

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, FEBRUARY 11th, 1926

No. 42

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE IMPORTANCE OF MOTIVE IN BIBLE STUDY.

The first lecture of a series on "How to Study the Bible," by Rev. T. T. Shields, delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Tuesday evening, January 9th, 1923. (See note at end of lecture.)

(Stenographically Reported)



THE Bible is a great continent of truth, which no man has ever fully explored. If we were able to understand all that is written in this Word, we should soon weary of it. You may have heard of the man who professed to be an infidel, who was asked by a friend what book he would choose if he were shut up in solitary confinement for life. Instantly he replied, "I should choose the Bible." But his friend said, "You do not believe it." "No," he said, "I do not; but it is no end of a book." And that is true: it is no end of a book. But many young disciples ask, "Is there a path into the interior? How may I find my way to its hidden stores? How may I hew a path through its forests, and possess myself of its hidden riches?" The Bible may be likened to a shoreless and unfathomable sea. Is there a star by which we may safely steer our ship if we set sail upon it, or a chart and compass by which we may safely navigate this mighty ocean?

I shall endeavour, in these lectures, to avoid technicalities, and to speak in the simplest way on the assumption that there are some people here who do not know very much about the Bible. That may not be true of many of you; but I have no doubt that some of the young disciples here have found it so vast a Book that they have been lost in its immensity. I have no rules to apply this evening, but I shall try to lay down certain principles which will be useful for beginners, and which must hold throughout our study of this inspired Book.

Some years ago when in London, one Saturday afternoon I received a telephone message. There was a gentleman from Toronto on the other end of the line. He said that he and his wife were staying not very far away from where Mrs. Shields and I were staying, and that as they had the afternoon free, we might go sight-seeing together. We agreed to his suggestion, made an appointment, and started on our sight-seeing tour. We had no programme, and he suggested that we begin with the British Museum. That is not much for anybody to attempt of a Saturday afternoon! However, he suggested that we begin with the British Museum because it was not very far away. We went into that great central hall where millenniums in stone were looking down

upon us, speaking of the splendour of empires which had long passed away. This gentleman looked around with unseeing eyes; he saw a large room, but in those carved figures of antiquity he saw nothing particularly interesting. We walked about among those silent witnesses of vanished greatness, until at last he spied, over in the corner of that great hall, a sign, "Tea Room." "Why," he said, "Here is a restaurant, that looks good to me. Supposing we go in and have a cup of tea?" And as he had proposed that we should go together, I thought in courtesy, I must accord him the position of leadership. So we agreed, and we went in and sat down in a very comfortable tea-room and had a very enjoyable cup of tea, for which, I remember, he paid the bill. We were not there very long, and when we came out he looked around and said, "Well, I think we have seen all there is to see here. We shall be able to say that we have seen the British Museum."

That was rather an amusing experience; but I found much comfort in it afterwards. The gentleman does not come here now, but he used to come. And sometimes I thought he was rather bored when the Pastor preached; but I comforted myself by remembering that he took to the British Museum a "cup of tea" appetite, and that was all he brought away.

That is the way some people come to the Bible. They cross its threshold; they turn its pages, and persuade themselves that they know something about it. I have gone at another time, indeed many times, through that great treasure-house of wonders to which I have referred, the British Museum, and I have seen a "Cook's Tour" group of tourists gathered about some point of interest listening to a guide talk for five or ten minutes like an auctioneer saying his piece; then they go away persuading themselves that they have learned something. It is thus some people try to study the Bible. They listen to sermons and to lectures and they think they have tapped the great resources of this Book. But I have seen other men in that great Museum shut away in a corner with priceless books about them, carefully studying and making notes; really digging for treasure. And we shall understand and appreciate the Bible only as we really labour to do so. I am not speaking of reading the Bible, but of studying it. And I warn you at the outset that I, at least, know of no royal road to learning. You young people know what it is to apply yourselves at school with all diligence to the acquisition of secular knowledge. The same application is necessary if we would "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." There are men who work from early till late in acquiring wealth. There is no other way by which we may possess ourselves of the wealth of this Book, for it will not yield its treasures to the indolent. It will not give up its secrets to the careless. It is only by searching the Scriptures that we can know and possess the wealth they contain. All that by the way.

In the study of God's Word *Motive is more important than Method*. As we approach this Book we must enquire why we are studying it? what do we hope to learn? and why do we desire to know what this Book has to teach us? Few of us are prepared to spend time talking with men who come to us merely to argue with us. I know a man of whom a friend of mine said that he would rather argue than eat his dinner. He appears to be never so happy as when engaged in controversy. He is in that belligerent mood always; and I frankly confess when I see him coming, if there is a way round, I endeavour to make my escape; for there is no profit in argument for argument's sake.

The Bible is a living Book; and if you come to the Bible merely to argue with it, it will not talk to you. You will find that the Bible will be like the Incarnate Word. They asked Jesus certain questions, and He answered them not a word, because He knew the motive that lay behind the questions. And the Bible will not speak to the man who comes merely to prove his own case: it will not yield its secrets to him.

When a doctor is called in and the case is put in his hand, how seriously he addresses himself to the task of discovering what is the matter with the patient; and how carefully he gives his counsel, because he knows that his advice has been asked by somebody who wants to follow it, and who is dependent entirely upon his direction.

It is very important, therefore, that we should approach the Bible in a right attitude. It will always speak to the poor and needy; it will ever be found

ready to advise the ignorant; but, like the One of Whom it speaks, the proud it will always know afar off. If we would enter into this great treasury of truth we call the Bible, we shall have to do as Peter did when he entered into the empty sepulchre of our Lord: we shall have to "stoop down," we shall have to humble ourselves.

This attitude in our approach to the Word of God involves an assumption of its value. You cannot profitably study any subject without some subjective capacity for the understanding of that subject. You will not trouble to ask direction of a man you meet on the road unless you have reason to believe that that man is qualified to direct you. If you know that he cannot give you the information you desire you will not waste your time seeking his counsel.

We need, therefore, in this matter, a working hypothesis. We have to begin at least with an assumption that the Bible is true; and if we come to it in any other way, questioning its truth, while I do not say that it will absolutely refuse to speak to us, I am certain that we shall not be enriched by its wisdom. You cannot approach any book without some subjective assumption respecting its character, and as we come to the Bible we must ask, What is the Bible to us?

