

HOW FAR APART ARE THE TWO WINGS?	Page 10
EXECUTOR OF McMASTER ESTATE SPEAKS	" 14
THAT ALUMNI ASSOCIATION CIRCULAR	" 18
B. S. LESSON	" 21

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, MARCH 11th, 1926

No. 46

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE GOSPEL IN GENESIS.

The fifth lecture of a series on "How to Study the Bible," by Rev. T. T. Shields.

Delivered in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Tuesday evening February 6th, 1923.

(Stenographically reported.)



E approach this subject this evening as those who believe that the Bible is the Word of God. I have been trying to lay a foundation for some weeks in order that we might clearly get that point of view; and I trust we believe that the first word of Genesis was inspired by One Who knew what the last word of Revelation would be: "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world"; and the end of this Book was known to Him from the beginning.

I.

I desire to put you on your guard against an *entirely different conception of the Bible*. Some time ago I used to have friends say to me in this church. "Why bother about the modern view of the Bible? There are very few people here who hold that view. Why so often refute the doctrine of Evolution? There are comparatively few evolutionists in Jarvis Street." And I suppose that was true. But some errors become atmospheric: there are moral and spiritual diseases that are not only contagious—communicated by contact; they are infectious, they are imbreathed, for they are in the very air; and unless you are careful you are liable to breathe these things in without knowing it. The popular view of the Bible, although it is not expressed in so many words, postulates the evolutionary principle: it assumes that the principle of evolution has been proved to be an universal law. And since the principle of evolution is to account for everything, it is assumed that the Bible also is the product of evolutionary law. Hence, it is taken for granted that the events recorded in the Bible, so far as the record is historically accurate, are the result of that evolutionary principle. Man was evolved, and therefore the Genesis story of his creation cannot possibly be true. It is all to be accounted for on the same ground, by the operation of the same principle. The principle is applied even to the literary structure of the Book; and if certain things are found in the Pentateuch, which the wise men say do not properly belong to that period, because things at that time had not sufficiently evolved, it must belong to a later period. Thus the Pentateuch and every other part of the Bible is to be interpreted in the light of this supposedly established principle of

evolution. The difficulty is that a great many people use the word too loosely, for the word has a very wide significance; and like any other word, its meaning is changed by use. You hear one speak of the evolution of the steam engine, or the evolution of the motor car, or the evolution of the telephone, or of radio, and a great many other things; it is a misuse of the term. Strictly speaking, the word means more than development; it presupposes an automatic development of this ordered universe by the operation of powers that are resident in the material world, that the world so to speak, has made itself. It is admitted that far back in the prehistoric past, not millenniums ago, but millions and millions of ages ago, God did something, but that since then the thing has gone on, and on, until it has come to be what it is.

I venture to assert that the *Bible disproves the evolutionary hypothesis on every page*. Some years ago I said boldly from the pulpit, "If that hypothesis be true, the Bible is untrue; for there is no possibility logically of harmonizing the two." A friend, who was supposed to be quite conservative and orthodox, said to me afterwards, "Don't you think that is putting it rather strongly? Supposing the principle of evolution were ultimately to be established; where would you be then?" I said, "Exactly where I am now. I am so absolutely certain that the Bible is true that I am equally positive that the evolutionary hypothesis is not true, and never will be established. I am quite willing to accept the consequences of that position."

I have said all this because I want now to say that *there is in the Bible a gradual unfolding, a gradual disclosure of a predetermined purpose*, on the principle that Jesus laid down when He said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Now God deals with His people as with children. He has made known His purposes a little at a time as men were able to bear it. And so you will find through the Bible a principle of development. Some people call that evolution, but in the strict sense; it is not evolution: it is simply the gradual, deliberate, and predetermined disclosure of that which was formed in the Eternal Mind before the world began; and that is vastly different from the interpretation of Scripture by the application of the evolutionary idea. The Bible reveals God in His creative and redemptive relation to His human creatures, and as such it does show a gradual development of His purpose of grace.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the light and glory of the City which is representative of the ultimate of divine redemption—I dare say that is very largely a pictorial representation in the book of Revelation—though the reality doubtless will far exceed the picture—but in that City which represents the ultimate glory of the saints, our Lord Jesus Christ is the centre: "For the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

And the Lamb is all the glory of this temple of revelation we call the Bible. He is the light and glory of every book in the Bible, of every chapter in every book, and I believe of every verse in every chapter, and, properly understood, I believe of every word in every verse. It is as full of the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ as was Moses' bush with the unconsuming flame.

II.

I desire now to call your attention to a few passages before I attempt to show you how full Genesis is of the gospel. We read, for instance, in confirmation of what I have just said, "of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." *Now this principle of divine prescience and preparation, is not peculiar to the spiritual realm.* It must be evident to all that this planet was prepared by someone for human habitation. Just now we are complaining of a shortage of fuel; but it is not because God's coal-bins are empty, but rather because God's naughty creatures won't dig it out: there is plenty of coal; and every time you shovel coal into the furnace, let it remind you that into the fabric of this material world God has built a witness for Himself, showing that He thoroughly prepared this planet for human habitation. Moreover, if you survey the whole field of scientific investigation and discovery, you will find the same principle obtains. There is nothing new in radio except our discovery of it: the first man, had he known how, might have made use of certain laws which were in operation from the beginning of creation, just as we are making use of them now. This light that we enjoy here this evening is generated by natural powers, and all that we are learning to do is to harness God's

great horses which were running wild in His world, and were put here for the very purpose of dragging our carriages and carrying our messages, and serving us in every way. For when He had made man He said, "Have dominion."

Is it not, therefore, reasonable to suppose that if God anticipated our physical necessities, and in every part of the world caused the earth to produce that which was necessary to make human habitation of that part of the world possible,—if God anticipated human need in that way and provided for it, *is it not reasonable, I say, to expect that in the moral and spiritual realm also He would go before His creatures and make provision for all their spiritual necessities?* And that is what the Bible says He has done: The Lamb was "slain from the foundation of the world." The Apostle Paul at one time thought he "ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth;" but after his eyes were opened and he learned Who Jesus was, and what He had come to do, he declared that God had "saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Then in the epistle to the Ephesians we read also that we were "chosen in him before the foundation of the world." In that same epistle Paul explains to those who read his words his peculiar and special knowledge of spiritual things. He says that it was made known to him by revelation "whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." He says, in effect, "I did not learn it, I did not discover it for myself; but He made known these things to me by revelation which in other ages were not made known unto the sons of men as they are now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." They were there in the mind of God before the foundation of the world; but in other ages they were not known as now God has been pleased to reveal them, but now the Apostle Paul says: "It has been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." And when Paul's letters are read we are to understand why he is able to write as he does,—because the Holy Spirit has drawn the veil and revealed these things to him. Now if that is not inspiration, I do not know what it is. And that Paul claimed for his writings.

You see, therefore, the principle: *that the whole plan of redemption was ordered before the worlds were made; that God's purpose of grace was gradually revealed, and the full-orbed revelation given to us at last in the person of Jesus Christ; and that the record of that full-orbed revelation is written here in the New Testament as its gradual unfolding is recorded in the Old Testament, by men to whom that revelation was given, and who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*

Let me now call your attention to another great principle laid down by Paul in I. Corinthians 10, referring to the pilgrimage of the children of Israel, and their wilderness experience. He says: "All these things happened unto them for ensamples", or types. He is referring to a certain historical period of Israel's history when they worshipped the golden calf, when they departed from the Lord: and of those things he said, "All these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the ages are come." He actually says that *the historical events themselves—not only the record of them, but the historical events themselves, were providentially ordered by the hand of God, for figures, or types, or examples, for illustrations, as a sort of moving picture rehearsal, all staged by God Himself.* There it is on the stage of history; and he tells us that God found somebody to write it down for our admonition, "upon whom the ends of the ages are come." Therefore we are justified in looking to the historical portions of Scripture for illustrations of the principles of the gospel.

If you were to listen to one of our Modernist friends, lecturing, for instance, upon Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, he would tell you that God never said to Abraham, "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac;" but that Abraham was influenced by the people around him, and that he misunderstood God altogether: he only imagined that God commanded him to offer a human sacrifice. Indeed they would explain all the history of God's people by the influence of environment. There, of course, comes in the application of the evolutionary principle to the interpretation of history. They implicitly deny that any distinct voice from heaven has been heard.

