

# Prof. Campbell Says Prof. Marshall is a Modernist

Page 13

## 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 18th, 1926

No. 47

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MOSES.

The sixth lecture of a series on "How to Study the Bible," by Rev. T. T. Shields, delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Tuesday evening, February 13th, 1923.

(Stenographically reported).



HIS evening I shall try to show you that the gospel is to be found in the first five books of the Old Testament just as truly as in the first four books of the New, and in the Acts and the Epistles.

I.

Let me first say a suggestive word or two about *the authorship of these five books that are commonly attributed to Moses*, about the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. I have no time to discuss it at length, and therefore, I shall not attempt to prove it; but I merely suggest to you some ways by which you may investigate the subject for yourselves. For after all, nothing is really ours until we have done it for ourselves. There is a vast difference always between the prophet and the parrot, between the voice and the echo, between the man who says something because somebody else has said it, and the man who says what he profoundly believes in his own soul. And if we are to be really spiritually profited we shall have to come into the presence of the Lord and get these things for ourselves directly from Him. If you study the books of Moses for yourselves with this in view, you will find abundant internal evidence of their Mosaic authorship. For instance, in the seventeenth chapter of Exodus and the fourteenth verse you have a word like this: after the battle with Amalek, Jehovah said unto Moses, "Write this for a memorial in a book." You have in the twenty-fourth chapter and the fourth verse: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord." Then in the book of Numbers, and the thirty-third chapter: "And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeyings." And if you carefully read Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, you will find the words, "The Lord spake unto Moses" frequently recurring; while in Deuteronomy, you will find Moses speaking in the first person; and on nearly every page there is evidence of the Mosaic authorship of these books. In the book of Joshua and the first chapter, when Joshua has assumed the position of leadership, we read, "This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt

meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein; for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success." The "book of the law" was in the possession of the people when Joshua began his ministry, a written book to which the people were admonished to give heed. And when you come on farther into the books of I and II Samuel you will find they are based on the law; and in I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles, there are numerous references to "the law of Moses," "the book of the law." "The book of Moses" is also referred to in Ezra and Nehemiah.

Now I do not discuss this with the idea of proving the point at all: I am merely suggesting a line of study for yourselves.

Therefore if you would settle this question for yourselves come again to these books of Moses and say, "I am going to try to find out for myself who wrote them." And incidentally as you read on through the Old Testament keep the question in mind, and you will find that the subject suggests itself again and again that the law was given by Moses, and that it was a written law. In the book of Psalms there are numerous confirmations of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; indeed, I think you will find internal suggestions even in the book of Proverbs that the author was thoroughly acquainted with the Pentateuch; and all the prophets—Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and the minor prophets, only confirm the view. The principle that the Bible stands or falls together even in respect to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is proved on nearly every page. But my point this evening is this, that on this subject you should allow the Bible to speak for itself. The great difficulty to-day is that people will persist in reading books about the Bible instead of reading the Bible itself. I do not say we should not read books about the Bible; nor that we should not accept suggestions; for then I should be inconsistent in addressing you on the subject; but the book or the address that sends you away from the Bible instead of driving you to the Bible you can afford to dispense with.

However, again in this matter our great authority is the Lord Himself. You will remember He says in the fifth chapter of John: "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. I receive not honour from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only? Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" And here, as on all other matters, is the highest possible authority, and Jesus in those verses put His seal upon the traditional view that the Pentateuch was of Mosaic authorship. I know that there is room to believe that the chapter, for instance, recording the death of Moses was written by another hand; but, personally, I see no difficulty in believing that it was written by the hand of Moses. It may appear to be an extraordinary thing for a man to write his own obituary. But not if we believe that God spake through Moses. The events attending the death of our Lord were written centuries before He came. I was quoting to a friend of mine last night that great scripture which speaks of the prophets, "Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." It was prophesied of Him "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death." Moses was advised that he was to die: he was to come up into the mount and die there. It was all deliberately planned,—the time and place of his departure,—by the Lord. I do not say that it is at all necessary to the view of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in general, to believe that Moses wrote the account of his own death and burial. I could well believe that that chapter may have been added by Joshua, or somebody else; but whoever wrote it, he wrote what no man witnessed, but wrote what God communicated. And He could as easily use Moses for the purpose in advance of the event, as

He could use another after it had occurred. In any event it was all planned by God: "He spake and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast."

The prevailing notion of the composite theory of the Pentateuch, that it is a fabric cleverly woven together of many materials, at a date much later than the time of Moses, is prolific of many errors. I see no objection to the theory that Moses may have drawn upon certain sources for his materials; as for instance, the genealogical tables; it may be that God directed him to some reliable records and that those records were copied; but the idea that the Pentateuch is composed of elements from even heathen sources,—and that it was really not written by Moses at all—lays a foundation for the denial of the divine inspiration of other parts of Scripture which are based upon the Pentateuch. But I am not going to go into that argument this evening; I only want to tell you a story that to me is illustrative of the folly of the whole supposition. The prevailing notion, you know, is that at a later period than the time of Moses, and from many documents this Pentateuch was compiled; the theory implies, in fact, that it is a forgery, that it is not what it claims to be at all.

Travelling on the train a year or so ago I picked up a copy of *The Ladies' Home Journal*—an article with large headlines attracted my attention. The title of the article was, "The Anonymous Theodore Roosevelt." I did not know that Theodore Roosevelt ever did anything anonymously. I thought he was such an outstanding, distinctive character that he could not possibly be disguised. But this was an article written by the editor of that widely circulated journal. The editor tells the story of how he suggested to Mr. Roosevelt that he should write twelve articles on any subject he liked, and that he should make no attempt whatever to disguise his hand, to change his style; he should be his own inimitable self; and that these articles should be written by his own hand, he was not to dictate them to any one; he was not to share his secret with any one: he was to write these articles himself and put them personally into the hand of the editor, that then the editor would with his own hand transcribe Mr. Roosevelt's articles, and from his hand they should go into the hand of the compositor. So the secret of the authorship of these articles was to rest with Mr. Roosevelt and the editor of the paper. These articles were to be published successively in *The Journal*, which has a circulation, if I am not mistaken, of far over a million,—at all events it has a very large circulation. Mr. Roosevelt agreed to write the articles.