Well, then, if it be true, it is a book of divine origin; for it claims that for itself. It is either all that it claims to be, or else it is utterly valueless; and if it be divinely inspired, then this Bible is in a class by itself. I want you to clearly understand that. We sometimes speak of the Bible as literature. We are to study it for its history, for its poetry, for its ethics; for its philosophy, for its style, for all kinds of things, and we are to study it side by side with other books. Now, I insist that you cannot turn to a page of this Holy Book without meeting with the Bible's demand, that it be given a place apart. For instance, I give you one or two illustrations of it. The Old Testament begins, "In the beginning God"—we need not concern ourselves for the moment as to the human author of Genesis, for the book assumes in its very first verse that it is in a position to speak to us about "the beginning"—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." The very first verse of the book of Genesis requires me to believe in its divine inspiration, for it speaks about "the beginning," it speaks about a matter concerning which no mortal has any personal knowledge, or ever did have such knowledge. It speaks of that which antedated the creation. Therefore, the human author writes about something concerning which neither he nor any other mortal could possibly have first-hand knowledge; hence if he does not speak by virtue of an authority conferred upon him from above, what he has written is utterly worthless. And you will find that all the way through the Old and the New Testaments the Bible implicitly demands that it be accorded a place entirely apart from all other books.

And I am convinced that we shall properly understand it only as we accord it that pre-eminence. It is literature. It is the inspiration of the best of all literature. There is no literary store comparable to that of this Book, and that is not to be explained by the culture of a particular age; it is to be explained by the fact that sublime truths must be clothed in appropriate language. The grand style of this Book is but the drapery of the divine figure of Truth it enfolds.

I do not say that the Book has no message for those who do not so regard it. Jesus came to a blind man and opened his eyes. Later He met him in the temple, and said, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" And he said, "Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him?" And Jesus said, "Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee." And he said, "Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him." His eyes were opened by Jesus before, he knew Who Jesus was. And the written word, by the blessing of God, may be used to open the eyes of the blind when they do not even know that this Bible is the Word of God. But as soon as their eyes are opened, and they make the acquaintance of the Book, they recognize it is the Word of God, and respond to its authority, even as the man whose eyes had been opened, bowed to the authority of the Word Incarnate.

The Bible on every page claims for itself a supernatural origin. It is of a supernatural character all the way through. The protest of modernism is made against this very principle: it denies the supernatural character of the

Book. It says it is to be accounted for on natural grounds. We must distinguish between revelation and inspiration. By revelation we mean the supernatural communication of the divine thought to men. By inspiration, as applied to Scripture, we mean the supernatural impulse which moved and directed men to write an accurate record of that revelation. There was a revelation of God before there was any record of it. Abraham had no book, Noah had no book, but they knew God. God revealed Himself to them, and moved others to write a record of that revelation. Hence we must distinguish between revelation and the record of revelation. Some time ago, when discussing these matters with a Modernist, I enquired, "Do you believe in the principle of divine revelation?" He replied, "If you mean by that any sort of extramundane revelation, no." He believed that all that could be known of God was received by purely natural means; and denied that God ever communicated His thought to His creatures supernaturally.

I warn you young people to be on your guard against that, for that is the attitude of Modernism. It denies that God has spoken in any supernatural way or that He has ever wrought in any supernatural way; but rather that He has shut Himself up within the laws He has made, that He cannot, or, at all events, does not, suspend them, and that He works only by natural laws. Hence, the denial of the virgin birth, and the miracles, and the supernatural character of the Scriptures as a whole.

Now I say that this Book will quarrel at every point with everyone who holds that view. You cannot walk in agreement with this Book unless you are prepared to admit its supernatural character, unless you believe that it is divinely inspired, that it is something different from any other book; that the Spirit of God is in it as He is in no other book; that He speaks through it as He never spoke through any other book,—that it is indeed the very Word of God. It is written, "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." And I believe the same may be said of God's Word: he that cometh to God's Word must believe, if he is to experience the riches of God's grace, that it is God's Word; and that, therefore, it is true, and that God's promises therein recorded must be fulfilled.

We come now to what is logically involved in this, the necessity for a subjective preparation of heart, in order to an understanding of the Bible. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Do not be surprised when men deny the truth of God's Word; nor when you hear one say, "I cannot understand the Bible"; nor if another one say, "I have no interest whatever in the study of Scripture;" do not be surprised; because unless he has by a new birth been brought into agreement with the truth of Scripture, unless his nature is changed, it is impossible that he should understand or that he should profit by its perusal. We should save ourselves from a great deal of trouble if only we could bear that principle clearly in mind. A recognition of that principle would rule the rationalist out of court in matters requiring spiritual judgment.

And that accords with the nature of things. It is psychologically as well as theologically necessary that there should be a subjective capacity for the appreciation of objective truth. For instance, some of you boys are particularly fond of mathematics. You could sit up all night studying mathematics, couldn't you? But your sister, perhaps, cannot get through her lessons at all, and she asks you to help her out. Or perhaps it is the other way; for there are some mathematical women, especially when they go to market. In any event, we all know that we have our natural aptitudes. I have heard a mother say, when speaking about the progress of her children in school, how each displays a special aptitude for particular subjects, one delighting in that which is distasteful to another. It is natural that it should be so. The objective lesson in each case may be the same; but the subjective qualifications for the study of the subject are different. It is not difficult to distinguish a true artist when he sits down at the piano. I have heard people, who were supposed to be musicians, play like a piano, only not quite so accurately. They were mechanical. There was no soul, no expression. But another sits down and has scarcely touched the keys when everybody wakes up. It is not the fingers that are playing; the music is the expression of a soul. Yet the score may

be the same in both cases. What is the difference? Simply that "the soul of music is the music of the soul;" and if there is no music within, it cannot come out: that is all.

