

CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN'S MEMORY	Page	6
DR. JOHN MacNEILL BEFORE AND AFTER	"	7
THE CANADIAN BAPTIST AND DR. NORRIS	"	10
DR. GOODCHILD ON "HERE'S A PRETTY FIX"	"	11

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, JANUARY 14th, 1926

No. 38

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"IS IT NOTHING TO YOU?"

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, August 26th, 1923.

(Stenographically Reported.)

Editorial Note: The exposition which follows is the first half of a sermon published in *The Gospel Witness* June 25th, 1925. The reason for republishing here will be found in an editorial note on the editorial page, entitled, "Chancellor Whidden's Memory". We request all our readers to read both very carefully.

"Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger."—Lamentations 1: 12.



OW doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people! how is she become as a widow! she that was great among the nations, and princess among the provinces, how is she become tributary! She weepeth sore in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks: among all her lovers she hath none to comfort her: all her friends have dealt treacherously with her, they are become her enemies . . . Jerusalem hath grievously sinned; therefore she is removed." It is thus Jeremiah in the context laments the sorrows that have befallen the daughter of his people. He beholds the broken altar of Israel, its continual fire extinguished; the sanctuary defiled; the walls of her palaces in the hands of the enemy; her gates sunken, her bars destroyed; her king and her princes captives; the law forgotten; the prophets without a vision from God. He sees the Gentiles as they pass by, they clap their hands, they hiss, and wag their head at the daughter of Jerusalem, saying, "Is this the city that men call, The perfection of beauty, The joy of the whole earth?"—And the holy city's desolation, and Israel's utter ruin so affect the prophet's pious patriotic soul that he voices the sorrow of the daughter of his people in the pathetic cry of the text: "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger."

But Jeremiah looked upon the ruins of a city built by men; the Gentile passers by to whom he called, beheld only the ashes of a temple made with hands. They saw a proud nation bow its neck to a foreign yoke; they beheld her king

bound with fetters of brass, his eyes put out, and his kingdom destroyed. And that was sorrow enough; a scene tragic enough, to arrest the attention of the most careless observer; pathetic enough to call forth the sympathetic interest of the most callous passer by.

But is there not a prophetic as well as an historic significance in this text? Did He not speak of His body as a temple, was He not the Antitype of that "mass of gold and snow"? Was He not the Archetype, the Original and Ultimate of that principle pictured in the cities of refuge? Was He not Himself a King? Was He not more intimately identified with the world's great grief, than was Jeremiah with Jerusalem's? And when I see the veil of that temple rent in twain, the walls of that city besieged by the archers, the Master of monarchs scourged as a culprit, and the Emperor of the universe nailed to the Cross, I take these works from Jeremiah's prophetic lips, and give them to Him to Whom most appropriately they belong. And now above all the Babel sounds of history, this cry rings out from the Cross all down through the ages, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger."

There was never a Prince so royal,
 So worthy of deathless fame;
 There was never a Friend so loyal,
 Such an ocean of love in a name!
 There were never such springs of sweetness,
 Such streams of ineffable bliss,
 Such powers of holy meekness,
 As welled in that heart of His;
 Which moved His hands in kindness,
 O'erflowing His lips with grace,
 Impelling His feet to mercy,
 And suffusing with love His face.

Yet never a field did fathom
 Such measureless deeps of shame;
 And never the vilest traitor
 Did bear such a burden of blame!
 There were never such rivers of sorrow,
 There were never such floods of grief,
 As flowed from the hearts of sinners
 Into His, for their relief!
 And where is the heart so hardened,
 And who is so vile as he
 Who beholdeth the Saviour suffer,
 And saith, "It is nothing to me"?

The sorrows of Jesus, therefore, challenge comparison; and the sacrifice of Calvary merits universal attention. To these two observations we shall direct our thought this evening.

I. THE SORROWS OF JESUS CHALLENGE COMPARISON: "Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." You will see how incomparable, in the nature of the case, were the sorrows of Jesus, *if you reflect that He was and is God*. Capacity for suffering is, perhaps, the truest measure of a man. There are some natures so shallow and superficial, that they have but an infinitesimal capacity for pain—that is, for any but physical pain. There are others whose natures are a mighty deep where the rivers of earth's tears may lose themselves. I would remind you that the Lord Jesus was the most perfect man the world has ever known. His was the broadest, the highest, the deepest, the most symmetrical of all human characters; but the measure of His matchless Manhood was infinitized by union with the fathomless deeps of Deity:—though sin had converted the oceans and the rivers into wormwood and gall, His heart was larger than the world.

You have seen, perhaps, the father standing at the graveside of his wife, his little ones around him; and as the casket is lowered into the grave, the

fountains of the great deep within are broken up, great tears of sorrow roll down his manly cheeks, and the strong man is convulsed with grief. But the little ones look up and wonder "what papa is crying for?" They, too, will cry, a little later, when mother does not come to give them their good-night kiss; but they will soon cry themselves to sleep, and dream that mother is only sleeping too! Not so the bereaved husband and father, who waters his couch with his tears, and will not be comforted because he knows, as his children cannot know, his own and his children's irreparable loss. They sorrow as children; he sorrows as a man. There is sorrow in the cradle over a broken doll; and it is a real sorrow to that little heart; but, O, ye mothers! it is nothing like mother's sorrow when the cradle is empty and the broken dolly's little mother has been carried by the angels beyond the skies. Just as a father's or a mother's tears exceed in bitterness the tears of their children, so, but infinitely, do the sorrows of Jesus surpass all human woe. Let it never be forgotten that it was into the hands of God the nails were driven; let it never be forgotten that it was into the feet of God the nails were forced; that it was on the brow of Incarnate Deity the crown of thorns was pressed; that it was before Him Who was Himself God, man bowed in mockery; that it was into the face of God men rebelliously spat; that it was in the sovereign hand of God they placed in mockery a reed; that, at last, it was into the very heart of God sin drove its spear! There must have been a veritable deluge of grief which broke to the overflow the heart of God. When I remember that it was the Son of the Eternal Who was with the Father before the worlds were,—that it was He Who bowed His head and gave up the ghost, well do I know that there never can be sorrow like unto His sorrow.