Now, will you remember he had been President of the United States for nearly eight years; he had been an outstanding figure in American public life for twice as long as that; he was supposed to have a peculiarity of style; he was a great phrase-maker: they talked about the "Rooseveltian touch" and all that sort of thing. It was said that he had addressed more people than any of his contemporaries in the United States. He had written books; his public speeches had been printed in all the newspapers of America, and indeed of the world: for Theodore Roosevelt was an outstanding world-figure, of whom all civilization had abundant reason to be proud. I question whether there was another man in all the world who was so thoroughly known to his contemporaries as Theodore Roosevelt. He wrote those articles; they were published in that magazine; they were read by the men and women who had heard his speeches. They were written for the people in their own mother tongue; and published, for a nation of one hundred and ten millions of people for twelve successive months. And how many people do you suppose in all the American Republic, or in the wide, wide world, ever suspected that Theodore Roosevelt wrote those articles? There was not one solitary person out of one hundred and ten millions who ever guessed that Theodore Roosevelt was the author.

And yet, some gentleman learns a language that is not his own; he projects himself back into that dim and distant past; he submits that language to a careful analysis; and he gives us one verse of Scripture, or perhaps, several verses, and he says, "I can tell you that that verse has been made up from a half dozen documents or a dozen documents"—I do not know how many it is now—and he can tell you how it was composed, and where each part came from. I have characterized it again and again as learned lunacy; and so I believe it to be. More than thirty years ago the theory was said by a distinguished scholar to be "too monstrous to be seriously entertained." And so it will be regarded by those who ascribe infallibility to Christ.

## II.

Now the New Testament says "the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." *There is a difference between the law and the gospel*; and between the Old Testament and the New. But what is that difference? The popular notion is that they are contrary to each other; that in principle they are antagonistic. Somebody shrugs his shoulders and says, "Oh that is the Old Testament," as though when the angels sang their Christmas carol the Old Testament at that moment became obsolete; as a matter of fact, large sections of the Old Testament are yet to be fulfilled. It is not old in the sense of being obsolete.

What then is the relation between the law and the gospel? and is it really true that the gospel was preached by Moses, that the gospel was written by Moses as truly, if not as clearly, as by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? In the lecture which you get this evening you will observe that last week we tried to show that there is a gradual development, a gradual unfolding of the divine purpose all through the Old Testament. It is like the dawning of the day,—first the grey streaks of dawn, and gradually the light comes upon us until the sun shines in noonday brilliance from his zenith. Thus the lesser revelation of the Old Testament shines in full-orbed glory in the face of our Lord Jesus Christ. But there is no quarrel between the noonday and the dawn. The Old Testament is not a period of darkness: the light is shining there; it is the dawning of the day. And I shall try to show you that there is absolutely no antagonism between the principles of law and of grace; that there is no conflict between Sinai and Calvary; but that they are the complement of each other: the Old and the New Testaments are mutually complementary; you cannot have the gospel according to Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John, without the gospel according to Moses.

I refer you now to a New Testament scripture because I love to preach the Old Testament from the New, and the New from the Old. I think that is the way to preach—to expound the Old Testament from the New, and to illustrate the New Testament from the Old, and to show that they are one and indivisible.

Paul writes in the Epistle to the Galatians, to correct an error which had crept into the Galatian churches, to the effect that while it was a very necessary thing to believe in Christ, having believed, they must still keep the law of Moses and observe the ceremonies of the law, notably, the ordinance of circumcision. In this Epistle the Apostle shows the relation of the law to the gospel, and he says in the third chapter: "He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Now where is he going to find his proof? "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." And now will you please mark this word: "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And thus I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise."

The gospel was before the law, not only in the plan and purpose of God—we have already seen that “the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world”—*the gospel was before the law in its revelation*. God preached the gospel before unto Abraham: He gave the inheritance to Abraham by promise. The principle upon which He dealt with Abraham was one of grace—precisely the same principle which operates in our acceptance with God. It is said that the covenant which was made with Abraham was confirmed of God in Christ. “He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.” And Jesus Himself said, “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.” You have the gospel in Genesis, as I said last week; but here Paul marks a point of time, and he says that the gospel was expressly revealed to Abraham; that the promise of the gospel was explicitly given to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before the law was given by Moses; and that inasmuch as the covenant was made and confirmed and ratified, that the law being four hundred and thirty years after could not disannul it.

There follows an important question; and I believe if we can understand this we shall have the germ of all right thinking, theologically. Paul asks the question here that we have all asked, “Wherefore then serveth the law?” Why was the law given at all? What is the relation of the law to the gospel? If only you can learn that, you will be saved from all the errors of Adventism, Seventh-dayism, and practically every other ism,—if once you clearly see the relation of these two principles, of Sinai and Calvary, of the Old Testament and the New, of the law and the gospel: “Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.”

Now the principle of law is never opposed to the principle of grace: it is absolutely necessary to grace. The law is made for the transgressor always—the law of music, the law of letters:—what do you go to the dictionary for? What is a dictionary? It is a book of law, which tells you how to spell a word if you do not know how; it tells you the meaning of the word. And if you have some doubt as to its correct spelling, you go to the law and to the testimony to find out; if you have a question as to its correct meaning, you go to the authoritative statement found in the dictionary. But if you know how to spell, and if you know what the word means, where it was born, where it has lived, who its parents were, what its etymological significance is, and what meanings it has acquired by its use in literature, both of the past and of the present—if you know all these things you do not go to the dictionary for that particular word: you are no longer under law, but under grace: the law was our schoolmaster to bring us into grace. By the law came the knowledge of sin, by the law you discovered that you were not spelling correctly and learned how to spell correctly; it was by the law you learned you were using the word in the wrong sense, and you learned to use it in the right sense. But it was not until the law of the dictionary had been transferred from the book to the pages of your own mind, and spelling and speaking correctly became automatic, that you experienced the grace of the realm of letters. What is the score before the musician? It is simply the objective law; and if you haven't the score in your mind you must have it on the piano. Isn't that so? Mr. Hutchison does not look at it half the time. Do you know why? He is not under the law but under grace, musically. For when you have the music in your soul, when you have the tune in your memory, somehow or another it comes out through your fingers. But it is by the law you are brought into the principle of grace. The law is always made for the transgressor; the law “was added because of transgressors, till the seed should come.”