I remember a home where I used to board some years ago. A sister of the family was, by courtesy, called an artist. She used to "paint." There was no doubt about it: beyond question, she "painted"! Her brother-in-law was a good man, a very plain man, and greatly appreciative of his wife's family. One day he asked me a question: "Which do you think is the more beautiful, nature or art?" I thought it was rather a clumsily expressed question; but I said, "Well, I think art is beautiful just as it approximates the perfection of nature." "I do not agree with you," he said, "let me show you something." And he took me into the parlour, and pointed to something that was framed, and which I will not attempt to describe. He stood off quite proudly and said, "Did you ever see anything in nature like that?" I studied it carefully and with what self-control I could command, I said, "No, I do not think I ever did." I never did! And I am morally certain no one else ever did. But that good man really thought his sister-in-law was an artist. That vulgar mass of colour was to him a work of art.

The same principle holds in all realms of thought and understanding. I knew a certain young man some years ago, who if he was riding in a car, if anything went wrong with the engine would be likely to look in the back tire for it. He was destitute of a capacity for understanding mechanics. You might talk with him forever about wheels, but he could not understand you. But he could appreciate a picture. He loved the best music, but he could never understand anything mechanical. It was not in him. I think educationists might profitably bear these principles in mind. No one can make a musician of a person who is not so born. You may develop one, but you cannot make one. You cannot make an artist unless God has first made him an artist by nature. In other words, in order to development and perfection in any of these directions, you must be born to the thing in which you are to be perfected. It is that which is within which will determine the measure of your perfection. All that men can do for themselves or for others is to develop and train what God has given.

The same principle holds in spiritual things. That is what Jesus meant when He said, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." The things of the kingdom belong to another realm, and the natural man has no faculty, no capacity, for the understanding of spiritual truth. As we come to the Word of God, therefore, we must remember, above all things, that it is necessary that we be spiritually prepared for its understanding. Somebody here perhaps will say, "But, sir, I do not claim to be a Christian; but I do confess that I have begun to find an interest in the Bible." I am glad to hear that, if that be true; because, do you know what it means? It means that the sun is coming up, that the day is breaking. Jesus touched the eyes of the blind man and He asked him if he saw ought, and he said, "I see men as trees, walking." He did not see clearly, but it was the beginning of that work which Jesus later completed by enabling him to see all men clearly. And even the beginning of spiritual interest in the Word of God is an evidence that the soul has been touched by the Spirit of God, for interest in spiritual things is divinely inspired. And there is the foundation for true faith.

It is necessary also that we should have a spiritual purpose in the study of God's Word. We may be spiritually prepared for an understanding of spiritual truth, but with respect to an understanding of a particular precept or principle we shall be enabled to understand it only as we are ready to obey it. Let me show you what I mean. You study the history of the Bible, what for? For the sake of the historical knowledge it supplies? Now, the Bible is not unhistorical, I have a quarrel with any man, I do not care who he is, who dares to tell me that there is one thing recorded in that Book as fact which is contrary to fact. It may be contrary to what we think to be fact, but there is nothing in it contrary to what is established as fact. But while there is nothing unhistorical in the Bible, it was not written, primarily, to teach history. Nor is there anything in the Bible that is unscientific, albeit you might read it forever and never become a scientist. It does not teach science. It will always be found in accord with the proven facts of science, but it will never

teach you science. It is written for another purpose: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." That is what the Bible is written for. It is written for a spiritual purpose. For instance, let me give you a further example of what I mean. Supposing some Paedobaptist friend here this evening were to say to me, "I should like to sit down with you for a couple of hours to study the subject of baptism. Will you assist me?" I should reply, "If we find from the Scripture that you ought to be baptized, will you be baptized?" And if that person should say, "No," I should answer, "Then such study would be waste of time." The Scriptures relating to baptism were not written merely to prove the truth of immersion. They were written to give direction to those who would obey the Lord's commandments. And if you do not want to obey the Lord's commandments it will not teach you. We must come to the Word of God, if we are going to get profit from it, not merely for our intellectual satisfaction, but in order that we may learn the will of God, and walk in His ways. The Bible is the most practical book in the world, and unless we are ready to obey its precepts and principles we shall miss much of its treasure.

It follows, therefore, that if we are to understand the Word of God it is absolutely necessary that we should depend upon the illumination of the Holy Spirit. He is the Author of the Book. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." I shall not say one word to discourage anyone that would seek the most thorough mental equipment in order to the understanding of the Bible. If there are young people here who have a college course in view, or who are in the midst of it, I congratulate you. I advise you to develop your intellectual powers to the utmost, and you will be all the better equipped for the service of God. The Bible puts no premium upon ignorance. It gives no special promise to the mentally dull; but it does implicitly lay the emphasis upon a spiritual attitude and temper, upon a mind that is responsive to the teaching of the Spirit of God. And that is why many a man of little education who has almost to spell out the word of Scripture, gets further into the heart of it than many a distinguished scholar who depends upon his scholarship rather than upon the Holy Spirit.

Some years ago I went to a country place, and the pastor said to me, "I am going to show you a curiosity." And he took me to the shop of the blacksmith at the four corners. The curiosity was the blacksmith himself. The pastor said that he was a man of about forty years of age, and that he had been converted three or four years before. At the time of his conversion he was absolutely illiterate: he did not know the alphabet. But after his conversion he desired to learn to read that he might read the Word of God; so he got his little girl who was attending school to teach him. He began with the first book; and little by little, by patient application he learned to read, and immediately he took to the Bible. And this pastor told me that he had already at that time gone through the New Testament carefully forty times, and how many times he had read the Old Testament, I do not know. The pastor wanted me to talk with this man, who literally had not read any other book in the world but the Bible, to observe his remarkable mental development. So I went down and talked to the village blacksmith on many subjects. And do you know, it seemed to me that in the study of this Word, he had climbed a tower. Instead of being shut within the narrow limits of his own natural understanding he had been lifted up so that he could look over the walls and beyond the mountain-tops; it seemed to me that he had a glimpse into the knowledge of all realms. He could talk on almost any subject, and he seemed to be able to give an intelligent opinion on the matter. He seemed to have mounted up with wings as an eagle, and to have become supernaturally wise.