But now take the light of the New Testament back into the Old Testament for a moment for an interpretation of these things, and you will find in Hebrews, the eighth chapter, a word like this: "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." "The true tabernacle" is set over against that which was pitched by man. Of the priests we read, "Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." Then in the ninth chapter of Hebrews we have these striking words: after saying that "without shedding of blood there is no remission," the writer continues: "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." He tells of the purification of all the furniture of the temple, that every thing was purified with blood; but he says that these things were "the patterns of things in the heavens": they were not the pattern of something in a neighbouring tribe; they were a pattern of things in the heavens. But where did Moses get it? He says, "Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." Thus the epistle to the Hebrews tells us that the tabernacle with all its elaborate ritual was made after the pattern which was shewn to Moses in the mount; and that that was a pattern of heavenly things; and that these things which were the pattern of the heavenly things were purified by the blood of bulls and of goats; but that "the heavenly things themselves," the spiritual reality which lay somewhere in the invisible realm, beyond the reach of natural man, those things were purified "with better sacrifices than these." Further, he tells us that "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands," remember the altar and the veil between the holy place and the holy of holies into which the high priest entered once a year with blood, which he offered, not for himself only, but for the sins of the people,—he says, "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." So that back in Exodus, with all that dry reading as some people find it, the story of the tabernacle with all its worship—you have a picture of a pattern of things in the heavens; you have "the figures of the true": in a word, you have there an illustration of all the great principles of the gospel of grace.

There is still another passage from the New Testament that I must suggest to you. In the Epistle to the Galatians Paul refers to Abraham and his two sons: "Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory." By which Paul did not mean that the story was unhistorical: but that being a true historical record, it had a spiritual significance—"which things are an allegory." If a preacher were to-day to make such use of an Old Testament scripture, in some quarters, at least, his interpretation would meet with scant courtesy. Yet Paul was fairly intellectual, and he made such use of the Old Testament Scripture as this: "These are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." Then he goes on to say, "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." He actually finds in the story of Abraham and his two sons—the one the son of a bondwoman, and the other the son of a free-woman—the two covenants—the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, Sinai and Calvary, Jerusalem which is below and is in bondage with her children, and Jerusalem which is above, which is the mother of us all.

Perhaps somebody will say: "I am quite willing to go as far as that; but do you not think that these references you have quoted to-night have application to the particular Scriptures mentioned? For instance, you may be justified in finding that spiritual teaching in the story of Abraham and his two sons, but are you thereby warranted to treat other scriptures in the same way?" Let us see.

In the eleventh chapter of Hebrews the writer calls the roll of the heroes of faith, and concludes by saying, "The time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, and Samuel and of the prophets." Does he not mean, "I have mentioned a few of the outstanding cases. Time would fail me to call the whole roll. You do it yourself. I have told you of Abel, and Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Joseph, and Moses, and the rest of them; and if you read under the guidance of the Holy Spirit you will find the same principles operating in the lives of others whose history is recorded here." At the close of John's Gospel it is said, "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." Here is a selection of the miraculous events which characterized the life of Jesus, but "many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." And I venture to think that that passage which says that the historical events of Scripture were providentially ordered; and that which refers to Abraham and his two sons, saying, "This is an allegory designed to teach spiritual truth; and the passage which says that the children of Israel going through the Red Sea were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," and later drank "of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ,"—I say that when the gospel is thus shown to be in these historical events, I believe that *these instances are given us simply as examples to teach us how to interpret the Word of God, and that we may therefore with Jesus as our great Light go right back to the first book, and then walk through all the Old Testament, and find Him on every page and in every chapter.*

III.

How, then, shall we find Jesus in Genesis? The first chapter of Genesis: "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. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." The first chapter of John's Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." The first chapter of Colossians: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist," or hold together. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him"—the Word. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And God said, Let there be light." And *God said*,—And *God said*—and at last "*God said*, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Who created man? The Word. Who is our Creator? The same One Who is our Saviour. Jesus appears in the opening chapter of God's Word as the Creator; and as you thus go back with Him into the Old Testament you find Him in the very first verses of Scripture. He made us: we are His, and not our own.

Now, I think we ought to be interested in all the discoveries of science; we ought to be interested in all that men can tell us about this world; because it was our Lord Jesus Who made it: "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." There is a revelation of God in nature; but the revelation of God in nature is the revelation of God in Christ Jesus, because there is nothing in nature that He Himself did not put there. He is the Maker of all things: "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made."

Somebody comes to me and says, "But, sir, you theologians are too narrow. You shut people up to an intellectual apprehension of the truth, to some verbal creed; and you say the salvation of the soul is conditioned upon its acceptance

of some statement of truth." No sane man ever said such a thing. No biblically instructed man ever believed such a thing. *I venture now to say what some may regard as a daring thing.* I believe the content of the word "believe," in respect to faith in Jesus Christ, is much wider and fuller than some of us generally suppose. Those who have the full knowledge of God in Christ Jesus the Lord will be judged according to the light they have. But if somebody discovers a tribe in the interior of Africa, or somewhere in Tibet, and among them a man who has never heard a missionary, but, having seen the light of God in nature, so far as he was able to do so, has yielded himself to the great Spirit—"benighted," yes; you say,—*"a very imperfect knowledge of God";* yes; but if he has followed the only light he has had—mark, I say, "if"—if he has followed and believed in that light, may he not have believed in Christ? For the only light that ever shone from God into this darkened world came through our Lord Jesus Christ. The light of nature, though it shines less brightly, is the same light as shines in the face of Jesus Christ. If there is only a spark in nature that the soul of man sees, he will surely be judged by the measure in which he yields himself to God's light. Hence, the epistle to the Romans (second chapter) teaches that God has His witness in the human conscience, and that men "show the work of the law written in their hearts," and by that they will be judged. In this connection I commend to you a careful study of the nineteenth psalm, and the tenth chapter of Romans, particularly from the sixteenth verse to the end.

I have said all this to show you that whatever is revealed of God's wisdom, of His power, of His foreknowledge, of His predetermining will in nature; whatever may be learned from "the argument from design" that theologians used to talk about,—all these things are to be traced to the person of Jesus Christ, for "all things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." He has His part in the very first chapter of the book of Genesis, and there is nothing revealed in the New Testament which God could not have told us in the Old Testament if He had willed to do so.

What do you look at first when you pick up your newspapers? The majority of people look at the pictures first. Well, *the Bible is full of pictures: it is the greatest picture-book in the world.* Sometimes in your newspapers you see a portrait of somebody with the name under it, and you say, "What has he been doing to-day?" You turn over the page and find something written about him; but you see the picture first. *The whole gospel is pictured in Genesis, and the Lord puts some of the pictures in the first chapter of the book.* I believe there is not a doctrine of grace that is not illustrated in the book of Genesis. The great Joseph Parker, one of the world's greatest preachers, the author of "The People's Bible," said not long before he died that he would like to live long enough to preach all through Genesis again. It is a book of beginnings, and the beginning of everything as in Genesis.

I can only just touch upon certain points, to suggest subjects of study. "The Lord God made coats of skins, and clothed them." *Who made the first coat that man might appear before His Maker? God.* How were they made? They were made of skins. At what price were they made? At the price of blood—the whole principle of redemption is there, wrapped up in one verse. In the beginning *Abel offered to God a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain.* In what did the difference consist? Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, and Abel the firstling of his flock. It was blood that differentiated Abel's sacrifice from Cain's. What was the first murder about? A religious difference. And what was the basis of it? The doctrine of blood. The advocate of a bloodless religion was the first to shed blood; and if you want to be hated, if you want to feel the full force of all the powers of hell, cross the path religiously of somebody who rejects the atonement by blood, and see what he will say. You will find that the spirit of Cain is as real to-day, and as potent in human affairs as it ever was.

Following that, you have *the story of the development of human sin.* Now, if you are a disciple of the evolutionists, you read that story up to the account of the Deluge and you will not get very much satisfaction from it. I am not at all surprised that some people want to get rid of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, because it smashes their theory into as many pieces as they say there are millions of years behind it. Evolutionists talk of humanity living

itself up. But you do not find humanity lifting itself up in Genesis I to VI: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." "The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth"; and He did so.

In sharp contrast to the development of the old Adam nature in these chapters, *redeeming grace appears*: "but Noah found grace in the sight of the Lord." Read the old, old story again, and you will find a picture of the gospel. And read with it the eleventh chapter of Hebrews and the seventh verse: "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." And that is the gospel: "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

Read *the story of the Babel tower*. You ask, "Do you mean to say that that is literal history?" Yes, I think it is historical; but I think it is allegorical, too. It is history, but it is prophecy as well; for men have been building towers from then until now, with a desire to reach up to heaven by their own might, by their own skill, and always with the same result—only Babel, in the end. They all spoke one language, and they said, "Let us build us a city and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name." "And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them which they have imagined to do," so great was their collective might. But God came down and examined the tower, and confounded their speech, and they were scattered abroad upon the earth. Set beside this story of the Babel tower and the confusion of tongues, this Scripture: "Are not all these which speak Galilæans? and how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?" Of what were they speaking? By the grace and the power of the Spirit of "the wonderful works of God." Men gathered in order that they might magnify man and make to himself a name, and God confounded his speech and destroyed his tower, and scattered him over the earth. But some day He will gather them all together again, and they shall speak one language, and they shall magnify one Name, and they shall declare with one voice the wonderful works of God: "I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another."