And now add to the volume of His Deity, *the vicariousness of His suffering*, the fact that He suffered for others, and you will see how pertinent is the iniquity of the text: "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." He died beneath the weight of the iniquities of the whole world.

And we read of a place "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched"; of a place where "the smoke of their torment ascended up for ever and ever"; "these shall go away into everlasting punishment"; we read of a "lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." I do not know what these things mean. I would not attempt to expound such a terrible phrase as this: "Sodom and Gomorrah . . . are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." I pray God nobody in this house may ever know what it means. Dimly I apprehend this truth, that sin is eternal in its nature and consequence; "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned"—and there is no end to it; it goes on—and on—and on. I do not know what the Scripture means by a "bottomless pit", except that sin needs infinity in which to do its deadly and its damnable work. If you and I could see sin as it is; if we understood the meaning of that awful tragedy; we should, I fear, despair of ever receiving forgiveness. But whatever it means, whatever the significance of hell, Jesus Christ died to save us from it. And if there be no such place, if there be no future reckoning, no time at which God will bring all men to account, then the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ were a denial of the moral government of the universe. He died "the just for the unjust"; He came "to give His life a ransom for many." Suppose a man is sentenced by a military court to receive forty-nine lashes. Suppose one thousand men found guilty of some misdemeanour are similarly sentenced. And suppose one man volunteers to receive the forty-nine thousand lashes himself that the nine hundred and ninety-nine may go free. But you cry, "It would be impossible. He would die ere half the lashes had fallen, ere half the penalty were paid." Of course he would. Have you ever wondered that Jesus did not die in Gethsemane? Others have sweat drops of blood in hours of extreme anguish, but invariably they died. Jesus alone survived such grief as that. Had He been a man only, your forty-nine lashes

would have killed him without mine, or mine without yours. It was because He is God that He was able to die for us all. Unitarianism can provide no atonement. What the sin-sick world needs is a vision of a suffering God, a knowledge of the vicariousness of the death of Christ. I beg of you to hold fast to that great truth. I hope we shall none of us ever be ashamed to sing—

"Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast,
Save in the death of Christ my God:
All the vain things that charm me most,
I sacrifice them to His blood."

Oh, "it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul"! And only the blood of Him "who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life," only the blood which is the wealth of all worlds in solution, can possibly pay the price of your redemption and mine.

And now for a moment *contrast His original glory with the shame of the cross*. It was the fact that Jerusalem which now lay in ruins had been the city which men called, "The perfection of beauty, The joy of the whole earth," that intensified her sorrow, and aggravated her shame. The measure of her present humiliation is the measure of her former exaltation, the measure of her sorrow the measure of its contrast with her former joy. The most fine gold was changed, the gold became dim, the precious sons of Zion comparable to the most fine gold were esteemed as earthen pitchers. They who had fed delicately were desolate in the streets, and they who had been clothed in scarlet embraced dunghills. It was this great contrast that made her feel the incomparableness of her woe. None had descended so low, because none had soared so high. And you see that principle illustrated every day. I heard of a man who was so reduced in circumstances that he had to somehow or another manage to make ends meet on twenty thousand a year. He was very poor; he hardly knew how to get along; and he had to cut down his benefactions in many directions. He really felt himself to be a hardly used man. And I heard somebody speak of it somewhat scornfully, as though they would suggest that a man who could not live comfortably on twenty thousand a year ought not to live at all. I suppose most people would feel like that; but, after all, it is quite possible that such an one would suffer far more than a man who had never known the luxuries of life. I have seen a beggar who possibly through all his life had never known what it was to have a week's supply in hand. If he had enough to satisfy his hunger when the next mealtime came around, he had no anxiety about the future. He drifted along a mendicant through life, and that was all he wanted. He had never known anything better. But if you take a man from some exalted situation, and reduce him to a condition like that, the contrast with his former experience is so great, he suffers immeasurably more than one who has never had experience of the heights. Similarly, my dear friends, there never was any one so reduced in station as was the Lord Jesus. When we read of the ex-Kaiser in his comparatively humble position as an exile in a foreign land, while we can scarcely offer him our pity, yet there is a pathetic aspect to it all, that any human soul should so have missed the meaning of life as he. Read of Napoleon at Elba, or at St. Helena, or any others who have sat upon the thrones of the world, and who have lost their crowns and kingdoms; and not one of them did ever explore such depths as the Lord Jesus. O, ye angels! Come measure me this infinite stoop—

"From the highest throne in glory
To the Cross of deepest woe!"

Those nails had no power to wound other hands as they did His, Who laid the foundations of the earth, Who measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance. The thorns could wound no other brow as they did that brow upon which had rested the diadem of heaven. Those cries of "Crucify Him!", the curses of the multitude, would have made no music even in our ears; but who can tell what excruciating torment they were to Him in Whose ears there still were ringing

the songs and anthems and choruses, the mighty, holy, hallelujahs of the skies!

And you will see that *the Saviour's sorrow belonged to the day of the Lord's fierce anger, in a deeper sense than did Jerusalem's*. Nations and individuals have been given earnestness of the divine judgments, just as the saints are afforded foretastes of bliss. But "the day of the Lord's fierce anger"—"the day of His wrath" is not yet. There is a sense in which even the lost in hell do not know fully the pains of judgment yet. We have scriptural warrant for believing that the condition of those who pass from this life into the future without Christ, is a state of woe indescribable. But there is a still more terrible day in prospect for the wicked; for there is a day when soul and body are to be reunited, and when men are to be judged according to the things done in the body; when they are to suffer not only in their minds and in their spirits but in their bodies. There is a resurrection unto condemnation; and in that dread day men will taste of death as they never have tasted it yet, and as no one can taste it until their complete nature of spirit, soul, and body—partners in iniquity, shall be partners in suffering under the fearful wrath of an offended God. But our Lord Jesus anticipated the judgment of the great white throne. I read—and I do not know what it means, but I beg of you to ponder it—I read that He "tasted death for every man"—He tasted death as no human soul has ever yet tasted death, but as all men must taste it who reject Him, and who "drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation."