Do you know why? You cannot give place to the thought of God in your mind without enlarging your intellect. You cannot think God's thoughts after Him and be a mental imbecile. You will see things as you never saw them before. And if I were speaking exclusively to students this evening I would say, "If you would sharpen your wits, if you would strengthen your intellect, if you would learn to think, feed your mind on that Book every day. It will help you to understand every other book that ever was written that is worth understanding, because the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

We must learn then to depend upon the Holy Spirit for our understanding

of spiritual truth. And I would like to offer encouragement to people who have had few advantages, who have to work hard every day, and have no such opportunities of study as some others have. How can you acquire a knowledge of this Book? I believe, my friend, that if a person really desires to know the Word of God and will submit to the Holy Spirit's guidance, so as to come to this Book with the right preparation of heart, He will accelerate the ordinary processes of understanding, and will lead us to a perception of the truth that will be astonishing to ourselves. That is a daring thing to say; but in no other way can I explain the rapid spiritual growth and mental development of babes in Christ which I have witnessed in my experience as a minister.

Thus, as to motive, it comes to this: that our relationship to the Author of the Book will determine our relationship to the Book itself. It is inevitable: if we are rightly related to the Author we shall be rightly related to the Book; if we love the Author we shall love the Book; if we understand the Author in some measure we shall understand the Book; and understanding the Book we shall understand Him better. Somewhere I have read of a young lady supposed to be of literary taste, who at a certain social gathering was asked by a friend if she had read a particular book. She replied, somewhat critically, "No. I confess I have not. I have tried to read it, but I could not become interested in it." "But it is all the rage," said her friend, "everybody is talking about it, and really I found it most enjoyable. I think you are missing something." She was a superior sort of girl, and she said, "Well, perhaps so. I tried, I faithfully tried to find the secret, but I had to lay it aside." Some time after this, these two, on another occasion, were at the same place, and the one who had asked the question heard the other lady, who had said she could not be interested in the book, telling a friend about the same book, and insisting that it was the most wonderful book she had ever read in her life; it was so fascinating that when she took it up she could not put it down until she had read every word of it. And her friend, who had first recommended her to read the book, overheard what she said. She turned to the person beside her and said, "Did you hear what Miss So-and-So said? Some time ago when I recommended that book to her she said she had tried to read it but had found it very dull. And now she is enthusiastically recommending it to her friend." The other friend smiled and replied, "Have you not heard?" "No," said the other, "what is the secret?" "Only this—that she is engaged to be married to the author." That made all the difference.

And that is the secret of understanding this Book. From beginning to end the Bible is a volume of love-letters. If we love the Author, and really desire to know what He would say to us, we shall be diligent students of His letters.

And if this Bible is to any of us a neglected Book, it is because we have grown cold toward the Lover of our souls.

This, then, is my introductory word, that important as is the preparation of the mind, a spiritual preparation of heart is absolutely essential to the profitable study of the Bible.

Editor's Note:—Owing to Dr. Shields' absence we shall print, instead of the weekly sermon, a series of addresses on "How To Study The Bible," delivered by him in the spring of 1923 and issued in booklet form. "Witness" readers have enquired respecting this series, and we print in response to many requests. The second address will appear in next week's issue.

LAST WEEK AND NEXT.

Last Sunday morning 1,157 were present at the Bible School, and several professed conversion. In the evening eight were baptized, a large number responded to the invitation, and fifty-five received the hand of fellowship at the Communion Service. Immediately at the close of the Communion Service Dr. Shields left to fulfill an engagement in the South.

Dr. R. E. Neighbour, one of America's outstanding Bible expositors, will preach morning and evening next Sunday, Feb. 14th.

Dr. Neighbour in all his preaching exalts the Christ of the Bible, and we anticipate great blessing for next Sunday. Dr. Neighbor will teach the Pastor's Class at 10 o'clock.

Editorial

A REVIEW OF THE EDUCATIONAL CONTROVERSY.

We remember reading some years ago a sermon by Mr. Spurgeon in which he discussed some very familiar aspects of gospel truth. We believe, but are not sure, that he was discoursing on the subject of faith. In introducing the subject he remarked that he had spoken upon it many times before, but that it was necessary to say the same thing over and over again in order that people might remember. Then he said that while in the country he had seen a man dibbling beans. He dropped three into each hole, and as he went on his way he sang:

"One for the worm, and one for the crow,
And let us hope the other will grow."

In the discussion of the matters now engaging the attention of the Convention it seems to be necessary to go over the same ground again and again. We propose, therefore, in this article, to restate the steps we have taken in the present controversy, in order that we may make quite clear what is really the issue before us. At London, in 1924, the Convention placed itself on record in the plainest terms. The issue before the Convention was not the admission to McMaster University of a modernist professor, but the honouring of a modernist educator outside of the Convention, by conferring upon him an honorary degree. And in unmistakable terms the Convention expressed its disapproval of any action on the part of the University that could, by any means, be interpreted as an endorsement of Modernism. The resolution which carried the Convention, and which the Editor of this paper moved and the Chancellor of the University seconded, was in the following terms:

"Whereas, discussions have arisen from time to time within this Convention regarding the action of the Senate of McMaster University in granting certain honorary degrees, therefore be it resolved,

"That, without implying any reflection upon the Senate, this Convention relies upon the Senate to exercise care that honorary degrees be not conferred upon religious leaders whose theological views are known to be out of harmony with the cardinal principles of evangelical Christianity."

During the period between the Convention of 1924 and September, 1925, it cannot be charged against the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, even by his worst enemies, that he said or wrote anything that could disturb the peace of the Denomination. We were anxious about the filling of the vacant Chairs in the University. We knew, from experience, how difficult it was to criticise a professor's teaching without seeming to attack the professor himself. Therefore, in order to avoid anything of that sort, in our issue of April 23rd we wrote the following:

"Prevention is better than cure! When once a professor has been appointed, if his position is discovered to be unsound, it is impossible to raise opposition to his teaching without introducing personal considerations. In this article we are not discussing unsound professors but vacant Chairs, and dealing with principles in the abstract. It is to avoid the necessity of holding discussions involving persons this article has been written. We respectfully suggest to the Senate and Board of Governors that the utmost care should be exercised in even considering men to fill the vacancies referred to, to see that they are in cordial agreement with the great doctrines of supernatural Evangelical Christianity."

