mary. 3. On the basis of these considerations, the supernatural character and absolute uniqueness of Christ should be emphasized. It is well that these fundamental truths should be instilled into young minds. There is a way of stating the profoundest doctrine in chaste and simple language, which will make an appeal even to the youngest. It is not the quality of the truth we teach, not its depth and breadth and length and height, which perplexes the minds of the young; but our inability to express the truth in simple language. We believe it is important that even the profoundest truths of Scripture should be simply taught to little children. Only in this way shall we be able to fortify their young minds against the prevailing errors of the day.

III. HOW THE WORLD RECEIVED CHRIST.

1. He came at one of the world's darkest hours,—“in the days of Herod the king”. Whenever and wherever Christ comes, He is contrasted with the Herod spirit still. Often He comes to the human heart as to Bethlehem's manger—at a time when the Herod spirit is in the ascendancy. 2. Herod endeavored to use the very Word of God against His Son: he enquired of the Scripture where Christ should be born. This is a striking illustration of the hardness of the human heart. Here is a man who believes in the divine inspiration and accuracy of Scripture, and who consults God's Book to find out something about Christ,—but only that he might use the knowledge gained to destroy Christ. This is still the Devil's method. Thousands are engaged in the study of the Bible, not with a view to obeying its precepts and principles, but in an endeavour to discredit it, and, at the same time, to discredit Christ Jesus the Lord. 3. The Creator of all things comes into His own world by taking on Him the seed of Abraham; but at His advent, could find on earth only a stable in which to be born. And it is ever so: He Who by eternal right should in all things be first, is by the many put last, and crowded out of the inn. Sin aims to crowd God out of His world. 4. In contrast with the antagonism of Herod and the indifference of the multitude, there were some wise men who saw His star and followed its direction, that they might worship Him. But only the wise men saw the star. It is ever thus: only those who are made wise unto salvation by the illumination of the Holy Ghost find their way to Christ. But there is always a remnant according to the election of grace who come to worship Him. 5. This infant Life, this delicate Exotic that came from God the world sought to extinguish. It has always done so: the murder of Joseph was planned by his own brethren; and Moses providentially survived a slaughter of innocents as Jesus did. The same principle holds when Christ is formed in the believing soul the hope of glory: a conversion invariably calls forth Herod's rage, for this vile world is not a friend to grace to help us on to God. 6. But the precious life of Jesus was guarded by the angels, and was, indeed, in itself, indissoluble; for He was made after the power of an endless life (*Hebrews 7: 16*). And no man could take His life from Him until He should voluntarily lay it down of Himself (*John 10: 18*). At last it was said, “They are dead which sought the young child's life”. Thus too the life of God implanted in the soul at conversion can not be destroyed by all the powers of hell: God's gift is eternal life. 7. Inevitably a man's attitude toward Christ determines his attitude toward others: because Herod was determined to make sure of removing the new-born King, he ordered the destruction of all babes of His age.

ILLUSTRATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

1. The Unique Birth of Jesus. No mortal was ever born as Jesus was born. It is well to emphasize this point. The present tendency is toward a disguised Unitarianism which reduces our Lord to the level of a man. The Scriptures plainly teach He was the Incarnate God to whom ultimately every knee shall bow and every tongue confess. The value of His death for sinners, the authority of His teaching, His testimony to the Old Testament Scriptures, the significance of His resurrection, and the promise of His return, all depend upon

the principle that Jesus was and is the incomparable Son of God as well as the representative Son of Man.

In this Truth also there is afforded an opportunity to illustrate the character of the Scriptures. The written Word of God, like the Word Incarnate, is both human and Divine. While written by human hands, the writers wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Thus the Bible is different from all other books, and is Divinely inspired as no other book is inspired; and as none could take the life of Christ, so the Bible is indestructible, and as He was infallible as the Incarnate Word, the Bible is infallible as the Written Word.

The supernaturalness of the birth of Christ suggests the supernaturalness of the religion of Christ. Emphasize the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion, justification, sanctification.

2. Accompaniments of the Birth of Christ. Only the wise men saw the star, only the shepherds heard the music of the angels. Here we have spiritual sight and hearing. Illustrations of this principle abound. All men have eyes, but what men see depends upon the mind behind the eyes. The artist sees what is hidden from other eyes. Love discerns behind the plainest features a beautiful soul which no one else can see. Not everyone can really see either a landscape or a sunset. So only those whose heart's eyes are opened by the Spirit of God can see the star, or see the Truth in the Bible which leads to God.

So also of spiritual hearing. Many have ears for the rattle of money, or the clang of machinery who have no ears for music. Thus only the spiritually anointed ear can hear the angels sing, or join the hallelujah chorus.

Everything concerning Christ and the Spiritual realm is beyond the ken of the natural man and may be known only as it is revealed by God's Spirit.

3. How the World Received Christ. Herod's antagonism. Always the devil finds some one to seek to destroy the Heavenly seed. Cain against Abel, Ishmael against Isaac, Esau against Jacob, Pharaoh against Moses, Saul against David, Haman against Mordecai, Nebuchadnezzar against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, the princes of Babylon against Daniel.

"No room in the inn". Christ is represented by the Bible, the Church, Spiritual matters in general, but all these are crowded out to make room for pleasure, and business, and other earthly and temporal interests. Christ Himself is still crowded out of the human heart by worldly things.

The wise men and the shepherds worshipped. Some one is always receiving Christ.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS FOR CHRISTMAS.

Subscriptions are pouring in for The Witness by every mail, from Canada and all over the United States. Now is the time to subscribe for your friends. Many are sending The Gospel Witness for a Christmas present. Some Schools, adopting the Whole Bible Lesson Course, have subscribed for the entire teaching staff of the School. Samples of the lesson helps will be found elsewhere in this issue. Send your subscriptions to The Witness at once—new subscriptions entered at \$1.00 per year

JUNIOR LESSON HELPS.

Lesson Helps for the Junior and Primary Departments of the School, written by the Editor of this paper, are now on the press, and within a few days sample copies may be obtained from the Union Gospel Press, Cleveland, Ohio. They cover the same lessons, but are simplified with a view to helping the teachers of Junior and Primary classes.

LAST SUNDAY.

We had a great day in the Bible School last Sunday,—the attendance was 1,125. The auditorium was filled at the morning service, and many responded to the invitation. At night the church was packed, and the Deacons had to sit on the platform. The sermon appearing in this issue was preached; seven were baptized; and about twenty responded to the invitation at the close of the sermon.