Abraham: I could speak to you for a year about Abraham. If you could give me every night in the week, I am positive that without difficulty I could give you some fresh thing about Abraham for three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. Volumes upon volumes could be written about Abraham "who is the father of us all"—the outstanding and distinguishing characteristic of Abraham being that he "believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." In the New Testament in Galatians, we read, "He saith not, And to seeds as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Now observe, incidentally,—and I think we may learn a good deal as we go on that is incidental to the main subject—I am not speaking now of the inspiration of Scripture; but the Apostle Paul bases his argument upon the number—it is singular, not plural—"He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." That is pretty nearly verbal inspiration, isn't it? What do you suppose Paul believed about Genesis when he wrote that? Or, put beside that a saying of our Lord: "Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" I commend to you a careful and minute study of the whole story of Abraham, for it is full of the gospel. He goes out from Ur of the Chaldees in obedience to God's call; his belief in God, the supernatural birth of Isaac the child of promise,—a supernatural man, don't you see? led out to live a supernatural life, to be supernaturally guided, to be God's man separated from all the people round about him, that God might from him choose a nation and rebuild the world.

Again: You cannot come to Mount Moriah and see "a ram caught in a

thicket by his horns" without thinking of Calvary. "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains that I will tell thee of." And I think when Abraham took his son and the wood for the burnt offering (he went three days' journey) I think the Spirit of God whispered to Abraham, because I do not think all that God said to Abraham is written: He said, "Abraham, I am going to take that road myself some day. Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah: and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains that I will tell thee of. I am not asking you to do any more than I am going to do." As a matter of fact, He had done it already in His eternal plan and purpose: "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Abraham went his three days' journey and saw the mount afar off. Can you not see God marching through the whole Old Testament dispensation? That was His three days' journey! "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." "They went both of them together," father and son, in perfect agreement, going together to the mount of sacrifice: "And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him." "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son"—Father and Son consenting. They went together to Moriah's mount. And Isaac said, "Behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering." How do you know, Abraham? I think he would have said, "He told me so long ago." "And Abraham stretched for his hand, and took the knife to slay his son." But a voice said, "Abraham, Abraham: and he said, Here am I. And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me. And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns; and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son." "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." How full it is! It is perfectly legitimate, if I had time to tell you, to extract the gospel from the story of Isaac and Eliezer, and of Eliezer going to find a wife for Isaac. You may call it an allegory or not; it is at least a beautiful illustration of the mission of the divine Spirit Who finds a bride for Jesus Christ, Who has been appointed "heir of all things." Read it at your leisure. How truly did Abraham rejoice to see Christ's day!

Read also the story of the appearance of the mysterious Melchizedek in Gen. 14: 18-20; Psalm 110; Heb. 5: 6 to 7: 28. This is surely nothing less than an Old Testament appearance of our Lord Himself. Did Abraham see Christ in Melchizedek?

Then we come to the story of Jacob and his ladder,—no Babel tower, but "a ladder set up on earth, and the top of it reached to heaven." You will also remember what Nathanael said: "Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou? . . . Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." There is a Ladder whose top reaches to heaven; there is a Way to the glory; up and down those golden rounds the angel ministers ascend and descend; "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" and Jesus is The Way!

We now come to Joseph, and with this I have done. If ever I have time and ability to write a book, I think I will write a book on Joseph, only I am afraid the one would become a half dozen books; because the story of Joseph is full of the truth of the gospel. It seems to me there is no aspect of gospel truth that cannot be illustrated from that marvellous story. I offer you a few suggestions: The son and heir with a coat of many colours; the well beloved, envied of his brethren; sold for silver; imprisoned; numbered with the transgressors; a prophet: "Behold, this dreamer cometh"—a prophet from the beginning, a prophet in the prison, foreseeing the future, telling of plenty and of famine, himself a revelation of things that were to come; and because of

that, becoming himself the saviour of the nation where he dwelt and of all nations round about; filling the storehouses while men were wasting their surplus; ultimately throwing them wide open and all lands coming to him to buy bread; his own brethren who sold him for silver, and who would have slain him, bowing down before him; the sun and the moon and the eleven stars making obeisance to him, the sheaves in the field making obeisance to his; the despised and rejected being at last exalted, wearing the golden chain and the signet ring, and being next in authority to Pharaoh, and having the lives of all men in his hands: Can you read the story without thinking of Him Who prayed, "Thou hast given him authority over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him"?

That is only the barest outline, but if you could live to be as old as Methuselah, and if you were to study Genesis all the time, you could never exhaust its fulness of gospel truth. You could as easily drain the Atlantic as you could empty Genesis.

We do well to be very jealous for the honour of God's Book! Listen to no one as a Christian teacher who dares to put unholy hands upon that which God Himself has given to us to tear it from us; or to echo the serpent's suggestive word, "Yea, hath God said?" You cannot have Jesus without Genesis; you cannot have Genesis without Jesus. Genesis is the book of beginnings. He is "Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End," the King of kings, the Lord of lords. Hallelujah!

CLOSING OF CHURCH YEAR.

Our Church Year closes March 31st, leaving only three more Sundays in the year. Great blessing has rested on every department of our church life, and prosperity has attended our every effort. The Bible School has grown steadily, showing a largely increased attendance over last year; the Young People's Department, early in January, moved into the splendidly equipped annex purchased during the church year.

The circulation of *The Gospel Witness* has greatly increased. There have been large additions to the membership both by conversion and letter.

We would remind our members that our growth means increased expenditure, and while we will show the largest financial year in our history, we urge that subscribers through the weekly offering system endeavour to complete payment of all pledges before the end of March.

THE PASTOR AT HOME.

After an absence of six weeks the Pastor will occupy his own pulpit morning and evening, Sunday, March 21st. Dr. Shields will most certainly be home for the Saturday evening prayer service, possibly earlier in the week. We shall give fuller particulars next week.

THE BIBLE SCHOOL.

We were down in our attendance last Sunday owing to the snowstorm. Dr. Sowerby's exposition of the lesson in the Pastor's class was a wonderful unfolding of the truth.

The Junior Department have already reached their objective set for Easter Sunday.

Dr. Shields will teach his own class March 21st. Why not make a special effort to greet him with an attendance of 600?

NEXT SUNDAY.

Next Sunday Jarvis St. Church will be favoured in having Rev. H. H. Savage, of Pontiac, Mich., as minister for the day. Mr. Savage is President of the Michigan Branch of the Baptist Bible Union. It is expected he will reach Toronto in time for the Saturday evening prayer service, March 13th. Mr. Savage's subjects for Sunday are: "Filled with Power"; and, "The Christ of the Bible".

Editorial

"HOW FAR APART ARE THE TWO WINGS?"

The leading article in *The Baptist*, of Chicago, of February 13th, bears the above title. The first five paragraphs of the article are as follows:

"In current doctrinal discussions in the Baptist denomination reference is frequently made to "the two wings," and there is an undertone of assumption which sometimes rises even to affirmation, that there are irreconcilable antagonisms between these wings. If such contrariety exists and to such degree that it will ultimately render fraternal co-operation impossible, the sooner it is clearly ascertained and recognized the better for the cause that Baptists are trying to serve. But if it does not exist, one of the first duties at the present juncture is to isolate and eliminate the misunderstanding based upon it. Let us therefore frankly face the fundamentalist and the modernist types of thought in their actual relation to each other in order that we may intelligently chart our course in the light of the facts.

"Let us endeavor first to identify the fundamentalist type. Its formulated expression is found in a statement of doctrine set forth some years ago by the Christian Fundamentals Association. But that statement has not been accepted by any Baptist group as satisfactory and final. A second typical statement is found in the Des Moines Confession adopted by the fundamentalist conference in 1921. This confession was closely in harmony with the historic Baptist position; but it never became current. The next year at Indianapolis the New Hampshire Confession was substituted for it as a representative fundamentalist statement. This, however, was, in the nature of the case, a transitional gesture which was later superseded by something more precisely definite, viz., the latest formal creed of the Baptist Bible Union, a statement of doctrine not yet sanctioned as representative, satisfactory and final, for the whole fundamentalist group. It is perhaps enough to say that this group stands for the central values of inherited orthodoxy."

"But is not the basic position of the reasonable modernist so far at variance with that of the reasonable fundamentalist as ultimately to compel their separation? That question is germane. What is the basic position of the modernist? Perhaps no man is better qualified to state that position than Dean Shailer Mathews. He has written a book recently for this very purpose. In that book he states with studied precision and in italics the ground principle of modernist thinking in these words: 'It is the use of the methods of modern science to find, state and use the permanent and central values of inherited orthodoxy in meeting the needs of a modern world.'