We had no part whatever in the appointment of Professor Marshall; nor did we spend so much as a postage stamp in the investigation of Mr. Marshall's views. We assumed, as we think we had a right to assume, that the Governing Bodies of the University would respect the oft-repeated expressions of the Convention, and exercise every care to appoint a man who would be in harmony with our theological position in this Convention. Without our seeking them the letters written by the Rev. W. M. Robertson came to our hand. (It ought to be plainly stated again that Mr. Robertson was asked by someone what Mr.

Marshall's position was, and he replied according to his own knowledge of the subject.) When these letters came to our hands, we did not give them publicity, but embodied them in a written statement which we read to the Senate, suggesting that in view of these letters it would be wise for the Senate to re-examine the case. To have done less than we did, in our judgment, would have been to be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty. The Convention now knows how that communication was received. The minutes of that meeting were recorded; they were read at the Convention in Hamilton; and have since been broadcast through all the churches. In view of the reception accorded us by the Senate, there remained nothing for us to do but to appeal to the Denomination. Consequently, these letters were printed in *The Gospel Witness* of October 15th, and the whole matter was submitted to the Convention. The Convention saw fit, mistakenly, as we think, to endorse Professor Marshall's appointment.

Since that time, however, many things have occurred. Mr. Marshall has preached on many occasions, and we have had the opportunity of reading articles which he wrote while still in England. In *The Canadian Baptist* of February 4th, there is an article entitled, "Let Us Have Peace," which is, according to the Editor, "from the pen of a well known leader of our people, a layman". This writer speaks in part as follows:

"During the last four months, to go no further back, our theological faculty, and one member of it in particular, has been held under a high-powered searchlight, with the result that *not the slightest deviation from the straight lines of evangelical teaching has been disclosed.*"

This anonymous authority therefore tells us that "not the slightest deviation from the straight lines of evangelical teaching has been disclosed". We do not know whether this writer is a Baptist Rip Van Winkle, or whether he illustrates the proverb, that "there are none so blind as those who won't see". Let us again examine the case:

WHAT PROFESSOR MARSHALL SAYS:

(From a sermon preached in England, entitled, "What Baptists Stand For".)

"Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship. We are not in any way bound by the traditions of the past, but are perfectly free to welcome all light and truth from whatsoever quarter they come, in the sure confidence that all light is God's light and all truth is God's truth. Living in personal loyalty to Christ, we have at the same time open minds for all new truth which God vouchsafes to reveal to mankind through any channel."

(From a sermon preached in First Ave. Church, Toronto.)

"To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite a crucial importance for which there is no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense."

The testimony of some of the students. Excerpts from addresses given at the protest meeting held in Jarvis St. Church, January 14th.

STUDENT WILL S. WHITCOMBE:

"But what of Professor Marshall's view? In a case such as we have described, where the teaching of science and the statement of Scripture are in direct opposition to each other, we enquired from him what his attitude would be. He unhesitatingly replied that under such circumstances he would choose science. He stated that he believed that he must accept truth from whatever quarter it came. We recall that the phrase he used was that he could not go to God with a lie in his mouth.

"Most of our Canadian Baptist people will not believe that a man does go

to God with a lie in his mouth if he accepts the plain teaching of Scripture, even though that be in contradiction to the teaching of modern science. To the dogmas of modern science they would reply with the Teacher of teachers, "It is written."

STUDENT GORDON BROWN:

"Mr. Whitcombe and I have had, on two occasions, personal conversations which I do not regard as confidential, with the said Professor Marshall.

"What have these things shown us? For one thing, they have shown us most distinctly and absolutely that he does not hold to belief in the plenary, and full, inspiration of the Word of God; that the Bible from cover to cover—not, of course, as it appears in the King James, but as it came from the sacred writers—is through and through inspired of God.

"Another matter: when we were talking about the article which I had written in *The Prophet*, the Professor said that what I had said about his attitude on the question of the historicity of the book of Jonah was quite right—mark that—quite right! He believes that that book is only allegory, and not history. But what did Jesus say? He said, 'As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly: so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth'—and I do not regard Jesus as a myth! 'As Jonas was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth', that was what Jesus said. But suppose we grant, for the sake of argument, that that is only an analogy that the Jews knew about, and that Jesus did not necessarily mean that that was history?—grant that, but go on and read the rest of it. Do not stop with a little, take the whole dose,—that 'the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it'; that 'the queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it.' I suppose there were men who lived in Nineveh? that there was a real queen of Sheba? I believe there was a real Jonah who went down into the fish, and that by and by the fish vomited him out, and that he went on his way preaching the gospel as the Lord had given it to him. I prefer to take Jesus as an Authority on these questions; I would rather take His word than that of any theological professor."

STUDENT FIELDUS:

"On another occasion Professor Marshall greatly astonished me when he stated in my presence, that any man who accepted the historicity of the book of Jonah, and its literal interpretation, would find very few churches open to him in the Old Land, because he would be considered an uneducated fool! I state again that is what Dr. Marshall said to me; and I am prepared to stand to-night by that statement. (Applause). I would suggest to those who are in doubt about the question—do as I did: interview Professor Marshall.

"After such a statement coming from the Professor, I did not publish it from the housetops, but, instead, interviewed the Dean in Theology. I told him exactly what Professor Marshall had stated to me, for I was greatly disturbed,—who would not be? Do you blame me? ('No! No!') I stated to Dr. Farmer that I could not accept Mr. Marshall's position; and furthermore, I could not conscientiously defend Mr. Marshall in this present controversy when he held such views. Again I ask, Do you blame me? My interview with the Dean in Theology left me sadly disappointed. I did not think that Dr. Farmer would adopt an attitude of tolerance toward a view of the book of Jonah which implicitly denies the authority of Jesus Christ. Our conversation was lengthy, and my confidence in the Dean was shaken when, in effect, he stated that he would rather fellowship with men like Dr. Faunce and Dr. Fosdick, than with men who are well known for their orthodoxy, but who manifest a bitter spirit. You can interpret that just as you like!

"I interviewed the Professor Tuesday afternoon of this week, and asked him in a straightforward way if he really believed that the book of Jonah was only an allegory and not an historical narrative; and he restated exactly what he said to me before, adding that the one who accepts the literal interpretation of Jonah becomes the laughingstock of the world."