The law was a preventive measure. God was going to preserve the Jewish race until it should produce the Seed. That, or rather, He, was to be the medium of blessing to the whole world. The world had already witnessed the necessity for a judgment, when for the salvation of the human race God found it necessary to sweep the earth clean, and begin over again with one man; and the law “was added because of transgressions” to preserve the race. And that is true to-day! Where there is no law, you know what follows: anarchy is another word for annihilation.

But the law had a *special educational value*: "By the law is the *knowledge of sin*." That is what law is for. Let me give you an example. I remember distinctly when I was a lad in England when going home from church on a Sunday evening I used to meet a certain man who was a member and an office-bearer in an evangelical church. I used to see him every Sunday evening going from his church to his store,—and his store was a liquor store. He used to open that store after church to sell wines and spirits; and few people discerned any inconsistency between that act and his Christian profession. And it is not so very long ago in this country since it was not unusual to find church-members who were not teetotalers; but our liquor laws became more and more stringent until at last it was made illegal for a man to buy or sell intoxicating drink; and now we scarcely reckon a man respectable who has anything to do with it. But why? The act is the same; but there has been a standard set up and by that law comes the knowledge of that sin. Of course human laws may be defective; but God's law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. The law of God sets up a standard to show us the kind of men we ought to be, so that we may measure ourselves by it. That is what He did through Moses. The law was given by Moses, and "the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," to teach us our need of Christ, to teach the world their need of Christ: the law was a revelation really of human impotence, of man's inability to save himself.

Perhaps someone will enquire, "Do you mean to say that the law given in the days of Moses was given to teach the world that; and that it was written, and that successive generations passed away, and that there was no gospel till Jesus came?" Certainly not. Do you not see that "the gospel was preached before unto Abraham"? In fact, *since the day that the first man sinned this sin-cursed earth has never been without the gospel*. Blessed be God! To the first sinner the promise of the Seed that should bruise the serpent's head was given; and all down through the Book that promise is repeated. The gospel was no after-thought. Its principles are not an evolutionary product: the Bible reveals a gradual unfolding of God's eternal purpose of grace.

Paul now asks *another question*. He says, "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid." And yet, that is the teaching of Modernism, that the law is against the promises of God, that the whole teaching of the Old Testament is against the teaching of the New. I declare it to be absolutely untrue and contrary to the facts of the case; and if only we come to the right standpoint, and see the relation of these two, and see how absolutely necessary the one Testament is to the other, we shall have settled for ever for ourselves the whole controversy; for when the Old Testament enters into your experience as a Christian and you come to see how essential it is to the whole divine revelation, you can just as easily do without the New Testament as you can do without the Old. I say that advisedly. So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon part company with the New as with the Old; because without the Old I have absolutely no assurance that the New is true. The New has its roots in the Old; it is the very soil in which this tree of life grows. "Is the law then against the promise of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Paul says the law is not against the promises of God; but if there had been a law, if there had been any possibility of life coming by the principle of law, then righteousness should have been by the law. But the law was given to show men in all generations the utter impossibility of any man's being made righteous by the law: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin,—from Adam to the last man that shall be born, until Jesus shall come to claim His own—the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith that should afterwards be revealed." The Law and the Gospel were given for the same purpose, the one to show us our need, and the other to supply it.

### III.

And still, as a matter of fact, *the law is not done away with*. The gospel does not do away with the law. The law is just as much in force to-day as it ever was, except as to its ceremonial aspect. The summary of the law: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," and "thy neighbour as thyself," is still

in force. Can you find me anywhere between the pages of God's Book a suggestion that that law has been done away with? It still obtains. What did Jesus come for? Christ came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. . . . For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." In other words, the gospel is the only power that can give effect to the law; the gospel is the only power that can help a man to live in obedience to the law. By grace he is enabled to keep the law, not in order to be saved, but because he is saved, the law being written in his heart and in his mind. The law and the gospel go hand in hand all the way through, in all dispensations; and therefore I say Sinai and Calvary are complementary to each other.

"The Gospel according to Moses:" *How did Moses preach the gospel?* He gave the law, and by the law taught repentance. But what else did he do? Read the story in the book of Exodus: "When I see the blood I will pass over you." How was Israel saved? By the shedding of the blood, which was but a symbol of the Great Sacrifice: "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." "Without shedding of blood is no remission." "Without shedding of blood" there could be no remission then nor now. The Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The tabernacle preached the gospel all the time. There was the brazen altar upon which the sacrifice was laid; there was the veil into which no man might enter without blood; there was the mercy-seat over the ark, the ark of the covenant, and beneath it and within it were the two tables of stone. When Moses came down and found the people had departed from God, he threw down the tables of stone and broke them, a symbolic action showing that the people had broken the law. But the Lord spake to Moses again and said: "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables which thou breakest." And the same law was written with the finger of God on the tables of stones. And that unbroken law was put in the ark.

Further, God chose who should be His priest, and Aaron was to be His priest. There were certain men who thought Aaron took too much upon himself. Why should not there be many high-priests? But God signified His approval by bidding them cast down their rods, and the rod that budded was the rod of God's chosen, the one anointed priest through whom He would speak to His people, and no other. And Aaron's rod budded and yielded blossoms and almonds. Therefore the rod of God's chosen priest was later put within the ark of the covenant.

Thus *the ark of the covenant* had within it, in symbol, the righteousness of Christ in the unbroken law; the bread of life, in the golden pot that had manna; and the sign of the divinely anointed priest in the budding rod. Over it all was the symbol of the divine throne of grace, the cherubim shadowing the mercy seat, where the blood was sprinkled, and of which God said, "There will I meet with thee."