"Is the principle of modernism so stated by Dean Mathews antagonistic to the faith of a reasonable fundamentalist? Perhaps no man is better qualified to give an authoritative answer than President E. Y. Mullins. He also has written a recent book having for its express purpose the warning of Christians against the perils of an anti-evangelical modernism. What is his attitude towards the use of the methods of modern science in the investigation of religious truth? In this book he says: 'It is most pleasing to say with the greatest emphasis, in this connection, that there is a common standing ground for Christianity and modern science. That standing ground may be summed up in three words: Loyalty to fact. . . . A sincere desire to know facts; a spirit of patient and painstaking investigation to discover facts; courage to proclaim what is clearly proven; modesty and self-restraint in refusing to go beyond the evidence; willingness to accept evidence of an unusual kind, provided it seems genuine; unwillingness to prejudge the evidence even when it tends against one's convictions; openness to evidence bearing upon reality of any kind, physical or spiritual—these are among the

qualities of the true Christian and the true scientist The defender of the faith . . . is willing to apply every criterion and test which the field of investigation permits.' Every fundamentalist who has spoken of the subject is in accord with this statement of President Mullins. And between his statement and that of Dean Mathews as they stand, there is not a shade of essential difference.

"What is the conclusion? It is not, of course, that there is no difference between fundamentalism and modernism; but rather that so far as they are evangelical at all they are related as two complementary emphases of a common faith. Fundamentalism emphasizes the inherited doctrinal content, and modernism the scientific method of investigation and interpretation of that common faith."

We are sorry to see President Mullins classed with Dean Shailer Mathews. We remember that in the famous Scopes trial it was reported that Dean Shailer Mathews had referred to Dr. Mullins as favouring evolution, and that later it was reported that Dr. Mullins had denied agreement with Dr. Mathews' position.

It is ever the way of the modernist to so twist the words of Orthodoxy as to make them appear to be in agreement with Modernism. Nor need any orthodox believer complain of that, for Modernism's chief impiety is to quote our Lord Himself in support of its infidelity.

This article is written in the South, in a hotel where we have no access to either of the books quoted, and the fact that these books are on our shelves at home does not help us to exact quotations here. We may, however, assume that the Editor of *The Baptist* has quoted enough from each author to enable us to justly weigh these quotations one against the other.

Let us examine President Mullins' words first, of which *The Baptist* says:

"Every fundamentalist who has spoken of the subject is in accord with this statement of President Mullins. And between his statement and that of Dean Mathews as they stand, there is not a shade of essential difference."

Let us see. We have not always agreed with President Mullins, but we believe in the "fair play" for which he so vainly pleaded at the Memphis Convention.

From the quotation before us it would appear that Dr. Mullins is discussing the relation of Christianity to modern science, and expresses his conviction "that there is a common standing ground for Christianity and modern science. That standing ground may be summed up in three words: Loyalty to fact." That, of course, is only another way of saying that Christianity is supremely loyal to truth, i.e., to demonstrated truth, and is never afraid of truth, but welcomes all truth in all realms.

Out of this, however, the question naturally arises, What is fact? By what means is fact to be identified as fact, and proved to be fact? There are facts of Christian revelation and experience which do not disclose their identity nor reveal their secrets to microscope nor telescope, and which cannot be classified nor valued by laboratory methods. *Notwithstanding, they are facts*; and to these principles of fact the true believer must and will be loyal.

But Christianity must insist that it deals with facts beyond the reach of science; that it deals with spiritual realities which are not less real because they are undiscoverable to those who are without the spiritual equipment requisite to their identification and appreciation and appraisal: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God."

We believe President Mullins means something like that; and that in saying "loyalty to fact" is a common standing ground for Christianity and science, he would include in the realm of indisputable fact many things of which mere science has neither knowledge nor consciousness, because it has no faculty for their perception.

Let us now look at Dean Shailer Mathews' statement of the case for Modernism:

"It is the use of the methods of modern science to find, state and use the permanent and central values of inherited orthodoxy in meeting the needs of a modern world."

The subject upon which the modernist will use his wisdom is "inherited orthodoxy". Here Dr. Shailer Mathews flings Modernism's unflinching sneer at orthodoxy: it is "inherited". Orthodoxy, according to the modernists, is devoid of any intellectual quality worthy a modern man's respect. Orthodox believers "inherited" their religion as they did the colour of their skin or of their hair. It is the mission of modernists to open schools for the orthodox (more often, they steal schools from the orthodox and convert them to their own purpose).

Rightly understood, of course, orthodoxy is "inherited"—it is the spiritual birthright of such as are born again of the Holy Spirit. But Dean Mathews intends no such meaning in his use of the word "inherited".

It is, however, with "the permanent and central values of inherited orthodoxy" Modernism is concerned. But what are "the permanent and central values"? Who is to distinguish and differentiate between "the permanent" and that which is not permanent in Christianity? Who is to identify "the central values"? Modernism will do this for us! Its mission is "to find, state and use" these elements of our holy Faith. Modernism will come into the house of orthodoxy without so much as a by-your-leave, and make an inventory of its contents. It will "find" the permanent—what is neither "permanent" nor "central" it will pile in the backyard for the collector of religious garbage to carry to the Sanitary Scholastic Incinerator for obsolete religious ideas.

In this process Modernism will "find" and tell us how much of the Bible has "permanent" value, and what doctrines of the gospel are "permanent and central", and will give us back a Bible marked as our letters used to be marked during the war, "Passed the censor."

But Modernism will not only "find" these "permanent and central values" for us: it will also "state" them. In what language will these "permanent" things be "stated"? They will be stated in the language of orthodoxy. It will tell us that it "finds" the Bible "inspired", and that inspiration is a permanent value. Later we shall learn that the inspiration of the Bible is of the same quality as that of all good literature. Modernism will "find" the virgin birth is not subject to proof by "the methods of modern science", and it will "state" that "the permanent and central value" of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth consists in the truth of the incarnation,—spelled without a capital to encourage us to believe that we also may become incarnations of truth. It will "find" the "vicarious sufferings of Jesus" have a "permanent" value, explaining that His example affords inspiration for the "vicarious" sufferings of a mother for her child, the soldier for his country, and, generally, for everyone who will serve his neighbour at the cost of self-sacrifice.

Thus, Modernism, ignoring and implicitly denying the Holy Spirit's ministry, will "find" and "state" what is "permanent" in "inherited orthodoxy" in such a way that many of the orthodox will not know that their inheritance has been filched away from them.

But having "found" and "stated" these "permanent and central values", Modernism will also "use" them "in meeting the needs of a modern world". Yes, Modernism knows how to "use" them deceptively to establish itself in orthodox institutions and organizations, and steal them for their own "use". It will apply these alleged "permanent" values to the mass instead of to the individual; to a man's circumstances instead of to his soul; to his mind to the neglect of his spirit. Thus Modernism will "use" what it is pleased to regard as having "permanent" value in Evangelical Christianity, by substituting education for evangelization, and social betterment for personal salvation.

And all this is to be brought about by the use of "the methods of modern science". We are sure we have done no violence to Dean Shailer Mathews' intended programme in what we have written. But who that knows anything about President Mullins' theological position will believe, as *The Baptist* says,

that "Between his (Dr. Mullins') statement and that of Dean Mathews as they stand, there is not a shade of essential difference?"

It is true the orthodox believer, as Dr. Mullins says, is supremely loyal to fact, and that "the defender of the faith . . . is willing to apply every criterion and test *which the field of investigation permits*" (the italics are ours). But when "the field of investigation" is the spiritual realm in which the facts of divine revelation find their verification in Christian experience, "the field" does not "permit" the application of "the criteria and tests" employed in "the methods of modern science."

The believing heart must say to modern science respecting these deepest and most real experiences of the spirit, "Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep." True faith is so sure of the fact of Christ; of the fact of His substitutionary death and literal physical resurrection; of the fact of the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, and hence of the falsity of everything that is contrary thereto; and is so loyal to these incontrovertibly demonstrated facts of Christian experience, that she is undisturbed by all the subtle attempts of a science falsely-so-called to destroy men's faith in the essential facts of the Christian religion.

We have regretted Dr. Mullins' tolerant attitude toward certain aspects of Modernism, but such mistakes of his as we have observed—and may we, without immodesty, say we greatly fear even so great a man as Dr. Mullins may make mistakes—have been mistakes of policy, and we may add, mistakes of expression. By mistakes of expression we mean his almost habitual ambiguity of speech.

An example of Dr. Mullins' ambiguity is contained in the quotation we have under review. Discussing the common standing ground for Christianity and modern science, among other things he describes it as being a "willingness to accept evidence of an unusual kind, provided it seems genuine; unwillingness to prejudge the evidence, even when it tends against one's convictions."