Does this distinguished layman, whoever he may be, mean to say that the

man who regards those who believe Christ's statement about Jonah, and who therefore believe in the historicity of that book, as "uneducated fools"—does this distinguished layman mean to say that Professor Marshall has not deviated from the straight lines of evangelical teaching? Is it to this we have come in the Ontario and Quebec Convention? If that be so, then we are greatly mistaken if there are not many thousands of "uneducated fools" who will be heard from in such a way that the authorities of McMaster will never forget it as long as they live.

THE MEETING OF THE McMASTER ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

A meeting of some of the alumni of McMaster was held a few days ago in Toronto. Resolutions approving of McMaster, of Professor Marshall, and of Dean Farmer, were passed. Some very bitter things were said, but we are inclined to think that the efforts of the body to cudgel the Denomination into an acceptance of the present condition of things will prove abortive.

First of all, what is this Alumni Association? It is, of course, made up of the graduates of McMaster. What are the terms of membership? Nothing more than that they will have graduated from McMaster University. They may be Baptists, and probably a large proportion of them are, or they may be Catholics or Jews or Unitarians—or nothing at all, that does not prevent their holding membership in that Association. We were told by one graduate of McMaster University that probably at least a third of those who assembled in Toronto were not even members of Baptist Churches; a large number of them probably would not belong to any evangelical church, and make no profession of religion whatsoever. But they came together to pass resolutions to mould the opinion of a Baptist Convention!

From the reports given there were not very many ministers present, we should have expected a very much larger number. But we call our readers' attention to the fact that we have within the Denomination an organization that is not Baptist; that does not require even a profession of religion on the part of its members; and that this organization exists to determine the course of a university which Baptists own. This surely suggests the necessity of another organization within the Convention which shall be composed exclusively of Baptists; it suggests that all the members of the Baptist churches within the Convention who really stand for the old faith and who have no sympathy with Modernism, should be brought together in a closely-knit organization which will not withdraw from the Convention, but will contend for the faith within the Convention.

We have before said that McMaster students are trained to put loyalty to McMaster before every other consideration. We repeat the statement. Poor Professor Marshall, in an hysterical speech in Ottawa which was characterized by neither good manners nor gentlemanliness, and by a spirit that could not, by the broadest charity, be called "Christian", declared that Dr. Shields was determined either to rule or wreck the Denomination. This is another case of confusion of thought which is so characteristic of the Professor. His speech, from beginning to end, was a very good description, not of the Editor of this paper, but of McMaster itself and its aims. For twenty years and more it has been endeavouring to rule the Denomination; now, apparently, it is resolved either to rule or wreck. We do, however, frankly acknowledge that we are determined to resist McMaster's rule. We will never submit to the McMaster hierarchy; and we are determined, if need be, to devote the rest of our lives to breaking the shackles it is attempting to fasten upon this Denomination.

We say to the Alumni of McMaster University, Mind your own business. The mere fact that a young man or young woman has graduated from McMaster does not entitle that person to a voice in the direction of our denominational affairs.

We call the Convention's attention once again to the serious defect in the McMaster Charter. The Board of Governors is made up of men who are directly responsible to the Convention; the Senate is an aggregation of irresponsibles; it is responsible to no one. It is composed of the Chancellor and Principals of Woodstock and Moulton ex officio; three members each from the Arts and Theology Faculties, elected by the Faculties; and four or five graduates

of Arts and Theology, elected by the Alumni of the University. No one may be elected to a position on the Senate who is not a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church; but the representatives of the Alumni are elected by the Alumni, and while they themselves must be Baptists they may be elected by Unitarians, Jews, or Catholics. Surely it is time our Baptist people were aroused to an appreciation of the danger which threatens the Denomination.

What are the facts? This new professor comes from England, unknown, and begins the propagation of his heresies here. That Professor Marshall is a modernist no one who has any knowledge of the situation at all can doubt; that his teaching is subversive of the faith no one can question; that his continuance in McMaster University is bound to disrupt the Denomination is also certain. Yet a few pastors, without discernment, and apparently with little conviction, join in leading this motley crowd of Alumni, many of whom have no Baptist responsibilities, in voicing a determination to support Professor Marshall to the end. One of the men who, according to press reports, was among the leaders on that occasion, when resigning an important denominational position some years ago, stated as one of his reasons for resigning that he could not retain his position without having to resist the strangle hold on the Denomination McMaster had obtained.

In this war there can be no surrender; there can be no compromise; there can be no tolerance of that which denies the authority of God's Holy Word. It will probably be a long war, the battle will increase, the fight will wax fiercer and fiercer,—but what of it? We cannot turn back. Better a thousand times that there should be no McMaster University at all than that it should be permitted, unhindered, to continue its present ruinous course. We are resolved, therefore, so far as *The Gospel Witness* is concerned, to prepare ourselves increasingly for a war that shall never end until it ends in victory for the truth.

A LETTER FROM A NEW YORK ALUMNUS.

We have received a letter from a graduate of McMaster University now living in New York State, enclosing copy of her reply to the McMaster Alumni Association, both of which we print below. We do not know that we ever met the writer, but the letters were sent to us by her, and are printed with her consent:

Ebenezer, N.Y.,

Monday, January 25th, 1926.

"Dear Dr. Shields:

"I am enclosing a copy of the reply I am sending to the Alumni, praying that it will arrive in time, as we did not receive notice of the meeting in time to reply sooner.

"We certainly praise God that He has raised you up to expose the professor at McMaster, and frequently pray for you personally that you may be kept so that God will continue to use you.

Sincerely yours through grace,

(Signed) MRS. JOS. J. SAOHER".

LETTER TO THE ALUMNI.

Ebenezer, N.Y.,

January 25th, 1926.

"McMaster Alumni Association,
Toronto, Canada.

"I sincerely regret that I cannot in any way enter into the spirit of the meeting called for in your letter. Much as I wish to be loyal to my alma mater, as a child of God, I must be loyal to Him first.

"After a prayerful consideration of both sides of the question, I am fully convinced that Professor Marshall will not teach the students to depend on the Word of God, but that his teaching must positively undermine their faith.