In this connection, of course, you must study the Epistle to the Hebrews; for that Epistle has no meaning whatever apart from the Pentateuch—it has no significance at all apart from Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy—that is its very base; it is an exposition of the Pentateuch; and it is an exposition of the Gospel according to Moses. God chose a tribe for the ministry of the priesthood. He separated a tribe—the tribe of Levi; and while only those who were of the household of Aaron were permitted to minister in the office of the high-priest, there were others who were not of the house of Aaron, but who were of the tribe of Levi, who gave attendance at the altar—that is to say, ministered about the tabernacle. But only Levites were permitted to exercise any kind of priestly service: "Ye also, as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ"—our own great High-Priest.

Remember also *the distinguishing character of the Hebrew worship*. After the pattern had been shown in the mount, and the tabernacle had been erected, and its sacrifices were prepared, fire came down from heaven and consumed the

sacrifice; and the command was given, "The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out." And in all their pilgrim journey the ark was borne upon the shoulders of the Kohathites, others carried different articles of furniture; the altar also was carried, and upon the altar that supernatural fire was always kept burning; and every sacrifice that was subsequently offered was offered by that supernatural fire—not kindled from below, but from above. When the priest burned incense before the Lord, which was symbolic of prayer and intercession, he always took the fire from the altar, and with that supernatural fire he kindled the incense. There was no natural fire in the tabernacle worship: but only supernatural fire kindled from the skies; and under all circumstances, that was to be kept burning: "The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out."

He "through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God." There is no acceptable service that is not rendered in the power of the Holy Spirit. It is the power of the Holy Ghost that turns to ashes our burnt-offerings, that renders the sacrifice of ourselves acceptable; it is by the power of the Holy Ghost we are to pray, and to preach, and to labour, and to give, and to live: "The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out." The New Testament admonitions "Grieve not the Holy Spirit," "Quench not the Spirit," are equivalent to the ancient command to keep the heavenly fire burning. We, too, are unable to offer a sacrifice that can be acceptable to God without the heavenly Fire. Thus you have the symbol of the Holy Spirit in the revelation of God through Moses, the supernatural element, which has always differentiated revealed religion from the religion of the naturalist and rationalist.

I could refer you to many other instances. For example, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." Jesus Himself taught that the gospel was in the book of Numbers.

Perhaps that is enough for to-night. Again, I have attempted no exact exposition of any particular passage; but have only suggested to you that the first five books of Moses are crammed full of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. And in reading it, do not skip the book of Leviticus. You will understand Genesis; you will understand Exodus; you will understand much of Numbers and Deuteronomy—one of the sublimest parts of Scripture; but when you come to Leviticus, the Levitical law, the law of sacrifice, you may be tempted to pass that by. But that is where God has treasured His gold, and you will find every page of it full of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

My object in this and other lectures has been, and will be in the future, to magnify the Word of the Lord. And when you get the printed lectures, keep them at hand somewhere that you may be able to refresh your memory, but do not depend upon the lectures. They are intended only as expositions of principles useful in the direct study of the Bible. I have purposely avoided giving you any finished work: I have only made suggestions to you. There is the well: "Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation."

### THE AFTERNOON SCHOOLS.

The Parliament Street Branch of Jarvis Street Church, under the leadership of Mr. Wilfred Charlton, has been steadily growing since his appointment as superintendent of the work there. Last Sunday they had a record attendance at the Bible School, 287 being present.

At the Chinese School held in Jarvis Street at 3 o'clock there was an attendance of 60.

### LAST SUNDAY.

The attendance at the Bible School last Sunday morning was 1,123. Dr. H. H. Savage, of First Baptist Church, Pontiac, Mich., taught the Pastor's class, and preached morning and evening. Dr. Savage's evening sermon on, "The Christ of The Bible" was particularly strong, and a large number responded to the invitation. Dr. Savage won the hearts of our people by his fidelity to God's Word, and he has a standing invitation to the Jarvis Street pulpit.



## Editorial

### "THE LORD'S HAND IS NOT SHORTENED."

"Behold the Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy that it cannot hear." The prophet is speaking at a time when the religious consciousness of the nation was very faint, when God seemed to be far off, and when the resources of Deity were no longer reckoned as possible human assets. But the prophet declares that the sun is only obscured, and not obliterated; the divine hand is withdrawn, but not withered; though there be no prayer uprising to the throne, the throne remains.

And there is a danger always of the soul's losing its consciousness of God. We are prone to gild the days of old, and to write the miracles of grace in the past tense. We see, or feel, things slipping from our grasp. Many of our friends have left us and we have received no message from them. Those that remain grow away from us, their interests change, and we find ourselves to be elements of diminishing importance in their lives; our circumstances alter, our very neighbourhood is transformed; and we are conscious, perhaps, of a change in ourselves. We try to persuade ourselves that we are saner than we were: what we once cherished as ideals our aching, disappointed hearts now call vain fancies. We say we have become less visionary and more practical. We do not expect miracles now. We flatter ourselves that we are more tolerant than we were; our view of life is characterized by a broader charity. And yet we breathe a heavier atmosphere, and walk on lower level because, forsooth, we have learned to take things as they are!

But are we sure we have changed for the better? Are we sure the ideals we so passionately cherished, were only fancies after all? Are we sure, has it ever been demonstrated, that the mountains whose summits we hoped to explore are really inaccessible? Were the principles we abandoned really an encumbrance? Do we not need to be reminded of the things which endure? The helpless boatman, at the mercy of the wind and tide, may see what appears to be a receding shore with dissolving hills—whereas the mountains are unmoved and it is he who is drifting away! We may well pray,—

"Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;  
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away;  
Change and decay in all around I see;  
O Thou, Who changest not, abide with me!"