Here Dr. Mullins tells us that both Christianity and science should be willing to accept evidence providing "it seems genuine." Evidence that only "seems" genuine would not be accepted in any court of law. Unless we are sure the evidence is genuine, and in strict accord with fact, an honest man ought to be unwilling to accept it. But Dr. Mullins continues "unwilling to prejudge the evidence (presumably the evidence which 'seems genuine') even when it tends against one's convictions." If language means anything, this would imply that we should be willing to suspend our "convictions" in favour of evidence which only "seems" genuine.

This illustrates what we mean by Dr. Mullins' mistakes of expression. If the word "seems" is used carelessly, we must submit that the subject Dr. Mullins discusses is too serious to permit of the careless use of language. If, on the other hand, the word is used advisedly, it opens the way to every kind of hypothesis including that of evolution; and suggests that one's convictions may be set aside in favour of that which only "seems".

Whatever be the meaning of Dr. Mullins' language in this particular instance, we think it is unfortunate that he does not use language so clear and unmistakable as to render such an attempt as is made by *The Baptist* to include him in Dr. Shailer Mathews' school of thought so absurd as to be instantly recognized as impossible.

But what now shall we say of *The Baptist's* article, "How Far Apart are the Two Wings?" If it be true that Dean Mathews fairly represents modernists, and if we have fairly interpreted Dr. Mullins' position as expressed in the quotation we have examined; and taking into account Dr. Mullins' policies as representing an attitude of patience amounting almost to tolerance towards Modernists, if not toward Modernism; and therefore, classing Dr. Mullins with pacific Fundamentalists, we can think of no better answer to *The Baptist's* enquiry than that of the sixth chapter of II Corinthians, and the 14th and 15th verses: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

We are justified in regarding *The Baptist's* article as a representative utter-

ance. It speaks for Modernism among Baptists as no other organ in America can speak. This particular article might well have been written by Dean Mathews himself. And *The Baptist* would impress Dr. Mullins into the Modernists' army and call upon all orthodox Baptists to follow him into an unholy alliance with the enemies of the Christian faith.

What will Dr. Mullins say? Will he permit himself to be represented before the Baptist world as in agreement with one of the outstanding Modernists of the day? As President of the Baptist World Alliance, Dr. Mullins ought not to remain silent in face of what we hope is a gross misrepresentation on the part of this representative Baptist organ. The last sentence of our quotation from *The Baptist's* article reads:

"Fundamentalism emphasises the inherited doctrinal content, and Modernism the scientific method of investigation and interpretation of that common faith."

Fundamentalism emphasizes "the inherited doctrinal content" of the common faith: Modernism will "investigate and interpret" it by "the scientific method"! If this be true, "the two wings" are so far apart that the distance almost equals the breadth of the "great gulf fixed", to which Abraham referred in his terrible answer to Dives' prayer. We hope Dr. Mullins will lose no time in repudiating *The Baptist's* attempt to quote him as being in substantial agreement with such an avowed enemy of the Christian faith as Dean Shailer Mathews.

EXECUTOR OF McMASTER ESTATE SPEAKS.

Letter of protest by C. J. Holman, K.C., LL.D., copied from *The Canadian Baptist* of March 11th.

Mr. McMaster and the University.

Editor, *Canadian Baptist*:

As an executor of Mr. McMaster, the founder of the University, I crave a little space in your columns. Dr. Farmer's address at the convention was reported in your paper and copies in pamphlet form have been widely circulated. In that address Dr. Farmer makes reference to Dr. W. N. Clarke and Mr. McMaster and gives the impression that certain modernistic views of inspiration which Dr. Farmer knew to be held by Dr. Clarke, were approved by Mr. McMaster and would claim Mr. McMaster to be a "liberal." I would be recreant to the trust which Mr. McMaster reposed in me as an executor if I remained quiet. I care not what Dr. Farmer remembers or does not remember. I had very special opportunities for years of knowing Mr. McMaster's views, and I say that if there was but one person who could be called a fundamentalist that man was Senator McMaster. This destructive criticism had in his day raised its head and to it, as I knew Mr. McMaster, he was stoutly opposed; he was ever fearful lest it might find an abiding place in the institution; he spent anxious days and sleepless nights because of rather liberal views, held by two professors who at one time were on the staff, that had come to his knowledge. He was a Fundamentalist of the Fundamentalists; he believed in the Bible through and through, in its inspiration and its integrity; and he was an out and out Baptist—a Regular Baptist.

In the making of the University I was in close touch with Mr. McMaster and with all that led up to obtaining the act of incorporation; I was on the charter committee and I personally drafted the charter of the University. Mr. McMaster's moving thought was to establish a Christian school of learning for the advancement of his beloved Regular Baptist denomination, and for that purpose it was provided that no person could be elected to the Board or Senate who was not then a member of good standing of a Regular Baptist Church. There were two things Mr. McMaster anxiously sought to provide for: (1) To secure the institution to the Regular Baptists for all time; (2) To keep the institution free from destructive criticism. In the deed of the property it had been declared that it was for the educational work

"in connection with the Regular Baptist denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed of persons who have been baptized on a personal profession of their Faith in Christ, holding and maintaining substantially the following doctrines, that is to say: "The Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice, the existence of one living and true God, sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the same in essence and equal attributes, the total and universal depravity of mankind, the election and effectual calling of all God's people; the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, the free justification of believers in Him by His imputed righteousness, the preservation unto eternal life of the Saints, the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the resurrection of the dead both just and unjust, the general judgment; the everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting misery of the wicked, immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the only gospel baptism, that parties so baptized are alone entitled to Communion at the Lord's Table and that a Gospel Church is a body of baptized believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God."

Dr. Castle, President of the Theological Faculty in his report referred to this statement of faith and practice as "a most accurate and admirable summary", adding these words, "if the property is ever diverted from its use, it will not be for lack of the most precise safeguards that legal talent can devise."

Mr. McMaster defined the meaning of Regular Baptist churches in accord with the declaration of the convention of 1853 which was "that Churches which restrict their communion to baptized believers should be considered Regular; Baptists have never believed in baptism as a saving ordinance but have stressed baptism as essential to obedience. Mr. McMaster knew well the Baptist situation in England and how the "open" practice there had blighted the work; he realized that open communion leads logically to open membership and open membership to denominational suicide and he sought to safeguard the denomination from this. Mr. McMaster had the right to expect that all members of the Theological Faculty would not only inculcate Regular Baptist principles but would throw their influence and example in their support. Loyalty to the trust deed and charter leaves no room for other than a Regular Baptist (and a Regular Baptist from conviction) in the theological faculty. Mr. McMaster would in my opinion have been simply shocked at a proposal to place on the theological faculty one who was a Pastor of an open membership church in England. This appointment is a contravention of the Charter which says "no person shall be eligible for the position of a professor, tutor, or master in the faculty of theology who is not a member of a Regular Baptist Church." As might be expected, the new appointee, as I am credibly informed, avows himself to be an open communionist. Apart from any other objection to his appointment, this alone should in loyalty to the trust be a barrier to any such appointment. Objection to his appointment is not lessened by his having published in the *Baptist Times and Freeman* not long before he came to Canada, an article under the heading of "Baptists and Church Membership" in which he said:

"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."

As an executor of Mr. McMaster I here record my protest against the appointment.

Mr. McMaster was in the struggle in the early days when it cost something to be a Baptist; he was shoulder to shoulder with Dr. Fyfe and the other stalwarts in the battles which placed the denomination on its feet as one of Regular Baptists. Upon the basis of the statement of faith and practice above set out and the provisions of the Charter Mr. McMaster bequeathed his fortune and upon that basis the denomination accepted the munificent gift. Mr.

McMaster did his part and it remained for the denomination to be true to its trust.

Let me add that no greater injustice can be done to the memory of Senator McMaster than to suggest that he gave any smile of approval to destructive criticism or anything modernistic in the treatment of the Scriptures. Nothing that Mr. McMaster said will be found to afford a defence or cloak for any introduction of Modernism into McMaster University.

CHARLES J. HOLMAN.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL ADMITS HE USED THE WORDS "UNEDUCATED FOOL".

We invite everyone to read Professor Marshall's statement in *The Canadian Baptist of March 4th*. Read it carefully! Professor Marshall endeavours to raise a smoke screen but he admits that he used the words, "uneducated fool" in referring to the view he said was held in England toward those who believed in the historicity of Jonah. He says:

"What I did say was that the attitude of certain people here to the Book of Jonah would be regarded in most religious circles in England as the attitude of an uneducated fool."

Now read what Mr. A. J. Fieldus, Pastor of the Fairbank Baptist Church, said in his speech at the Protest Meeting held January 14th in Toronto:

"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!