Among the multitudes whose hearts ingratitude has broken, whom shame has crushed, bereavement bruised, or treachery betrayed, Jesus is incomparably the chief. A lonely Nansen was He, exploring the summerless region behind the back of God, where the rays of divine love never fall, where the beautiful feet of mercy never come. A solitary Columbus was He, sailing the ocean of sorrow, braving the billows of wrath, and treading with bleeding feet the hitherto undiscovered continents of infinite grief and pain. O Gethsemane! Thou hast never a rival! The shade of thine olives is still the deepest that ever wrapped a human soul about. And among the mountains of suffering, upon whose unsheltered, devoted, summits have broken tempests of trouble and tornadoes of pain, Calvary still stands out in unrivalled pre-eminence. For ever the Lord Jesus remains in splendid isolation, as the Prince of sorrows, the King of griefs, and the Emperor of woes! "Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow."

A CORRECTION.

Last week, in a note on page 28, we made the mistake of saying that Dr. Sowerby's letters had been refused publication by *The Canadian Baptist*. What we intended to say was that Dr. Sowerby's letter of the week before had been refused publication. So far as we know the letters of last week had not been offered *The Canadian Baptist*. We noted this error as soon as the paper was in print, and this correction is made without suggestion from anyone.

"WITNESS" SUBSCRIPTIONS.

New subscriptions continue to pour into the office. *The Gospel Witness* is still offered to new subscribers only for one dollar per year. This applies only outside of Toronto. In the city postage regulations compel us to charge \$1.50.

THE PASTOR'S ENGAGEMENTS.

The Pastor will speak at the annual meeting of the Baptist Bible Union of Michigan in Pontiac, Mich., Jan. 19 and 20; and at the annual meeting of the Illinois Baptist Bible Union, Chicago, Jan. 26 and 27.

TO ALL NEW SUBSCRIBERS.

Some who subscribed to *The Witness* in December failed to note that their first number was to be the first issue in January. Later subscribers should receive their first copy within two weeks of our receipt of their order.

Editorial

CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN'S MEMORY.

Last week we published two letters from Dr. A. T. Sowerby to Chancellor Whidden, and two letters from Chancellor Whidden in reply. In the first letter, second paragraph, page eighteen, of *The Gospel Witness* of January 7th, Chancellor Whidden says:

"The only sermon which it has ever been my privilege to hear Dr. Shields himself preach was one given to the Eastern Association at Coaticook a year ago last June. It was a strong sermon and with all its main statements and implications I was in full accord, but so FAR AS I COULD HEAR HE DID NOT ONCE REFER TO THE DEITY OR THE DEATH OF CHRIST." It was not preached for that purpose. Yet it was certainly a thoroughly evangelical discourse."

The words printed in capitals in the above quotation represent, of course, our own emphasis. The Chancellor tells us that we did not once refer to the Deity or the death of Christ. The following quotation is taken from the official minutes of the thirty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Eastern Association held in Coaticook, Quebec, June 24th-26th, 1924:

"The inspirational speaker of the evening was Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D., of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, whom the Moderator, Mr. J. H. Hunter, introduced.

"Dr. Shields chose his text from Lamentations 1: 12. His message enforced the thought that 'the sorrows of Jesus challenge comparison'. It was pointed out that that capacity for suffering is perhaps the truest measure of man. Moreover, all the sorrows and sufferings of Christ were vicarious. He died beneath the weight of the iniquities of the whole world. This further observation was then dwelt upon, namely, that "the sacrifice of Calvary merits universal attention". The speaker addressed the searching question of the text first to the Christians and then to the unconverted."

The sermon to which the minutes refer is the one whose first part is reprinted in this issue. In this connection we shall be compelled to let our readers into a secret, namely, that ministers sometimes repeat their sermons. We have somewhere read that Dr. Joseph Parker was once asked if he ever preached an old sermon, to which he replied, "No; but I sometimes repeat a new one." We have to confess that the sermon occurring in this issue has been many times repeated,—so often, in fact, that the first part of it is always delivered word for word as it here occurs. The second part, which we omit only for want of space but which will be found in full in Vol. 4, issue 7, of June 25th, 1925, is occupied with the application of the text, the Sacrifice of Calvary merits universal attention. The application being that if our redemption was purchased at such tremendous cost, what does it mean to us? It may mean "nothing" to some, but as between "nothing" and "everything", what does it mean to us?

We ask our readers to peruse this sermon carefully; and while reading it, to remember that Chancellor Whidden said in reference to this sermon, "So far as I could hear he did not once refer to the deity or the death of Christ." We do not suggest that the worthy Chancellor intended to misrepresent the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*; neither would we reflect either upon his perspicacity, or upon our own perspicuity, by suggesting, as the Chancellor did to Dr. Sowerby, that he had "evidently misunderstood" our position: the simple and obvious explanation of Chancellor Whidden's words is that he has to be reckoned among the number who, where the interests of Jarvis Street are concerned, sometimes "don't remember"!

ANOTHER ARTICLE REPRINTED.

Last August the Rev. Oliver C. Horsman preached in Walmer Road Baptist Church. Twenty years ago Mr. Horsman was pastor of Walmer Road Church for about a year. At that time a company of people withdrew and formed another church, as a protest against Mr. Horsman's modernism. Last August Mr. Horsman preached only one Sunday. On September 5th *The Toronto Daily Star* published certain correspondence which had passed between Mr. Horsman and the deacons of Walmer Road Church, by which it appeared that Mr. Horsman was under engagement to preach two Sundays; but after the evening sermon of August 2nd, his second Sunday's engagement was cancelled.

We reprint from *The Gospel Witness* of September 10th last a part of the article occurring in *The Toronto Star*. We would remind our readers that this article was printed before we had any knowledge of the theological position of the new professor of Practical Theology. We are still wondering why Dr. McNeill was so solicitous for the peace of Walmer Road Church, and, apparently, so indifferent to the peace of this Convention? The article which follows will speak for itself.

We have seen an announcement in the press that Professor Marshall is to preach for Dr. McNeill again at an early date. Dr. McNeill joins with Dr. Farmer in defending Professor Marshall.

FROM "THE GOSPEL WITNESS", SEPTEMBER 10, 1925.

Dr. MacNeill's Attitude.