#### I.

Neither the hand nor the ear of God has suffered any diminution of strength. He still has power to save amid the most untoward circumstances. We think of the gospel as something which has no power to make a way for itself, but must come on a later train when someone or something has cleared and swept and garnished the house. Yet it won its earliest triumphs in the city which crucified Christ. It won its way in cities which were wholly hostile to its reception: Corinth, Athens, Ephesus, Antioch, Thessalonica, etc. It was never dependent upon favourable circumstances.

He still has power to change the most rebellious hearts. To the natural enmity of the human heart there has been added a crust of unbelief formed by the insidious teachings of modern religious agnosticism. But no mind was ever more fortified against the truth than that of Saul of Tarsus; and yet the hand of God could strike the scales from his mind and make him to see. And the power of God is still the same.

He still has power to show Himself superior to the world's enchantments. "This present evil world" can be very winsome when on her best behaviour: when arrayed in all the splendour of its sensuous delights it appears a very formidable rival of the Lover from the skies. But when He unveils His lovely face, His glory eclipses the utmost splendour of the world. God can save a man who has fifty thousand a year, and has studied theology in Germany, as well as He could save Moses!

## II.

The ear of God is still acute and attentive. No change in the divine mind has alienated His resources from us. He has not shut Himself within His own works as behind prison bars because human philosophers have said He has. He can still hear us when we cry. The ear of God can still regard the human cry for the tender but mighty help of the hand of God.

It is still useful to pray for individual salvation, as Abraham for Lot, as Moses for Israel, as the church for Peter; it is not vain to pray for a manifestation of divine power and glory as Elijah did on Carmel; nor is it vain to pray for national deliverance as Hezekiah did.

## III.

The hand and ear of God have not declined in strength during the term of our Christian experience. He had power to satisfy us once—why not now? Religion was more than a memory, and prayer more than a form. Why is it not now? Has the Bridegroom lost His charm, His voice its sweetness, His hand its tenderness, His arm its strength? Some of us, we fear, have reason to cry, "Where is the blessedness I knew when first I knew the Lord?"

The Lord was able to use us once—why not now? Can we not recall seasons of service and joyous fellowship to which we are now strangers? He used to answer our prayers; we could trace a direct connection between our praying and the effectiveness of our service. Can we do it now?

Self-examination will disclose the reason for the change. It is declared that sin has stayed the hand and obscured the face of God. We must know God as a power in our lives; we must live in fellowship with Him, as a Father Who hears His children cry, or we cannot retain the consciousness of His presence and favour. God must be used or we shall lose sight of Him. The progress of sin leads to moral blindness and insensibility, and ultimate self-deception: "Truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter." The progress of sin leads men at last to regard the pursuit of holiness as a kind of madness. They speak lightly of spiritual values, and become irreverent in spirit. The holiest things become the subject of jest and merriment.

There is reason for hope in the promise of grace. Grace will take the initiative in the restoration, will give repentance, will enable us to return. Let us but yield to the constraints of grace, with reliance upon God obey the best impulses of our hearts, and the precepts of the divine Word—and the Spirit will lift up a standard against the enemy. The Redeemer will return to us on the simple condition that we turn from our disobedience; if we but do His will, He will come to abide.

## WILL SOMEONE EXPLAIN?

A short time ago an envelope was addressed to us containing a half dozen copies of Professor Marshall's sermon preached in Walmer Road Baptist Church, Sunday, January 24th, and "published by authority of the Senate of McMaster University", together with a like number of his pamphlet entitled, "Professor Marshall refutes serious charges". While in the opinion of many even this sermon could have been preached by a Unitarian, we have wondered why the utterances of the Professor upon which these charges were based were not "published by authority of the Senate of McMaster University" and sent by the score all over the Convention territory?

Why was not Professor Marshall's address on religious education delivered before the Convention in Hamilton October 19th last, containing the following paragraphs, "published by authority of the Senate of McMaster University" and sent broadcast among our Baptist people?—

"I believe that just as it is natural for a plant to turn toward the light, or the mariner's compass to point to the north, or a new-born babe to suck nourishment from its mother's breast—so I believe it is, in the best sense of the term, natural for the spirit of man to seek illumination and strength and inspiration from the Spirit of God. I believe it is very important nowadays to emphasize the fact that religion is really and truly perfectly natural; and that Jesus Christ Himself said that when a man really comes to himself and realizes all he needs, and the powers and

possibilities of his nature—what does he do? He says with the prodigal son, "I will arise and go to my father."

"When you and I give children religious training and education, when we take the baby hands and put them together and teach the child to pray, we are not endeavouring to graft some alien growth into the nature, or force anything artificial upon child life: we are simply and solely helping the child to recognize the best and highest and noblest possibilities of its own nature; and we are seeking to initiate the child into the mystery of God."

Why was not the new professor's sermon on "Coming to Jesus", preached in James Street Baptist Church, Hamilton, November 1st, 1925, from which we quote as follows, "published by authority of the Senate of McMaster University" and sent in quantities to our churches?—

"To really come to Christ we must get His view of life, His standard of values. We may have the simple wholesome pleasures of life and still be good Christians; but when we become selfish with these, that is when we do not belong to Christ. When a young person chooses a vocation in which the powers God has given are used to the utmost, then he can truly say he has come to Christ. We must have less snobbishness. We must learn to regard man as man; not as a mercenary standard. When we can give services to humanity and help any organization laboring in the cause of Christianity, then we can say we have come to Christ."

Why was not the sermon on "The Insight of Christ", preached by Professor Marshall in First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, November 12th, and published in *The Canadian Baptist* of November 26th, sent by the half dozen with his pamphlet in which he "refutes serious charges"? Surely any professor in a Baptist university who would make the following utterances would expect to be charged with something "serious":

"He (Jesus) knew that at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, beautiful, radiant, deathless, indestructible. It may be buried, hidden from view, ignored, forgotten, suppressed, but it is there in everybody, even in the worst, and there it remains incorruptible in all its corruptions, undefiled in all his defilement, awaiting the day of its manifestation, its expression, its diamond radiance, its power."

"The germ of life in a seed seems to be tough. So it is with the divine element in the human soul. Whatever the rough and tumble of life it abides indestructible."