"In the course of my conversation I told Dr. Farmer that I would be present on this platform Thursday evening, since I was involved in this controversy ('Praise the Lord!')—and I am not ashamed to be here to-night. He replied by saying that every man must face this issue for himself; but he did not think the issue important enough to split the Denomination. I faced the issue on my knees before God in prayer; and determined, before I lifted my voice in protest, that I would see Mr. Marshall once again.

"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."

This speech of Mr. Fieldus was delivered on January 14th, and was reported in all the city papers the following day and has frequently been referred to in the public press since then. Evidently these statements of the Professor were

causing his defenders much embarrassment, and he was sorely pressed as to how he could possibly explain himself. Now some forty-nine days after the speech was delivered, compelled to say something, he gives out the statement in the denominational paper. Read it! It speaks for itself: he is forced to admit that he used the words, "uneducated fool". Professor Marshall has not denied one word of what Mr. Fieldus has said.

The Professor evidently regards Canadian Baptists as rather ignorant in believing in the historicity of Jonah, and evidently he proposes to give us the light of Modernism. We would respectfully point out to the Professor that Canadian Baptists had thought out this and kindred questions before he landed here; and in this case we are prepared to stand by the words of Christ Himself. We can find no higher authority.

MARVELLOUS ACROBATIC FEATS.

Thousands of people sit on the grand stand at the C.N.E. and with open eyes and mouth witness the most daring and thrilling feats on the trapeze by Japanese acrobats, but a far more engaging spectacle has been furnished by Professor Marshall as he has leaped from trapeze to trapeze in his sermons since he arrived in Canada. This same gentleman may endeavour to disguise these adventurous leaps and thus lead the lay mind away from the real issue which is now before the Denomination, but he will not succeed.

We have good memories, and we presume as clear understanding of theological subjects and issues as he has, and we will not turn our attention away from that now famous Hamilton sermon which was nothing more nor less than a discourse upon salvation purely by works, and not by regeneration of the individual by the Holy Spirit. Then he took a flying leap to another trapeze in the First Avenue sermon, in which he distinctly taught reformation and cultivation of the good that is innate in us all until we become Christians. Such a thought as that used by Christ to Nicodemus was never once hinted at in the discussion of that text, "He knew what was in man." The sermon was censored by us at the time, not because of what it did not teach respecting the way of salvation, but because of what it did teach in the way of dangerous heresy. Then he took another extraordinary leap to another trapeze in the Walmer Road sermon.

We care nothing about what Dr. J. C. Carlile of England—a Modernist—may say of Professor Marshall. *We judge him out of his own mouth*, and independently of everything and everyone else. The extraordinary scene of the Professor leaping from the one extreme to the other is most ridiculous, and would be amusing were it not that the situation is very serious. We have witnessed him as he hung by his toes (of course, allegorically like Jonah) upon one swing at Hamilton, and then leaping through mid-air toward the Dean who was co-operating with him in the thrilling act. We have feared that he might in some unusually daring effort fail to reach the outstretched hands of the Dean, and, as the result, come to the ground with a thud, and there would be concussion of the—of the—of the position on the Faculty.

One of the outstanding educationists of Toronto, who is a professor in one of the universities and a passably religious gentleman, telephoned us one day recently, and made the following remarks: "That Professor Marshall of yours is, in my candid opinion, at heart a Modernist. I have studiously watched and weighed this whole affair, and I say again I am firmly convinced that he is at heart a Modernist. Of course, he is very orthodox *now*, very orthodox *now*." The men at the top are to-day endeavouring to draw the attention of the Denomination completely away from the Hamilton and First Avenue sermons, by showering the whole countryside with copies of the Walmer Road sermon; but we will not permit this ruse to go undisturbed.

The daily press reported Professor Marshall as stating to the Ottawa Baptists that it was really "a battle between education and ignorance". Is that so? Well, we are still stupid enough to hold him to his Hamilton false teachings and his First Avenue heterodoxy, and the coterie of those who have set themselves to carry him through at any cost cannot get him clear of those teachings.

CHRIST OF LITTLE OR NO ACCOUNT.

The Chancellor has evidently been very busy this week consulting the great Biblical authorities upon the book of Jonah, and in his collaboration of opinions has brought forward quite an imposing array of brilliant minds. We here and now admit that they are among the number of outstanding celebrities along some lines; and, doubtless, some of them have been regarded as experts. Several of them we have met and heard personally and we respect them as individuals, although we cannot endorse their conclusions upon certain things. However, as soon as we read the article in *The Canadian Baptist* two outstanding thoughts lay hold of us with all-powerful emphasis:

First, that the Chancellor has laid himself out to defend the Modernistic treatment of the Bible, and to put out a smoke-screen for Professor Marshall. There is nothing plainer than this to our minds: the real underlying purpose of this treatise was to do that one thing; and, of course, there was apparently the one live issue, namely, Jonah, to serve his purpose.

Secondly: we may say that we were a little surprised that in his search for light, or support, upon this subject he did not *ransack the whole field* of worthy opinions upon a matter which is just now rocking the foundations of his university, and not let up until he had carefully examined the treatment of the very same subject by One Who is without a peer, and in Whose presence all the authorities named by the Chancellor are but as fire-flies. There is an outstanding Volume in which this Jonah case is treated, and so simply at that that a child can understand it at once without having to resort to speculation. Surely the good Chancellor has the said Volume in the great library of the Institution. We refer to the Word of God (Matt. 12: 40), and the *neglected Specialist* upon the Old Testament, Christ Himself.

We would say to Dr. Whidden that it is as plain as the nose on a man's face that Christ treated the book of Jonah as *historical*, and the event referred to in that book as *real history*. We care not if the Chancellor paraded a list of names and opinions long enough to fill one whole copy of *The Canadian Baptist*, seeing that Christ has spoken so decidedly upon this matter. We go upon this principle, "Ye have heard that it was said . . . *but I say unto you.*" In that fifth chapter of Matthew's gospel Christ again and again claims absolute finality and supremacy as over against the religious opinions of all others; but, apparently, like the scribes, the Chancellor has not thought so. Why did he not include Christ in that list of distinguished theologians, and put Him last and pre-eminent? He has ignored Christ's opinion upon this subject of Jonah, or considered Him not worth while.

This treatment of Jesus pains us very much, and such treatment of the Word of God means to us who possess at least a reasonable amount of sound common-sense and foresight, the overthrow of the authenticity, and therefore supreme authority, of the Scriptures in the minds of future generations. Chancellor Whidden has missed fire badly. We get such sudden and severe shocks that we sometimes wonder if he is at the head of a Christian institution?

THAT ALUMNI ASSOCIATION CIRCULAR.

We have in hand a copy of the circular issued by the Alumni Association of McMaster University to the churches of our Convention, and we fully agree with part of its contents and declaration, that is, we, too, "sincerely deplore the never-ending controversies which are calculated to destroy that unity of spirit and purpose which we all recognize to be indispensable to any whole-hearted and successful co-operation in the missionary and educational enterprises of our Denomination,"—but just at this point we positively disagree: "and we believe the responsibility for the present deplorable situation rests with those who have, year after year, attacked the University, now on one ground and now on another, and sought to shake the confidence of the denomination in those whom it has repeatedly elected to these governing bodies."

This reads like an appeal for real unity in our denominational work; but it lays the blame entirely upon the wrong shoulders. *We surely had denominational unity until the year 1910 when the University shattered our confidence by defending the teachings of I. G. Matthews.* That certainly was the fault of Dr. Farmer, et al. They increased this distrust by retaining I. G. Matthews—and

who shall say it was *not* their fault? Who then caused that unseemly controversy? Must we sit down and fold our hands and swallow such a dose without uttering one word of reproach? or shall we be willing to be defenders of the faith and take the blame for that which was really brought about by others? We once more affirm that the whole cause of that trouble lay at the door of McMaster.

Then we pass on to the 1919 Convention at Ottawa, when a resolution disapproving of the editorial in *The Canadian Baptist* of October 2nd entitled, "The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture," was presented by the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* in the most kindly terms, but firmly demanding fidelity to the position taken by the Convention in 1910 re the same matter. An amendment to this resolution was presented, in order to sidetrack the original motion; but the sentiment of the Convention was found to be so overwhelmingly against it that it was withdrawn, and after a minor change in section 10, the original resolution was carried with "only a few voting in the negative" (see 1919 Year Book).

Who caused this friction and controversy? We positively answer that it was not the mover of the resolution, but the party or parties who permitted the insertion of that modernistic editorial. It was then and there before the Convention met that the University had an opportunity of showing its colours by protesting. It certainly would have been fitting that Dr. Farmer, as Dean in Theology, should have protested. That was their opportunity. Why is it always left to someone else to stand for the truth? When the discussion was on at Ottawa, why did not Dr. Farmer, et al., come out and disapprove the editorial? *Not they*. Why did not the Chancellor and the Dean in Theology, in the presence of the denominational delegates, come right out and assert their disapproval of that editorial because of its modernistic attitude? We are left to guess the reason. We deplore these unseemly occurrences in our Annual Conventions, but we deplore much more seriously the repeated occasions for them.