"Having seen the young students lose their faith and inspiration under the subtle teachings of Prof. Matthews, while an undergraduate, it fills me

with deepest sorrow to contemplate another such man poisoning their minds.

"Please bear in mind that our Saviour, while on earth, used very very harsh words towards religionists, without true faith in Him—Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness."

"My husband and I are sincerely praying for the day when Dr. Farmer and the Chancellor will so rectify their error that we may again confidently recommend our friends to McMaster.

Sincerely,

(Signed) HENRIETTA WILKINS SACHER '19."

THE "INCLUSIVE" PLAGUE IN CANADA.

Thoughtful Canadian Baptists must often have wondered where those anti-Baptist principles reside which periodically walk about seeking what Baptist principles they may devour. Year after year, for the past twenty years almost, in some form or another as Convention time comes, the Convention has to defend itself against these destructive principles: Bloor Street, Toronto, Convention in 1910; Ottawa, in 1919; Walmer Road, 1922; London, 1924; Hamilton, in 1925—all these Conventions are still fresh in our memory. Some, of course, would lay the responsibility for the disturbance of the peace upon the Editor of this paper, but he certainly had no responsibility for the agitation led by Dr. Harris in 1910; and his position was overwhelmingly endorsed by the Conventions of 1919 and 1924. But where does this pestilential rodent of Modernism live? It is certainly not exterminated by Convention resolutions, for no sooner has one hole been filled in than we find it gnawing its way into the Denomination's house from another direction.

The Gospel Witness has long contended that the rank and file of our Baptist people in this Convention are sound. We have said we believed ninety to ninety-five per cent., at least, of our people were doctrinally sound. We are still inclined to believe that that estimate is not an exaggeration; but we have just had a conversation with one who has had an extended interview with a certain "leader" who is not wholly unrelated to McMaster University. (At the moment we withhold his name. Had we permission to publish it, we are inclined to think that it would shock many of our people out of their complacency.) But this gentleman challenged the accuracy of our estimate; and declared his belief that the "better educated" people among us were liberally inclined, and would not now hold to the historic Baptist position. From that he proceeded to say that these people were entitled to representation in the University; that if there were more than one theological seminary one might afford to be thoroughly conservative, but inasmuch as there was only one it ought to include representatives of both schools of thought!

So that the Fosdick-Rockefeller inclusive membership principle is to be introduced into our Convention; the inclusive policy of the Northern Baptist Convention's Foreign Mission Board is to be applied to education here. The Board referred to claims that inasmuch as it receives money from both fundamentalists and modernists, it is entitled to send out both modernist and fundamentalist missionaries. So now we are to have a University to suit modernists and fundamentalists! This is an entire change of front: until last Convention the University authorities have insisted that there was no Modernism in the University; that it was still orthodox in every part. On that occasion, however, the attitude of the Dean in Theology was brought out, both in the minutes of the Senate, which were read to the Convention, and in his own Convention speech: there, while professing himself to be a conservative, he pleaded for tolerance, for a view of the Scriptures that would permit the inclusion of every theological liberal in the world who is not an avowed unitarian.

In the new professor's sermon preached in England on, "What Baptists Stand For," he also advocated the same principle when he declared that "some of our people (Baptists) are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad."

Now that Modernism declares itself in the University, our people are to

be prepared for the "inclusive" policy. But who are the people who are to be placated by this inclusive policy? Who are the supposedly "better educated" among us? For many years we have been accustomed to hear the representatives of McMaster discourse on the advantages of a "Christian" education; we have been told that it is exceedingly desirable that our young people, who have no thought of entering the work of the Christian ministry, but who seek a university training for equipment in other professions, should be educated in Baptist schools; we have been told that this would result in our having Baptist lawyers, and Baptist doctors, and Baptist school teachers, engineers, and so on. And Baptists have been supporting McMaster University supposing that they were really doing God service by producing a generation of "educated" Christians. Now we are told that the better educated do not, and will not, accept the old view of things, but demand a liberal interpretation of Christianity. We suppose the "better educated" who demand that their views shall be represented in the University's teaching have been produced by McMaster itself. So it would seem Baptists have been paying for the education of a generation of people who would now destroy the foundations of the Denomination in whose schools they have been trained.

We are not surprised that this "inclusive" policy is now being advocated. We remember protesting to the Dean in Theology against his attitude toward the so-called "Student Christian Movement". That that is an infidel movement there cannot be a shadow of a doubt. In our travels to and fro we have met a number whose faith has been absolutely wrecked by this accursed Movement that has taken to itself the Christian name. We believe the Denomination ought to know that the Dean in Theology favoured that Movement; and so did a number of other professors. When we protested against his attitude to Dr. Farmer, he asked us if we did not think that we ought to go into the Movement to save it! At which time we asked him why then we should not go into the Roman Catholic church to save that, and into the Paedobaptist bodies to save them? Why, indeed, we had thus far maintained a separate existence? If the way to save non-Christian or anti-Christian movements and organizations be to go in with them, what reason is left for our separate existence as a denomination? And if we are now to have thrust upon us this new "inclusive" doctrine, why call ourselves Baptists at all? Why not spread ourselves through all the denominations? If that be the way to do, why should not McMaster be merged into Toronto University to save that? Why should not its Theological Faculty be mixed up with Victoria and Knox and Wycliffe to save them? The fact is, this doctrine of "inclusiveness" is of the Devil; and will do the Devil's work. The Christian church exercises what power it has by virtue of its non-conformity to the world; and Baptists will be influential with other denominations, and with the liberal interpretation of the gospel, just in the measure in which they keep themselves absolutely separated from these things.

But this will be the doctrine which will soon be preached from McMaster University, for that institution is beginning to preach it already. When McMaster's modernism is discovered and unmistakably identified and revealed before the world, certain men will cease to deny that Modernism exists in McMaster; but will spend themselves in justifying it. This is a prophecy: in a very little while we fear *The Gospel Witness* will have occasion to say, "I told you so."

WHERE WILL THE MONEY COME FROM?