Mr. Horsman, following the sending of his night letter of August 6 to the Deacons, forwarded a copy to Rev. John MacNeill, pastor of the church, who was holidaying at Redwood, Muskoka, and received a reply in part as follows:

"I am very sorry that your visit to Walmer Road should have ended so unhappily. There can be nothing gained in entering into any extended discussion of the subject which called for the telegram from the Deacons. I have no doubt, as you state in your letter, that you had no intention of stirring up any controversy, but the simple fact remains that that is what happened. The sermon was decidedly at variance with the views of our people on Christ's bearing of our sins. That was the opinion of the Deacons who heard it and of many other members of the church who very strongly expressed their dissent from its teaching. The outline furnished me by some of the Deacons as well as the outline which appeared in Monday's press (Aug. 3rd) would certainly lead one to have his opinion—and I am informed that you were reported in the press in the fairest terms. Under the circumstances, the Deacons thought it wise to cancel the engagement for the following Sunday and I fully concur in their action. It could scarcely be called peremptory as it was the simplest way in which they could dissociate themselves from and safeguard the church against a recurrence of teaching which they regarded as erroneous."

To this, under date of Aug. 19, Mr. Horsman replied in part as follows:

"I note your entire concurrence in the views and action of the Board of Deacons. . . . There is nothing that I would wish to retract in either the sermon or the letter."

Mr. Horsman's Sermon.

In the sermon which caused all the trouble Mr. Horsman said that Jesus did not bear men's sins in a literal sense, that He did not bear the guilt of their sins, that He did not bear their penalties, but that He bore the sins of men in His sorrow of heart, in His suffering of body and fortune and in His service of love which was necessary for the deliverance of sin.

"How can one person bear the sins of another?" he asked, and speaking to the proposition that Jesus did not do it in a literal sense, said in part:

"I have heard people speak as though God actually picked up our sins and put them on Jesus. But that is manifestly impossible. Sin is not a thing of substance, an article, a commodity. It has no form, weight, or size. You could not scoop together a bushel of sins. All the sins of all mankind would not weigh sixteen ounces. Moreover, we must remember that when Christ died nineteen hundred years ago we had not yet been born. How absurd, then, to think that Jesus actually bore the sins that had not yet been committed by

people who were not yet in existence. Evidently the expression, 'He bore our sins,' is a figure of speech, what the grammarians call a metaphor. He did not really bear our sins, but it is as though He bore our sins."

"You cannot make an innocent person guilty," he stated on the second proposition. "Guilt attaches only to one who has himself done wrong or has aided and abetted another in doing wrong."

"There is no legal or theological jugglery," he added, "by which even God himself could lay upon the holy and stainless Christ the guilt of men's sins." God, he said, could not have laid on Christ the penalties of sin because He could not feel any displeasure toward one innocent of wrong doing.

Minister's Theory.

Christ, the preacher endeavoured to show, bore men's sins in His suffering of body and fortune similarly to a wife murdered by a drunken husband.

"It is her husband's sin that has put her to death," he said. "Human sin actually murdered the Son of God," he added.

"According to the evangelist's interpretation of the prophet (Isaiah) Jesus bore men's sickness in the sense that He went about rendering loving service that delivered them from their sickness. A mother bears her child's disease when she spends sleepless nights nursing her child to health."

We feel sure a great many Baptists in Toronto and elsewhere will have read this article with great satisfaction. It shows that the officials of the Walmer Road Church know how to take heroic action when in their judgment such action is necessary to the peace of their own church. Our Baptist people will be specially gratified with the splendid letter of Dr. John McNeill. While acquitting Mr. Horsman of any intention of "stirring up controversy" in the Walmer Road Church, he insists that that is exactly what his sermon accomplished. Thus Dr. McNeill recognizes that the modernist who uses the pulpit of an orthodox church to propagate his views, is the real disturber of the peace, and not the orthodox officials who seek to preserve the life of the church from corruption.

Dr. McNeill's letter is entirely free from the nonsensical suggestion that "Baptist liberty" confers upon a modernist preacher the right to disturb the peace of the church over which Dr. McNeill presides. He says: "The sermon was decidedly at variance with the views of our people on Christ's bearing of our sins. That was the opinion of the deacons who heard it and of many other members of the church who very strongly expressed their dissent from its teaching." On that ground he says: "The deacons thought it wise to cancel the engagement for the following Sunday and I fully concur in their action." Replying to Mr. Horsman's complaint, Dr. McNeill says: "It could scarcely be called peremptory as it was the simplest way in which they could dissociate themselves from and safeguard the church against a recurrence of teaching which they regarded as erroneous."

That is to say, that when the Pastor and Deacons of Walmer Road Church were convinced that the pulpit had been used to teach that which was contrary to the standards of the church, although it had been so used in only one address, they did not wait to appoint a commission to enquire into Mr. Horsman's teaching, but sent him a telegram cancelling his engagement for the next Sunday, thus making a repetition impossible; and this they did, Dr. McNeill says, to "dissociate themselves from and safeguard the church against a recurrence of teaching which they regarded as erroneous." We have never anywhere read a saner deliverance on such a subject than is contained in Dr. McNeill's letter: it is positively a classic. And we have no doubt it sets up a standard which will be quoted in many instances in the future.

We call attention to the fact, also, that Mr. Horsman reports that he sent a manuscript of his sermon to *The Canadian Baptist*, but that the Editor refused to publish it. We believe the decision of the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* in this matter was eminently right, and in accord with a resolution incorporated in the report of the Publication Board at the last Convention. That resolution, while recommending that the columns of *The Canadian Baptist* should be open for the discussion of denominational problems, contained these words:

"Since *The Canadian Baptist* is the official organ of this Convention and is published for the propagation of Baptist principles, this resolution is not intended to propose the opening of the columns of *The Canadian Baptist* for the expression of principles subversive of Evangelical Faith."

Since the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ is the very heart of Evangelical Faith, the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* was undoubtedly right in refusing to give currency to views which were opposed to that great truth.

We publish *The Toronto Daily Star's* article with these comments in *The Gospel Witness* because we feel certain it will be reassuring to the whole Denomination. Dr. McNeill and two or three of the Deacons of Walmer Road Church are members of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; other members of the church are members of the Senate, and some are on the Faculty. Their action in the Horsman matter will, no doubt, be a valuable precedent for the guidance of our educational affairs. The Denomination may now rest assured that in future, so far as the Walmer Road members of the Board of Governors and Senate of McMaster are concerned, if at any time it should be shown that views "decidedly at variance with the views of our people" are being taught by any member of the McMaster Faculty; or, if one holding such views is proposed for a position on the Faculty, instant action will be taken by the authorities of the University to "dissociate themselves and safeguard (the University) against a recurrence of teaching which they regard as erroneous." For surely everyone will recognize that if it be unwise to permit a visiting preacher, whose views are erroneous, to preach a second Sunday as a supply, it would be still more hazardous to retain such an one in, or appoint such an one to a permanent position on the teaching staff of the University.