Then came the Faunce degree discussion in 1924 at London. Is it not a fact beyond any successful contradiction that the present Chancellor, et al. (to use the words of another) "got themselves into the ditch" and had themselves only to blame? At that meeting after Herculean efforts to justify their action in that matter, a majority stood like soldiers until they were counted, and thus entered a mighty protest against and condemnation of that deed. They had given a respectful hearing to both sides of the discussion, had sat patiently for many hours, and *then voted censure*.

Who was to blame for that controversy and friction? Was it the handful of men who dared to raise a word of protest? Not at all. But they are to-day being persistently blackened in an attempt to poison the general mind of the Baptist body. Be honest, be fair in this matter; that is all we ask. We seek no mercy; we ask no favours; but we have a right to a just and honest statement of the case. We were not the cause of the trouble. The blame (and there was serious cause for blame) lay in McMaster. We heard the discussion all through, and so did that crowded church of substantial delegates, and the verdict went against the guilty parties. It ought to have been so: that was the only right thing to do.

And now comes the Marshall appointment—which was *their* mistake. The Convention was sadly deluded in 1910 in Bloor Street Church into sidetracking the Matthews matter. The Convention in 1919 disapproved the editorial in *The Canadian Baptist* after a bitter struggle on the floor of the house. The responsibility for these controversies rests at the door of the University and Dr. Farmer for not doing their duty. Now, to use the language of another, "they are seeking to put a tarpauln over a live volcano."

We would say in all sincerity to our brethren that *we* wish for denominational peace, unity, and co-operation; and we shall welcome such a state of affairs as heartily as any member of the Faculty, Board, or Alumni Body. But we must have these ugly causes for dissension stopped. We here and now enter a disclaimer against any responsibility for the present controversies; and we give you fair warning that we are still on the job, and shall battle to the end against all and every recurrence of similar misdeeds no matter who may be the guilty party or parties. The friction will all cease, and unity will naturally follow, just as soon as Modernism is abolished, and *not until then*.

"THE BAPTIST TIMES AND FREEMAN" AND J. C. CARLILE.

Articles from *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, London, England, are given in *The Canadian Baptist* from time to time defending the appointment of Professor Marshall to the Faculty of McMaster University. This is quite natural. J. C. Carlile was shown to be a Modernist by the late Dr. A. C. Dixon some years ago; and *The Baptist Times and Freeman* is the paper published by The Baptist Union in England. Anyone acquainted with the Baptist situation in England knows that Modernism has a strangle hold on the Baptist Union there. Professor Glover, of Cambridge, who recently retired from the Presidency of the Baptist Union, has been described as the Fosdick of England. Professor Glover has been contributing a series of articles to a daily London paper. *The Bible Call*, of England, edited by a well-known Baptist, in referring to one of these articles said that the article was an outrage on Evangelical Christianity.

These are the sources from which the new Professor gets his commendation. The Modernists of England endorse him! Read carefully Professor Marshall's article in last week's *Canadian Baptist*, and it will be seen that the Professor regards the Baptists in Canada as in the depths of ignorance.

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE WORLD'S CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS' ASSOCIATION TORONTO, CANADA, APRIL 25TH TO MAY 2ND.

By W. B. Riley.

The Eighth Annual Convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals' Association will meet in Toronto, Canada, April 25th to May 2nd, 1926.

THE PLACES OF MEETING

will be Massey Hall on Sundays and Jarvis Street Baptist Church week days. Doubtless other churches also will be used as occasion requires.

PROGRAM

The program will not be put into final form until a week before the Convention opens. This is due to the fact that each year necessary changes are made before preliminaries are finished, and certain disappointments result. Men cannot invariably keep their engagements.

SPEAKERS

will be of the very best. It is the intention this year to bring into correlation, at least, if not into organic union, the multiplied Fundamentalist movements. Representatives of the following movements and others, not now mentioned, are invited: "The Fundamentalist League" of Los Angeles; "Defenders of Science vs. Speculation" of Los Angeles; "The Science Research Bureau" of Los Angeles; "The Bryan Bible League" of Turlock, California; "The Defenders" of Kansas; "The Christian Crusaders" of Florida; and other well-known Fundamentalist organizations.

It is expected that the orthodox Presbyterians of Canada and of the States will be well represented, and that the above-mentioned organizations will send such representatives as Dr. C. H. Haddon, Dr. Paul Rood, Dr. Bob Schuler, Prof. Harry Rimmer, Dr. Gerald B. Winrod, Geo. W. Washburn, Dr. Albert Sidney Johnson, Dr. J. Frank Norris, Dr. T. T. Shields, Dr. W. M. Robertson of England, Dr. Arthur H. Carter of England, and others to be mentioned later.

The program this year will specially emphasize the menace of modernism in schools, and the methods of meeting and conquering the same.

THE THURSDAY EVENING LECTURES.

Rev. W. J. Millar, who has given such splendid Bible lectures Thursday evenings during Dr. Shields' absence, will speak to-night and next Thursday.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

No. 1.

Lesson 14

SECOND QUARTER

April 4, 1926

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

A CHAPTER OF PARABLES.

LESSON TEXT: Thirteenth chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Mark 4:1-34; 6:1-6;
Luke 8:4-18.

These notes are written in Macon, Ga., between services in a busy campaign. As this venture is new, as a Baptist Bible Union Course, the Editor takes this means of greeting his fellow-students of the Word, and expressing his gratification at the Publishers' report that these Lesson Leaves appear to be finding favour with a growing number of schools. They are used in the School of which the Editor is Pastor; and the Whole Bible Course is proving both attractive and profitable.

I. THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER—Vss. 1-23.

The parable is contained in vss. 3-8, and the services in a busy campaign. Resolving this parable into its elements, we have here the sower, the seed, and the soil. 1. *Teachers of the Word are but sowers*:—they manufacture nothing, but only sow that which has life in it. 2. *The seed is "the Word of the Kingdom."* The Word of the Lord is a living Word. Jesus said: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life". There is in the Word of God a power of reproduction. We are born not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. There is a mighty dynamic always in a vital seed. So there are mighty potentialities in the Word of God. 3. *The soil.* In this parable the seed was the same in all classes; but the measure of the harvest was determined by the quality of the soil. This teaches the necessity of the subjective work of the Holy Spirit in preparing the heart for the reception of the truth,—a principle which is often forgotten. Not all the good soil brought forth in the same measure; but that which was good, was good because it was prepared. 4. *The significance of the varieties of soil:* (1) There was the beaten path beside the field over which many feet had passed. Thus vagrant spirits find their way through the human heart, and evil thoughts beat a path for themselves through the mind into which the seed cannot enter. The modern movies and many other forms of worldliness have a hardening effect in deadening the moral sensibilities, so that when the Word is spoken it lies on the surface; and always the wicked,—the devil himself—and those who do his will, like the birds of the air, are waiting to catch the Word away. (2) The stony places. This is descriptive of certain superficial natures. The surface soil of their emotions are easily stirred, and sometimes appear actually to have been cultivated by the Spirit; while the fact is, that their deeper natures are petrified and remain untouched: hence they have no root in themselves and cannot stand the storm and heat. (3) Among the thorns. This is descriptive of a mind preoccupied with evil. The evil seeds were there. Who shall estimate the potentialities of the human heart? There are so many things which grow within which are indigenous or native to the carnal mind. These things grow up and choke the Word. How few of those who have riches do really enter into the kingdom of God. 5. *The significance of the degrees of fruitfulness.* It should be recognized that as there are no two leaves alike, so there are no two persons of exactly similar capacity. Sometimes good men are put at a disadvantage by comparison with men of genius. For example: Two ministers may preach the gospel with equal faithfulness, and each with a degree of spiritual power, but not with equal effectiveness. In the parable before us, each kind of soil was fruitful to the limit of its capacity. So in the Church of Christ, God has set people of varied capacities. See I Cor. 12th chap.