"It makes all the difference in the world to the spirit, and quality, and persistence, and hopefulness of our service if we undertake it in the strong faith that our task is simply by grace of God to rouse into activity high and holy powers which God has made an inalienable part of human nature. . . . How wonderful and how beautiful it is to think that in all of us, in you and me and in every human being, there are moral and spiritual potentialities, divine powers, which, under proper stimulus and encouragement from on high can develop into the excellencies of Christ."

Or, once more, in view of the Professor's appointment to a Chair in our denominational university, why was not his English utterance on, "What Baptists Stand For", "published by authority of the Senate of McMaster University" and sent in quantities to our Associational officers for distribution among our Baptist membership? This address contains the following paragraph:

"Some of our people (Baptists) are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the Creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship."

We were not at all impressed by the imposing list of authorities quoted by Chancellor Whidden in *The Canadian Baptist* of March 4th, in support of Professor Marshall's heretical view of the book of Jonah. We agree with Dwight L. Moody when he said that he would be willing to judge a man's orthodoxy by his attitude toward that book. But why have the Chancellor et al. turned the attention of all concerned so fully upon the Jonah case, and why are they anxious to keep the attention of our Baptist people riveted upon Jonah, if not to help them to forget about these sermons which are miles away from Baptist doctrinal beliefs? It would take a much longer list—and of even greater celebrities—to convince us that any man making the above utterances has any right to a place on the teaching staff of a Christian university. Perhaps the Chancellor and Senate of McMaster University have forgotten these sermons, but we would assure them the Baptists of this Convention have not.

### DR. T. R. GLOVER AND MODERNISM.

Dr. Glover was recently President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain, and his name has been frequently mentioned as a commender of Mr. Marshall in connection with his professorship in McMaster. Canadian Baptists generally do not fully realize how Modernism has fastened itself on the Baptist Union in England, of which Union *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, so frequently quoted just now in *The Canadian Baptist*, is the organ. Dr. Glover has been writing "popular" articles for *The Daily News* of London. He, in unmistakable language, makes clear that he has no use for Bible Leagues which accept the Bible literally, or for William Jennings Bryan who stood so nobly for the faith. As will be seen he regards them as emissaries of the Devil.

The following paragraph is from his article (January 16th, 1926) in *The Daily News*. We ask our readers to read it and reread it, that they may fully grasp its meaning and gather the spirit of the modernist. Dr. Glover says:

#### Bryan The Thing

"If I were invited to give the devil a hint, which it is quite plain he does not need, I would say to him: 'You are on the right lines at last; enlist Christian people to destroy belief in Christ; Ingersoll and Bradlaugh were no use; Bryan and the Bible League are the thing; see that they have plenty of funds to din it into every youngster's ears that Christ is identified with Jonah's whale, with bad scholarship and irrelevant Hebrew story.' No, I don't need to tend him that suggestion; 'we are not ignorant of his devices.'"

*The Bible Witness* of March, 1926, says of this paragraph:

"Under the title 'Fundamentalism on the Defensive' T. R. Glover, the religious satirist of *The Daily News*, contributes a scurrilous article (January 16, 1926). We would pay little heed to the vapourings of this crude journalist were it not for the fact that he holds a certain status at Cambridge University, and was recently the President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain. Glover's main assault is upon Professor Dick Wilson, but the paragraph well illustrates the notorious style of this 'popular' journalistic professor."

The words and tone of the paragraph by Dr. Glover sound much like the language of Professor Marshall in referring to Jonah and the inspiration of the Bible as uttered here in Toronto. We do not wonder that Dr. Glover should commend Professor Marshall. It is very clear that such teaching would bring to our denomination in Canada that "which has been a blight upon every church it has ever touched, and that has made our Baptist work in England a veritable tragedy".

It is announced that Dr. Glover is expected to preach shortly in McMaster Hall. It should be kept in mind that even Shailer Mathews sometimes preaches an unobjectionable sermon—depending on where he preaches.

## PROFESSOR ON McMASTER FACULTY FOR OVER 36 YEARS SPEAKS OF MODERNISM IN THE UNIVERSITY.

*Editor Canadian Baptist.*—

Dear Sir,—At the Convention held in Bloor Street Baptist Church in 1910, Dr. MacNeill as mover, and Dr. Shields as seconder, of a motion for the retention of Dr. I. G. Matthews as professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in McMaster University, in my judgment each did wrong to himself, did wrong to the church, did wrong to the denomination, did wrong to McMaster University, and, above all, did wrong to his Lord, and so also did the writer of this article do wrong, and with him, too, all the members of the Convention who that day supported that motion. Dr. Harris told the truth. Dr. Matthews was then, and is to-day, a pronounced Modernist.

I hold that the sound and helpful lectures of Dr. Farmer were being constantly counteracted by the erroneous instructions of his Biblical coadjutor, Dr. Matthews.

I am convinced, too, that Professor L. H. Marshall, whose attractive personality all recognize, is a supporter of Modernism. His sermons and personal talks, as given to the press and to others, clearly show that he is a Modernist. His appointment must, therefore, be regarded as a decided gain for Modernism.

When a prominent member of the Central Baptist Church, after hearing him preach, made to an old friend of mine a remark to this effect, "The attacks made on Professor Marshall's theological position are justifiable," don't you see that we, as Baptists, should rise up and resist in the power of the Holy Spirit this incoming tide of Modernism. Not many years ago, the students in McMaster of that day were tremendously excited when Dr. Foster, a popular professor, left us and became a professor in Chicago University.

Dr. Rand, the Chancellor at that time, was censured by the students for not doing his utmost to retain Dr. Foster. But you all ought to know that it was fortunate for McMaster that Dr. Foster left us, for he became, as all know, a destructive Higher Critic. Not many weeks ago, many students and many professors of McMaster heard Prof. Kanamori speak in our chapel. He told us how through Higher Criticism, he lost his Gospel

message and walked in spiritual darkness for twenty years. But in answer to the prevailing prayer of two consecrated women he was graciously restored to faith in God and His Word. To-day he is one of the mighty champions of orthodoxy in Japan. Thousands upon thousands have been swept into the Kingdom of God under his powerful ministry. Personally I believe that it was the Living God who permitted Prof. Kanamori to give this timely address in McMaster Hall. I am assured by those who know, that good results have already accompanied that message of this Spirit-filled prophet of God.