Furthermore, we may hope that under the influence of this decision, whenever it becomes necessary for any pastor or church member to protest against false teaching, they will not in future be regarded as "disturbers of the peace"; but will be treated with the respect due to those who endeavour to "safeguard (the Denomination) against a recurrence of teaching which they regard as erroneous".

And if at any time it should be necessary to take prompt action against a false teacher, to prevent his having another single opportunity to spread his "erroneous views", by the application of the principle of Dr. McNeill's letter, we may be sure such action will not be called, by such men as the Walmer Road officials can influence, "peremptory"; but, on the contrary, it will be recognized as "the simplest way in which they could dissociate themselves from and safeguard (the Denomination) against a recurrence of teaching which they regard as erroneous".

We have no disposition to analyze the extract from Mr. Horsman's letters published above, beyond saying that Mr. Horsman's worst enemy could not have done him a greater injury than he has inflicted upon himself by the publication of his letters. Our Walmer Road friends will not be much disturbed by his strictures. From a study of Mr. Horsman's letters, we conclude that he is as far from truth in his estimate of his own intellectual superiority as he is in his theological views.

Mr. Horsman's "professor of English literature" may call the action of the Walmer Road Deacons "silly", and Mr. Horsman himself may describe it as "childish"; but we are sure that those who wait on the ministry of the Walmer Road pulpit are accustomed to stronger meat than Mr. Horsman has ever learned to serve. Mr. Horsman says: "Occasionally I have wondered whether I took the wisest course in resigning from Walmer Road twenty years ago. I shall wonder no more. I should have stifled in an atmosphere where it is perilous to suggest a different idea from that to which the congregation is accustomed, and where people want to hear only what they already believe." It is probable that Mr. Horsman has not been alone in his wonder, for we have always supposed him to be a very amiable gentleman of whom many had become very fond; but if there was any lingering doubt in the minds of any as to there being justification for the protest against Mr. Horsman's teaching made twenty years ago, his recent visit to Walmer Road will have for ever dispelled it. Mr. Horsman may now enjoy the satisfaction of knowing that Canadian

Baptists will almost unanimously agree with his present judgment, that he did right to resign the pastorate of Walmer Road twenty years ago.

We suggest to our readers the wisdom of filing this particular copy of *The Gospel Witness*, for surely the unity of the Denomination is quite as important as the unity of a particular church.

"THE CANADIAN BAPTIST" AND DR. J. FRANK NORRIS.

The Canadian Baptist of last week published some news of the Texas Convention—most of it from Dr. S. S. Scarborough. We expect nothing complimentary from Dr. Scarborough about Dr. Norris. Anyone who is on speaking terms with the Editor of this paper becomes a target for the darts of the inspirer of *The Canadian Baptist*. To earn the bite of *The Canadian Baptist* is a high compliment to any Christian minister. We print below an article from *News and Truths* published and edited by Rev. Boyce Taylor of Kentucky. It speaks for itself.

FRANK NORRIS' VICTORY.

The Texas Convention by gag-law and by use of the steam-roller denied the messengers from Frank Norris' church seats in the Texas Convention. Here is what *The Oklahoma Messenger* says about it. Bro. Stealey is in sympathy with the other side just as far as decency will let him be so that this report is not from Norris' friends—

"Later on the Secretaries presented the application of the Messengers from the First Church, Fort Worth, and Dr. F. M. McConnell immediately arose and objected to the consideration of the question. This brought on considerable confusion with efforts to debate and ask questions amounting to debate on an undebatable matter. Dr. Norris was on the platform and sought to have the matter considered, but when the question was put, a large majority voted against consideration, probably 50 voting against the objection. Many did not vote at all. We presume there was hardly ever any doubt as to the action the Convention would take in the matter.

"Dr. Norris had announced that he would speak in the Methodist Church from 12 to 1. This matter was not settled until after half-past twelve but we understood that the Methodist Church where he was to speak at 12 o'clock was filled long before that hour and they waited until he had arrived. He spoke two or three times in the Methodist Church, we understand, and also at least twice in the open air to large gatherings."

The president of the convention is Judge of the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas. Yet he did what no decent judge in any court in America would do, namely, condemned a man and his church without a hearing. That is gag-law of the worst type. That is machine rule, worse than Tammany Hall in its worst days. That is suppression of free speech. That is Bossism and Autocracy of the Jesuit order. That was the most costly steam-roller victory, however that Truett, Brooks, Scarborough, Groner, Cranfill and the machine in Texas ever won. Somebody says, how did Norris win, if they refused to seat his messengers?

1. He won just like the Lord Jesus did on Calvary. He prayed: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." While Truett was bitter and vindictive, Norris was tender and forgiving. That is victory. The Bible says so: "Better is he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a city."

2. He won many sympathizers. That is his best win always.

3. He won in that over the vigorous protest of The Machine an amendment to the constitution was passed, to the effect that no man could be on the Board of Directors, who received any financial help, support or salary therefrom.

4. But his greatest victory was in this. That is the biggest and most humiliating defeat ever handed Geo. Truett in Texas. Bro. Truett was announced a good while ahead to speak at the Convention Hall on Sunday afternoon. The people of Wichita Falls, where the Convention was held arranged on Saturday for Frank Norris to speak at another auditorium on Sunday afternoon. And Bro. Truett and The Machine decided that they had better pull off Bro. Truett's appointment, as Frank was going to walk off with the crowd. And the city authorities offered Frank the Convention Hall. He

spoke for two hours uncovering the rottenness of The Machine and the evolution in their schools before a vast throng of people. We call that the most notable victory of his life.