Our educational authorities must be in sore straits for money. The professors have long been wretchedly paid. While we do not agree with the views held by many of the professors, we have always believed that their salaries were shamefully small. But we do not see how it can be otherwise: the only way of bettering conditions in McMaster is to bring the Institution close to the hearts of the people and make the entire Denomination feel that the University exists to serve the churches by training men who will fearlessly declare the whole counsel of God.

The McMaster endowment is too small to make a successful operation of the University possible. The value of money has greatly declined in the last

ten or fifteen years, but the professors have had very little increase. When the Forward Movement was launched it was agreed that McMaster's share in that Forward Movement should not be capitalized, but should be spread over five yearly periods and spent for the relief of the professors by increasing their salaries. Wise leadership would have suggested that the five years of relief afforded by the Forward Movement be spent in cultivating the good will of the Denomination, so that when the fifth instalment was exhausted the Denomination might be ready for an Educational Forward Movement on a sufficiently large scale to afford permanent relief. Instead of that these five years have been spent in inflicting on the Denomination needless and senseless irritations.

The policy of McMaster University has had the effect of dividing almost every church in the Convention. They tried first to destroy the Pastor of Jarvis Street—and it did have the effect of dividing Jarvis Street Church and sending out from its membership three hundred and forty-one people. Since that time over sixteen hundred have come into the membership, with a result that Jarvis Street is stronger and more united to-day than it ever was in its history. In fact, it is an absolute unit in this war. There are other churches united too. But in every instance they are churches which are standing for the faith; on the basis of truth their membership has been cemented together; but wherever, under denominational pressure or for other reasons, the pastor has taken a stand in support of the University he has divided his church. Of course, resolutions have been passed here and there supporting the pastor's stand, but we know absolutely that what we say is true in respect to Toronto; for there is scarcely a service in Jarvis Street Church which is not attended by representatives of all the Baptist churches except those who are standing solidly for the faith.

We come back now to the subject with which we began. The fifth instalment of the Forward Movement is exhausted, and the income of McMaster University on salaries' account must be shrunk by something like eighteen thousand or eighteen thousand, five hundred dollars a year, at least our recollection is that that was about the amount which the Forward Movement gave McMaster yearly. And even that left the professors' salaries woefully below the standard, for we recall an application coming before the Board from the professors for a general increase of salary over and above that which the Forward Movement allowance had made possible; and when we asked what it would cost to grant the professors' request we were told about twenty-one thousand dollars. McMaster University must be nearly forty thousand dollars a year below the proper standard, and certainly eighteen thousand a year below the standard set by the Forward Movement. How can that be made up? Can it be made up from Bloor Street and Walmer Road—the churches which mainly control the educational work of the Convention? Certainly we do not believe the regular income of McMaster University can be largely increased from the rank and file of the churches. The present administration in McMaster is responsible for the deplorable condition in which the University finds itself. Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man, or an institution, soweth that shall he or it also reap!

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

NO. 1.

Lesson 11

FIRST QUARTER

Mar. 14, 1926

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS CONCERNING JOHN.

LESSON TEXT: Eleventh chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text; Luke 7: 18-35.

I. A FAITHFUL PROPHET'S QUESTIONING.

In the preceding chapter Christ has been speaking of a prophet's reward. One element in that reward is set forth in the verses which follow. 1. John's faithfulness was rewarded with a prison cell so far as men were concerned. It is

thus the world has often estimated its greatest benefactors. The praise of men is not at any time worth living for. 2. John asked of Christ a pregnant question. We need not for the moment concern ourselves with the motive. No more important question could be asked: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Is the Lord Jesus God's last Word? Has He better to send to us? Is it worth our while at all to look for another? The answer is, that He is the express image of His Person; that Heaven exhausted itself when Jesus came. 3. We have never felt quite sure of the usual interpretation that John himself had some question as to whether Jesus was the Messiah. If he had, it must have formed itself in his mind in a moment of temporary depression. We are rather inclined to believe that it was the disciples of John rather than their master who wondered that John should be left in prison. If that be so, John's course was eminently wise when he sent his disciples with their questioning to Jesus. This, at all events, is what we ought to do. There is no question which does not find its answer in Christ; and if we can but bring people to Him, all their problems will be solved. 4. Jesus replied to John's question by bidding his disciples tell him what they had seen, and the programme He was carrying out. This is always a sufficient answer. What other could possibly do what Jesus does? 5. A blessing is pronounced upon those who can accept Jesus as He is and ask for no other, and find no occasion of stumbling or of offence in Him.

II. A FAITHFUL PROPHET'S REWARD.

Since the morning stars sang together no greater eulogy was ever pronounced upon a mortal than that which Jesus pronounced upon John when He declared that no greater had been born of woman: he was not a reed shaken with the wind; he was not a man clothed with soft raiment; he was even more than a prophet. What a testimony from the Lord Himself! What a reward to covet! Yet our Lord predicts opportunities for more exalted service in the kingdom of heaven that is to be.

III. A CONTRARY GENERATION. (verses 16-19.)

In our day many are trying to adapt the gospel to the natural tastes of man. But here our Lord describes the generation to whom He ministered, and to whom John ministered, as being determined not to be pleased, no matter what approach was made. And this is ever the attitude of the carnal mind toward any word from God, for "the carnal mind is enmity against God".

IV. CHRIST TEACHES THAT A HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY RESTS UPON THOSE TO WHOM THE TRUTH IS PREACHED.

Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, are the cities He upbraids, and this because they repented not, notwithstanding in them "most of his mighty works were done". Elsewhere He says the men of Nineveh shall rise up in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas had been among them. So the gospel is a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death to those who hear it. The gospel is preached for a witness unto all nations. It is a terrible thing to do despite to the Spirit of God, and to turn a deaf ear to the Word of God.

V. HOW SPIRITUAL TRUTH IS RECEIVED. (verses 25-27.)

Here Jesus lays down the principle that "these things" of the Spirit are not discoverable to the carnal minds of the wise and the prudent, but are revealed unto babes: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned".

VI. AN INVITATION TO THE WEARY TO REST.

The concluding verses of the chapter need no exposition. Who of us does not labour? Who of us is not heavily laden? Who of us does not need a yoke to help us carry the burdens of life? Who of us does not need rest? All this is promised to those who will come to Christ.

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.