At this point may I ask a question: Do you know any Modernist who is being mightily used to-day as a soul-winner? I could name not a few, who, having embraced this heresy, have left the ministry, for they found, as did Kanamori, that they had no longer a message.

Do you know that two or three years ago one of our graduates drank in this poison and became a zealous Modernist? Thank God he did not get it from McMaster, but he hearkened to addresses given by Modernists at Muskoka, and was poisoned.

That young man is to-day a student in Chicago University. Why did he leave us? Dr. Farmer, Dr. McCrimmon and Dr. MacNeill were too narrow for him.

Did the representatives of our Home Mission Board, Brethren Schutt and Cameron and others, do wrong in refusing, as they did, to give a Home Mission field to this young man, when they knew that he held doctrinal views diametrically opposed to those held by us as Canadian Baptists?

Do we want McMaster to turn out men to fill our pulpits, to go forth as our Home Missionaries and our Foreign Missionaries who, when asked their doctrinal views, would reply in the words of Dr. Shailer Mathews, Dean of the Baptist Theological Seminary of Chicago University, "They stand for what are called Fundamentals, an inerrant Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the physical resurrection, ascension, and return of Christ? It will be observed that none of these is in the field of morals." And yet, I am informed, that two honor graduates of McMaster

University can even surpass Prof. Shailer Mathews in unbelieving heterodoxy and yet everyone has heard that Prof. Shailer Mathews when addressing a country congregation, can be as orthodox as Paul. But he is not the only Modernist who can accomplish that feat.

Are you aware that Rochester Theological Seminary, an institution once as orthodox as McMaster professes to be to-day, has on its staff professors, graduates of McMaster, who support Modernism?

Does it give you pleasure to know that Crozer has on its staff professors or lecturers, graduates of McMaster, who are ardent Modernists? Is it encouraging for us as Canadian Baptists, to learn that in Chicago University, that stronghold of Liberal theology, several members of the staff are graduates of McMaster and that they uphold Modernism?

I make bold to say that the greatest scourge that has visited our day and generation is Modernism. It paralyzes the pulpit, it paralyzes the pew, it paralyzes Home Missions, it paralyzes Foreign Missions. The Modernist is an enemy to himself, an enemy to his home, an enemy to his church, an enemy to his denomination, an enemy to the University, and an enemy to his Lord.

He who is disloyal to the standards of faith which we as Baptists hold vital, is disloyal to McMaster University.

#### BE WARNED!

Modernism has captured Brown University; Modernism has captured

Newton, and Crozer, and Rochester. Modernism reigns in Chicago University. Are you willing, through an easy tolerance, to permit McMaster to fall into the hands of this enemy, both of man and God?

I am deeply concerned for McMaster and for all our educational work—this you all must know. I spent three years in the old Canadian Literary Institute when Dr. Fyfe, that great champion of Baptist principles was at its head. It was from that Institute that I matriculated into Toronto University. I sent my only son to Woodstock College. My two daughters took full courses at Moulton College. My son and one daughter are honor graduates of McMaster University. My son was a professor of Latin in his own Alma Mater. I have labored as professor of Greek in McMaster for more than thirty-six years. It may not be inopportune to state that in addition to my work as professor, I joyfully toiled as a Christian workman in eight centres between Hamilton and Toronto, and six of them have become Baptist Churches.

I have humbly asked my God to forgive me the wrong I did in 1910 in supporting a motion for the retention of a Modernist. These words are written to let my fellow-Baptists know that I dare not repeat that wrong.

Baptists of our Convention, again I say—take warning!

Suffer not Modernism to capture McMaster. For if you do, Ichabod will inevitably mark its future history.

P. S. CAMPBELL,

McMaster University.

We copy the above letter from *The Canadian Baptist* of to-day's date. Professor Campbell has been on the Faculty of McMaster University as Professor of Greek for upward of thirty-six years. He is a most godly man, a man of heaven-born convictions. Because of his long Professorship in McMaster, and his record in evangelistic work among our churches, Professor Campbell's letter will have great weight with our Baptist people.

#### TWO MORE CHURCHES WITHDRAW SUPPORT FROM McMASTER.

Christie Street Baptist Church, Toronto, at a meeting held recently dropped McMaster University from their financial budget; and similar action was taken by the Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, Hamilton, Ontario, Wednesday evening, March 10th.

#### PASTOR AND EDITOR AT HOME.

Dr. Shields who has been in the South for the past six weeks fulfilling speaking engagements in Atlanta and Macon, Georgia; Green Cove Springs, Jacksonville, and Orlando, Florida; Fort Worth and Houston, Texas, will reach Toronto Saturday, March 20, and will preach at both services on Sunday. Dr. Shields will also teach his Bible Class at 9.45.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

No. 1.

Lesson 15

SECOND QUARTER

April 11, 1926

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

### THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

**LESSON TEXT:** Fourteenth chapter of Matthew:

To be studied in harmony with lesson text: Mark 6: 14-56; Luke 9: 7-17.

The first two verses record Herod's fear that in Jesus Christ, John the Baptist had risen from the dead. In explanation, vs. 3-12 give an account of John's murder: hence, we should take vs. 3-12 first, and then vs. 1, 2.