5. One other thing. Note that report again. Just one short sentence. "Many did not vote". Machine politics and steam-rollers and gag-law make for that always. The timid and the ignorant are like "dumb, driven cattle". They don't vote. But folks that don't vote, don't give either. That is why they reported bigger debts and smaller receipts than last year. When people get afraid to vote they are cowed and have lost interest and initiative. They don't give. That kind of preachers don't put on programs nor budgets nor anything else. Whenever men get afraid of the denominational whip, and of the steam-roller, they have lost the very thing The Machine wants them to have when they get home, namely, initiative to put on the 1926 program next year. But it never works that way. Cowards and sycophants and puppets and tools of the Machine aren't the kind of men to put on big programs of any kind anywhere. We have lots of very interesting reading about that just as soon as the Minutes of the Kentucky District Associations get out.

DR. GOODCHILD IN "A PRETTY FIX."

In our issue of August 6th last we commented upon an article by Dr. Frank M. Goodchild in *The Watchman-Examiner* on the Northern Baptist Convention:

"Dr. Goodchild says that the Seattle Convention 'was thoroughly Baptist'. He mocks at the possibility of anyone's being able to 'put something over' in a Baptist assembly. Referring to the action of the Convention on the Park Avenue Church matter, he says, 'The Convention proved itself true'; and again, 'The Convention has spoken'; and once more, 'Now let us regard the question as settled, and set ourselves diligently to doing our denominational task.'"

We then wrote as follows:

With a full knowledge of Dr. Fosdick's position, the Park Avenue Church called him as their pastor. He accepted the call on condition that neither immersion, nor sprinkling, nor any form called baptism, should be made a prerequisite to church membership. The Park Avenue Church accepted his terms; and in a circular broadcast throughout the Continent announced its action in the "Statement on Behalf of the Joint Board of Deacons and Trustees, read to the Congregational Meeting of the Park Avenue Baptist Church". In reciting the difficulty experienced in finding a suitable pastor, these words occur: "Advice and suggestions were sought from men holding responsible positions in institutions affiliated with the denomination. Dr. Fosdick was the outstanding figure, and was recommended to your officers by practically everyone consulted"; thus showing that many holding responsible positions in the Denomination advised the Park Avenue Baptist Church to call to its pastorate one whose teaching was known to be destructive of everything for which Baptists have historically stood.

All this will show that the action of the Park Avenue Church was not taken without full consideration of all that action involved in its relation to the Northern Baptist Convention.

Again, we would remind Dr. Goodchild that the official group controlling the Convention, were so determined that the Fosdick delegates should be seated, that they proposed to invoke that clause of the constitution of the Convention which provides for voting by states; and that it was under the threat of that action, and on the specious plea that the Park Avenue Church had not yet put into effect its new policy, they secured the seating of the delegates of the Park Avenue Church.

Moreover, the Park Avenue apologists were so determined that they opposed a motion proposed by Dr. Gravett, and supported by Judge Freeman and other influential members of the Convention, and by their action deliberately and willingly incurred the risk of splitting the Convention. Upon what, then, does Dr. Goodchild base his assertion that the matter is now settled? Upon a resolution that was passed at the Saturday morning session? That resolu-

tion was passed with the consent of the modernist group; and as a result of almost pathetic overtures made to the enemy. There was only one clause in that resolution which had real value. That clause is printed in black type in the resolution which follows; and that clause, by amendment, was struck out:

"RESOLVED, Therefore, that we do hereby express our keen regret and emphatic disapproval of the course announced by said church, which has given and will continue to give, much pain and disquietude to large numbers of the churches, associations and conventions affiliated or associated with this Convention and its denominational program and thereby tends to defeat and destroy unity, efficiency and co-operation, and we hereby express to said church our keen and fraternal hope that it will not pursue the course it has announced, which in the opinion of this Convention would result in making this church thereafter ineligible to accredit delegates to this Convention. That this expression is the more necessary in view of the action of this Convention heretofore taken in holding valid the credentials of the delegates because the church has not yet put into effect and operation the plans announced and that therefore the status of the church at this time in relation to this Convention was unchanged."

If the modernists allowed that resolution to pass in good faith, and had any intention of giving heed to its admonitions, why did they strike out that clause? The proverbially thick hide of a rhinoceros is as the flimsiest gossamer in comparison with the sensibilities of a modernist.

The Editor Prophesies.

We venture therefore, to utter a prophecy, and ask our readers to preserve this article and mark it and see whether its prophecy comes true. Our prophecy is that this resolution will prove to be absolutely valueless; and that at the meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention in 1927 Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick will be selected to give the key-note address; or, in some other way, will be honoured by the Convention. We have a vision of the whole Convention rising to its feet amid tumultuous applause as Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick appears on the platform. The delegates from Dr. Fosdick's church will be seated in 1927 in the Northern Convention as they were in 1925. Dr. Goodchild and others who have imagined that the battle against Modernism can be won by negotiating with the enemy, will discover that their policy has sold out the Denomination to Unitarianism; and they will have no recourse but to withdraw from its fellowship, or surrender their principles.

We now have before us an article by Dr. Goodchild in *The Watchman-Examiner* of December 31st, entitled, "Here's a Pretty Fix", from which we quote as follows:

At a meeting of the executive committee of the Northern Baptist Convention, held November 17, 1925, in Chicago, important action was taken on a matter that will come up for decision at the next meeting of the Convention in Washington. The report of it is found in the issue of *The Baptist* for December 12, 1925. The report reads: "The law committee was requested to consider and report upon the following matters:

1. Whether the amendment to the Convention By-laws Article 1 Section 2, (Annual, 1925, page 244) as proposed is so in conflict with either the Convention Declaration or the Act of Incorporation as to render it inoperative.
2. Whether the notice is still in the hands of the proponents and whether signers can withdraw their signatures.
3. To what extent, if any, the proposed amendment can be amended from the floor of the Convention.
4. The effect of the adoption of the proposed amendment upon the merger contracts and agreements with the Free Baptists."