II. THE PURPOSE OF PARABOLIC TEACHING—Vss. 10-17.

1. *A spiritual capacity is a prerequisite to an understanding of spiritual*

things, and also to any spiritual enrichment. The normally healthy man has five senses, by each of which he may receive impressions from without. Losing one or more of these senses, his receptivity is by so much limited. Thus it comes to pass that to him that hath shall be given, and he shall have more abundance. 2. *God's Word is itself a parable to all who are destitute of spiritual capacity.* In such case men hear but do not understand, and see but do not perceive. 3. *The parable is a treasury of wisdom to all who have the key.*

III. THE PARABLE OF THE TARES—Vss. 24-30, 36-43.

1. *Here we have another kind of good seed described:* not now the Word of the Kingdom, but the children of the Kingdom. This is a striking figure, and will bear examination. In what sense are believers to be as seed? There is a hint of the hidden meaning in the Lord's saying: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit". Only as we are crucified with Christ; only as we really fall into the ground and die, do our lives become fruitful. 2. *The evil seed, called tares, are "children of the wicked".* As these differing seeds become fruitful and reproduce themselves, their true nature appears. Circumstances reveal the character of the man. 3. *Judgment is here reserved.* There is no warrant here for the careless toleration of error; for the judgment here is not a judgment of principles but of persons. And we are taught that man's judgment is so imperfect that he may not be able always to distinguish between the wheat and the tares; so that in judging men, it will be wiser to leave that matter to the angels. 4. *The two sowers are each propagating their kind.* Christ Himself is the Sower of the good seed. As surely as Joseph monopolized the corn of Egypt, so that as the years of dearth ended, the seed for the sower could be obtained only from his hand, so no one but God Himself can make Christians: He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man. And that is His mission to-day, —the re-making of men. But the devil also is propagating his kind, sowing tares among the wheat. This is written in a hotel where through the open window come the noises of the city streets; while a glance through the windows reveals the lights of places of pleasure and amusement, where many voices speak for the devil, and few for the Son of Man. The devil does his work at night: "While men slept the enemy sowed tares".

IV. THE MUSTARD SEED AND THE LEAVEN—Vss. 31-33.

These parables naturally belong together. They tell us what "the Kingdom of Heaven is like". The same phrase occurs in the parable of the tares preceding this, and those of the hid treasure, and the pearl of great price, and the dragnet which follow.

The parables of the mustard seed and the leaven are interpreted by some to be parabolic prophecies predicting a great apostasy. By that interpretation, the mustard seed becoming as a tree, shelters the birds of the air, which are said to represent evil. Thus a picture is given of the sheltering of all kinds of evil within the professing church. The leaven, too, is supposed to represent error; corrupt doctrine of many forms (it is true leaven generally has that significance in Scripture, as in such passages, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees"; "purge out the old leaven"); but I am inclined to regard that interpretation of these parables as being too ingenious to be authoritative. The fowls of the air, for instance, are referred to by our Lord Himself (Matt. 6: 26) to teach us a lesson of trust: "Your heavenly Father feedeth them"; and leaven, though it may illustrate the method by which error propagates itself, is not in itself evil. As the admonition to emulate the wisdom of the serpent does not enjoin the appropriation of his poison, so we may profit by the principle in the figure of the parable without conflict with other Scriptures in which references to leaven are made. Moreover, in the parable of the leaven we are told "the whole was leavened". And surely nowhere in Scripture is there ground for the view that the entire Church of Christ is to be corrupted. No doubt, there is in our day a great declension from the faith; but there is always to be found a remnant according to the election of grace. Furthermore, we are told the Kingdom of Heaven is like mustard seed and like leaven. We, therefore, regard these parables as proclaiming the potentialities of the mustard seed and the leaven. In this connection, read

I. Cor. 1: 26-31. Here God magnifies even "the things which are not". Thus God's great movements may begin with "the least of all seeds". Doesn't the Church of Christ and every believer need that lesson to-day? Ours is a day when we boast of big things. The movement from the farm to the city may itself be parabolic. Men seem to prefer to be manufacturers rather than farmers or gardeners. We would rather make than grow things. We want things done suddenly. We want every religious gathering or movement to be big enough to command newspaper notice; hence, "the least of all seeds" is despised. The prosaic business of prayer, the ministry of dew and rain and sunshine, and the benediction of the night silences, are too commonplace to interest us. The Sunday School teacher wonders how he or she can do some great thing: let us remember "the least of all seeds". God's way is to use the base things, and the things which are despised, and which are not. "The least of all seeds" gives God's sunshine and rain a chance. "The least of all seeds" is helpless apart from that which comes down from above. But we may teach the Word, and thus sow the seed in human hearts, and appear to have done nothing; but "when it is grown" there may be a stalwart Christian character, a great influential personality, under whose shadow multitudes shall come to lodge. So of the saints of Christ collectively: a great church, a great revival, a mighty missionary movement, set in motion by insignificant beginnings, become so great that souls like fowls of the air come to lodge in its branches.

In the parable of the leaven we may learn something of God's silent ministries. Most of us like noise; "pep" and "jazz" are human favourites. Perpetual hustle and bustle and noisy human endeavour command our admiration. "The Kingdom of Heaven is like leaven". That makes no noise, and does its work unobserved. Of Solomon's Temple it was said: "There was not heard the sound of hammer, axe, or iron," when it was in building (I Kings 6: 7). And it is thus individual Christian character is formed,—as we are transferred into a temple of the Living God. Thus, too, the spiritual house which "groweth into a holy temple of the Lord" (Eph. 2). At conversion we are made children of God; but we do not come into the Kingdom full grown, but as babes. And we grow silently as God's Spirit increasingly applies the principles of the gospel to the whole life. Let us make much of the solitudes and of the quiet hours of life:

"Drop thy sweet dews of quietness
Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our lives the strain and stress,
And make our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace".

V. THE HID TREASURE AND THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE—Vss. 44-46.

The cardinal principle of the gospel is salvation by grace: "The gift of God is eternal life". Any interpretation of Scripture that conditions salvation upon human merit cannot be right: hence, the finder of the hid treasure and the merchant who buys the pearl of great price cannot represent the seeking soul; the gift of God cannot be purchased with money. We believe the finder of the treasure in the field and the merchant who buys the pearl each represent the Lord Jesus Christ in two aspects of His redemptive work: in one case, He buys the field in which the treasure is hid; in the other, He buys the pearl,—but each at the cost of all He has.

1. *What is the field?* Redemption is far wider in scope than some of us have thought. Will God save us out of this world as Lot was saved out of Sodom, and then burn it up? We think not. In order to obtain the treasure our Lord has redeemed the whole field: hence it is written: "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Rom. 8: 19-23). Yes, even the earth is cursed. The thorns and thistles are here. The devil is called the prince of the power of the air, and the god of this world. Aside from man altogether, this old world suffers from pain. They say in this part of the country that Florida has the advantage of California in that it has no earthquakes. But the Book of Job tells us that when permitted to do so, Satan can command a cyclone:—creation groaneth and travaileth in pain. But hidden in

this field there is a treasure, and our Lord Jesus Christ has bought the whole field; because the whole creation is to share in His redemption. And with the field our Lord will possess Himself of the hid treasure, even of His own elect people. Therefore, we do well to rejoice that our Lord has bought the whole field and us with it, and it for our sakes; and that some day He will come to claim His own. 2. *What is the pearl of great price?* What can it be but His redeemed people,—the Church of the Lord Jesus: "Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it". What an estimate to put upon a poor sinner! A pearl! Of what use is a pearl? No use at all but an ornament of beauty. Can it be possible that God is to make ornaments of us? Where does He find His pearl? In the depths of the ocean,—yes, sunken in sin. He sees and finds, and pays all that He has in order that He may own the pearl. 3. *The lesson of security it teaches.* This world cost Jesus Christ too much for Him to neglect it,—the pearl too much to leave it exposed to robber bands. He will take care of His jewels: "They shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels" (Mal. 3: 17).

VI. THE DRAGNET.

The Kingdom of Heaven is not like the bad fish but like the net. It is true the devil counterfeits true religion. Not all who profess to have been taken in the gospel net are good fish. The parable teaches a lesson of coming judgment. The angels will sever the wicked from among the just. We may each know for himself if he is really saved; but not until the judgment day can we be absolutely sure about any one else. This does not mean that we should be suspicious of others, but rather that we must each use diligence to make his calling and election sure.

VII. THE INSTRUCTED SCRIBE.

It is important that we should understand the true end of teaching. Teachers should ask their scholars whether they understand. It is better that they should hear a little and understand it, than that they should hear much and understand nothing. What a wealth of teaching there is in the Word of God! It is a treasury of things new and old, and can never be exhausted.

VIII. AFTER THE PARABLES—Vss. 53-58.

1. *Those who see in Jesus only "the carpenter's son" will be offended by His words.* There is no accounting for Jesus on natural grounds. To reduce Him to the level of a mere man is to reject Him and His teaching altogether. 2. *As we know Him as coming from above, His words are understandable.* 3. *Unbelief is a rejection of Jesus in His Divine character.*

How Full is Your Envelope?

On February 6th, before leaving for the South, the Pastor sent a letter to every member of the church reviewing the progress of the church for the past year. A "savings" envelope was enclosed for a special Building Fund Thank Offering, envelope to be returned Sunday, March 28th. Every member was urged to put something in the "savings" envelope EACH day, aiming at a minimum offering of \$5.00 per member. Is your envelope full?