#### I. THE MURDER OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

1. *John's preaching accused Herod and Herodias of sin.* Herod had taken his brother's wife for his own; and John had declared the union unlawful. Preachers and teachers should be unsparing and direct in their condemnation of sin. 2. *Herod put him in prison,* and would have put him to death had he dared. So would men always silence the prophet's voice if it were possible. 3. *Deterred from murder only by the fear of the multitude, Herod was at heart already a murderer.* So men are prevented from doing many things from fear of public opinion. But God judges us not for what we do only, but for what we would do. 4. *Whenever there is a willingness to commit sin, the devil will be sure to provide the occasion.* Here the dancing Salome so inflamed Herod that he promised anything she might ask, even to the half of his kingdom. So the devil will translate the evil thought into evil action. 5. *A promise to do evil, or a promise which ought never to have been made, is better broken than kept.* Herod was "sorry", but was not sorry enough to desist from doing the thing requested of him. 6. *Here is a revelation of sin's character.* Herodias hated the prophet who rebuked her, even to the degree of planning his murder; and then demanded the delivery of his head dripping with blood. For this terrible crime two women were responsible. What a commentary on the native evil of the human heart! 7. *What a commentary, too, on the dance evil!* This, of course, was not one of the popular dances of to-day: Salome danced before Herod,—not with him. Notwithstanding, it so moved him that he was willing to give the half of his kingdom. Such sensuous pleasures are too dangerous for any of us to play with. 8. *John's disciples buried their master's body,* "and then went and told Jesus". A worthy example: whatever your sorrow, or trouble, or difficulty, go and tell Jesus, for in telling Him you tell God.

#### II. WHAT HEROD SAID TO JESUS.

"It is John whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead". 1. *Herod was a Sadducee whose cardinal doctrine was that there was neither angel nor spirit nor resurrection.* Yet Herod's infidelity was only superficial and theoretical. In the presence of John he doubted the doctrines he professed; and while declaring as a Sadducee that there was no resurrection, he now affirms that John is risen from the dead. All such infidelity is superficial. Men fear the resurrection. Dead men tell no tales; but all tales which dead men have heard will be told again at the resurrection. There are too many slain prophets and murdered witnesses and smothered voices to welcome the news that the murdered Johns will live again.

Not literally, of course, have any of us murdered. Notwithstanding, he that hateth his brother is a murderer. Many people have hated their preacher because of his doctrine, and those who do so come dangerously near to the commission of Herod's sin.

2. *Herod was in a sense right in saying that in Jesus Christ John had risen from the dead;* for the reason that in Jesus all the slain prophets of the past find a resurrection. In Him there is a summary of all that God has ever spoken to men (Heb. 1: 1; Matt. 23: 34-36). There is not a man living who has not reason to fear the resurrection of his past.

#### III. THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

1. *The teaching involved in the miracle itself.* Every harvest involves a similar multiplication. The corn of wheat falls into the ground and dies, and

thus brings forth much fruit. Here our Lord Jesus shows Himself to be Sovereign of all forces and resources of nature. He accelerates the processes of time, and instantly multiplies both loaves and fishes. He is the Lord of eternity to whom a thousand years are but as a day. Teachers should emphasize the miraculous character of this act of our Lord's. It is not according to nature but supernatural. In this day especially we shall be wise on every possible occasion to take time to insist on the supernatural. 2. *This record of the supernatural power of Christ has in it much of spiritual teaching*: (1) He would not exercise His Divine power to satisfy His own hunger in the wilderness (Matt. 4: 3, 4); yet He used it to feed others. What power of self-restraint He used in the one instance! How wonderful that the powers of Deity are exercised in our behalf! (2) Multitudes are spiritually hungry. Have we eyes to see them, and hearts to feel for them? (3) We are disposed to pass on our responsibility to others, and to say, Send them away that they may buy bread. (4) Our Lord Jesus requires that we feed them ourselves. How small our resources! How impossible! Locally, and in our own church, what can we do to feed them? (5) God is always pleased to make use of what we have. Christ could easily have fed them out of nothing. He chose to call men into partnership and co-operation with Himself. (6) All He asks is that we put all our resources in His hands: He will do the rest. (7) Let teachers remember that it was not a man but a lad who contributed the loaves and fishes. What wonders God can do with what a lad carries in his basket or in his school bag, if only He has the lad!

#### IV. THE DISCIPLES IN THE STORM.

1. *Another miracle*. Insist on the fact. It cannot be explained away, but must be accepted at its face value. 2. *Jesus went up into a mountain apart to pray*. If He needed prayer, how much more do we! In one sense He is still so engaged: "He ever liveth to make intercession for us". 3. *The disciples were in the way of the Divine Command when they found contrary winds and a rough sea*. It is often so. Jonah got into the storm through running away, but these men through doing as they were commanded: it is dangerous to judge of the quality of an action by the favourable or adverse circumstances accompanying it. 4. *Though it was night, Mark tells us "He saw them"*. He always does. He knows all our troubles; and however dark the night, from His place of intercession His eyes are upon His troubled people. 5. *He comes in the fourth watch*,—not at once, but in His own time. And His time is always good time,—and in plenty of time. 6. *The disciples were afraid of their deliverer*. God often comes to us in ways which make us afraid. Notwithstanding, He bids us be of good cheer. 7. *Peter's venture*. There was a bit of faith in Peter's action, but much of doubt, too: "If it be Thou, bid me come to Thee on the water". But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid. So if we take our eyes off Christ, and look at the waves; if we look at our circumstances instead of the Saviour, we shall be filled with fear. Yet, wonderful to relate, the Lord saves him though he has but little faith. 8. *On this occasion the storm did not cease at all while they were at sea*. At another time He stilled the storm; but now He comes to them in the storm, and makes the billows of trouble which threaten to engulf them, only stepping-stones to their deliverance. He walked on the waves of trouble; and only when He and Peter were come into the ship did the wind cease. 9. *Such a deliverance glorifies only God* (vs. 33). "Call upon Me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee; and thou shalt glorify Me".

#### V. THE INEXHAUSTIBLE CHRIST.

We know from the healing of the woman who touched the hem of His garment that Christ perceived when virtue went out of Him. In other words, His miracles were wrought at cost to Himself. Consider then His miracles,—the feeding of five thousand, the long night vigil, the mastery of the storm—and after all this they sent into the land of Gennesaret and brought together all that were diseased: notwithstanding all that He had done, He was still able to make all who touched him perfectly whole.

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

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

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