The announcement looks innocent enough. Read as we usually read things in these days when there is so much to read, it might give one the impression that our executive committee is very carefully guarding the interests of the Convention. No one could possibly have any idea of the direction in which this action looks unless he had before him a copy of the Convention Annual

that has just been issued. But the Annual is in the hands of very few of our constituency of more than 1,300,000 members. Indeed, it is not seen by a great proportion of our nearly 9,000 pastors. Yet the announcement of the committee's action is as unintelligible as the handwriting on the wall in Daniel's time was to the Chaldean astrologers and soothsayers, unless the Annual is at hand. The record of the action, obscure and unintelligible as it is, has been published, as far as we know, only in the columns of *The Baptist*, and *The Baptist* comes under the eyes of only a few of the Baptists of the Northern Baptist Convention. Surely since the action taken is a matter that concerns vitally every Baptist church, in thirty-four States of the United States, and indeed every Baptist in that vast territory, the widest possible publicity should be given to it, and the announcement should be made with unmistakable clearness.

Dr. Goodchild's whole article is admirable. There never has been any difference between the theological position occupied by the Fundamentalists' Committee, of which Dr. Goodchild is the Chairman, and the Baptist Bible Union: the only difference between these two bodies has consisted in the failure of Dr. Goodchild's Committee to recognize the true character, or, to use a still deeper word, the true nature of Modernism. Dr. Goodchild, and the splendid men who stand with him, will yet learn that one cannot change a Bengal tiger into a domesticated tabby-cat by tying a blue ribbon, called "resolution", around its neck. The fact is, Modernism has no respect for truth or honour; it has no conscience; it comes by the inspiration of the Lawless One, and is itself lawlessness; it aims to destroy absolutely the authority of the Son of God. When this is understood, believers see clearly that they can have no fellowship with it, and that to maintain any kind of diplomatic relationship with it is exceedingly dangerous.

When men have chloroformed their consciences, it is not difficult to evade the terms of any resolution. No resolution, and no constitution, can bind a modernist: the only safe attitude to assume toward Modernism is an attitude of belligerency. We do not know how the Executive Committee of the Northern Convention will accomplish it—the *how* matters very little—but we are certain that they will find some way to include the Park Avenue Church in the membership of the Northern Convention, and to put Dr. Fosdick forward to lead the whole body into Unitarianism.

Sooner or later Dr. Goodchild will have to lead his Committee to declare war. Those who know his sterling worth, and his absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ and to the faith once for all delivered to the saints, will believe that when at last he is convinced that war is inevitable, he will appear in his true character as valiant for the truth. The Baptist Bible Union cares nothing for a name, nor for any particular organization: it has been established for the purpose of conserving the faith as held by Baptists. Whether the members of the Fundamentalist Committee will become members of the Baptist Bible Union, we do not know; but we are sure of this, that in fraternal and co-operative endeavour they will be found standing shoulder to shoulder against the common foe.

PROSPECTIVE D.D.'S.

Any educational institution which has the legal right to confer honorary degrees is bound to wield great influence over a certain type of mind. In the political realm knighthoods and peerages, while they have often been conferred in recognition of distinguished service to the state, have sometimes been given as a reward for political hood-carrying. Honorary degrees also may be conferred as a reward for a kind of work that cannot well be paid for with money.

McMaster honorary degrees are supposed to be conferred as a recognition of service rendered. In the estimation of the McMaster powers-that-be, for the last few years, no service has surpassed in value a bitter hostility to Jarvis Street and its Pastor. It has seemed to us that some brethren have, for some time, been endeavouring to earn the favour of McMaster by excelling in this particular direction. We have found ourselves wondering who would be likely to be selected for this recognition at the spring convocation of Mc-

Master? Looking abroad over our ministers, on the principles above enunciated, it seemed to us there were two brethren, each of whom was especially deserving of an honorary degree as having merited the favour of McMaster in this particular. We therefore take pleasure in nominating for the degree of D.D., the following brethren: Rev. W. E. Hodgson, Pastor of Temple Church, Toronto; Rev. Hugh McDermid, of Ontario Street Church, Stratford.

We suggest that our readers put this particular copy of *The Witness* on file, that when this distinction is conferred upon these brethren, they may know why they have been selected for recognition!

THE ADVANTAGES OF "CHRISTIAN" EDUCATION.

McMaster University is supposed to be a "Christian" school of learning. Its representatives make their appeal on the ground of the special advantages of a "Christian" education. We have no doubt whatever that when such professions are genuine, and the education afforded is essentially "Christian", the advantages are very great. We are in a wondering mood to-day, and we wonder whether that which we report below would be included by Christian parents as among the "advantages" afforded by McMaster University? The following item is taken from a Toronto paper some time before the middle of December. If this sort of thing is encouraged in McMaster we need not wonder that so many of our churches are becoming so paralysed by worldliness:

HEARD IN COLLEGE HALLS.

McMaster "Stunt Night"

"Features of 'McMasterrifics' fifth edition, presented by McMaster men's student body in Castle Memorial Hall last evening, included Dan McGrew and the lady whose name was Lou, Charlie Chaplin and Big Jim McKay, freezing merrily in their shack in the Yukon; a feud situated in the mountains of Tennessee, and a touching movie, 'The Bootlegger's Daughter'.

"Clarencia Vichert shouldered the burden of producer for the evening, Henry Good was assistant producer, W. J. Riddiford was musical director, Carlos Mitchell looked after the stage and property, while Lawrence Mason and Colin Campbell shared the duties of the business department."

THE FRUITS OF MODERNISM.

Dr. J. H. Farmer, Dean in Theology at McMaster University, on more than one occasion has stood sponsor for the Rev. Oliver C. Horsman. We are informed that Dr. Farmer was not wholly without responsibility for Mr. Horsman's becoming pastor of the First Baptist Church, Edmonton. We have also been told that it was not Dr. Farmer's fault that he was not called to a certain important church in Ontario. We wonder how far Dr. Farmer will approve of the following, which is taken from one of the Erie, Penn., papers of January 4th?—

Free Vaudeville at Night Services for Erie Baptists.

"Free vaudeville acts from a local theatre will be given every Sunday evening at the First Baptist Church here, it was announced last night by the pastor, the Rev. Oliver Horsman, at the close of a surprise evening service in which two acts appearing at a local vaudeville house, a reel of moving pictures, and choir music, made up the program.

"In a special statement to his congregation last night, the Rev. Horsman declared that he has made arrangements with a local theatre for the appearance each week of the various acts. The Rev. Mr. Horsman explained his reason for the experiment by stating that in the past the attitude of aloofness adopted by the church in its relations with the theatre has accomplished no conspicuous good.

"I hope this church will feel kindly-disposed toward actors and actresses, treating them for what they are worth as real human beings like the rest of us", was the concluding statement."

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

NO. 1.

Lesson 7

FIRST QUARTER

Feb. 14, 1926

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.**LESSON TEXT:** Seventh chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with lesson text: Luke, chapter 6.

I. THE DANGER OF JUDGING.

It is impossible for men with their limited knowledge of each other to judge justly. We cannot know the hearts of men, nor judge of the motives from which acts spring, nor do we know the special tendencies of each other's natures. 1. We are told there is a law which causes our own judgment to react upon ourselves: Haman builds a gallows for Mordecai, which proves his own destruction. This principle operates everywhere in life. 2. Most of us have more than we can do to judge ourselves, and that is the only safe course: it is better that we should judge ourselves than that we should be condemned with the world. 3. Only as we are rid of imperfections ourselves are we qualified to judge others—and that will never be in this life. Christ applied this principle when He said to the sinful woman's accusers: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her."

II. THE DIVINE READINESS TO ANSWER PRAYER. (verses 7-11.)

1. God's gifts are conditioned upon our asking for them. This is asserted as a fact: ask, seek, knock. We must not expect to receive that for which we do not pray. 2. The reason for His principle is not hard to understand, because it necessitates daily communication with God. It was of that daily communication the son in the parable wearied when he said to his father, "Give me the portion of goods that falleth to me." He wanted to be relieved of the necessity of asking frequently; he wanted to be independent. It is just as necessary for the soul to have daily commerce with God as for the lungs to have constant commerce with the air about us. 3. Our Lord suggests that God is not less willing to hear our prayer than parents to respond to their children's requests. That would, in itself, involve a great promise; but (4) He goes further and asks, How much more shall our heavenly Father give good things to them that ask Him. Here is a suggestive phrase,—“How much more”? Consider the wisdom of God, the inestimable wealth, the unlimited power, and the endless life of the Father which is in Heaven; and in view of these things enquire, “How much more”?

III. THE GOLDEN RULE. (verse 12.)

This is but another expression of the principle, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” What applications of the golden rule we can make! Ask the question, How should we like others to speak of us? What would we desire that others should refrain from doing to us? What would we like others to do for us? This is a high standard: to be so utterly unselfish as to love others as we love ourselves, and to spend ourselves in their service as we should delight to have others spend themselves for us.

IV. THE BROAD AND NARROW WAYS.

1. There is a way that is called “broad,” that knows no restriction. There is a demand for broad-minded men to-day: men ask for broad and liberal views. 2. This way is largely patronized, it is the way of the majority; but (3) it is the way that leads to destruction. To follow the majority often means to commit suicide. 4. There is a way that is called “strait.” In that way some things are prohibited, some things are said to be wrong and dangerous. The people who walk therein are called strait-laced and narrow-minded. 5. It is said there are but few who find it. Those who go by this way must be willing to be in the minority, to be called peculiar, and fanatical, and many other things; but (6) it is the way that leadeth unto life; it is the path of the just

which shineth more and more unto the perfect day. Application: these verses afford a fine opportunity to press upon the scholars the question, Which road will you take? Will you choose destruction or life?

V. CHRIST PREDICTS THE COMING OF FALSE PROPHETS.

1. They come in sheep's clothing; they come in the guise of true religion; they come with the speech of orthodoxy on their lips; and are transformed into angels of light. 2. But their message has destruction at its heart. They are as ravening wolves who kill the sheep. 3. A rule is given for their identification: they are to be known by their fruits. Thus we may distinguish between Fundamentalism and Modernism: Fundamentalism leads men who have gone astray like lost sheep into the fold of the Good Shepherd, making them safe and contented; Modernism breaks down all standards, and makes men a law unto themselves, and leading them into the wilderness, leaves them a prey to the wolves of sin. The rule may be applied to the effect of the teaching of these opposite religions upon the lives of churches: Fundamentalism has established churches, has organized mission enterprises, has built colleges; Modernism only steals churches, corrupts mission enterprises, and converts colleges and theological seminaries into pest-houses. 3. The treatment to be accorded false prophets is suggested: like a tree that brings forth only evil fruit, it should be hewn down.

VI. HEARING AND DOING.

The concluding verses of the Sermon on the Mount admonishes men to be doers of the Word and not hearers only. 1. Our Lord refers to a day when God will put a difference between the false and the true. Let us ever keep that clearly before us, that a time of judgment is coming. 2. He tells us that in that day God will require more than a record of a religious profession. Teachers will do well to be faithful by their scholars and make it clear that mere church membership and religious profession does not insure salvation. 3. The proof of the genuineness of our religion is to be found in its translation into character and conduct. The mere professor is likened to a man who built his house upon the sand; and the possessor to the man who built his house upon the rock. To trust and obey is the only safe course.

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

ANOTHER GREAT DAY IN ZION.

Last Sunday was a day of special interest and profit in Jarvis Street Church. We were most happily surprised by a visit from Dr. George Ragland, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Lexington, Ky.; Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Roberts, General Superintendent and Primary Superintendent, respectively, of the Lexington First Church Sunday School; and Mr. G. P. Bobbitt, the Associate Superintendent. They paid us the compliment of coming all the way from Lexington to study our great Bible School. Dr. Ragland graciously consented to preach at the Sunday morning service. It was a glorious message from I Corinthians 4:6, "Nothing beyond that which is written", in which Dr. Ragland set forth three great principles: that in the written Word of God we have the finality of judgment, the finality of revelation, and the finality of authority. It was one of the greatest, if not the greatest, sermon this writer ever heard. After more than twenty-one years as a Professor of Greek, Dr. Ragland came into the pastorate of First Baptist Church, Lexington, only three years ago. We predict that before very long Dr. Ragland will be recognized as one of the greatest preachers in America, and his services will be in demand from one end of the Continent to the other. We count it one of the highest privileges to have made his acquaintance, and to rejoice in his friendship; and we hail him as one of the mighty defenders of the faith.

At the evening service the Pastor preached to a capacity audience, on I Peter 1: 22-26, in which he replied, in part, to Professor Marshall. Several responded to the invitation at both morning and evening services. The attendance at the morning School was 1,169, including 420 in the Pastor's class. Four were baptized at the evening service.