

FURTHER LIGHT ON THE HOME MISSION BOARD	9
SOUTHERN BAPTISTS REPUDIATE THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION	14
NOTES ON THE LESSON	15

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. 5. TORONTO, MAY 13th, 1926. No. 1.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE FAITH OF NOAH.
A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, May 2nd, 1926.
(Stenographically reported.)

"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."—Hebrews 11:7.



HIS morning Dr. Riley spoke to us from the text, "Come thou and all thy house into the ark", and many responded to the invitation and came into the Ark; and those of us who had responded before felt anew the blessings and privileges which are ours in being shut in with Jesus Christ.

It occurred to me when I found that I could not, by any means, arrange to get someone to drive Dr. Munhall to Buffalo—I tried right to the last minute—it occurred to me that we might meditate a little further upon the same story, and consider what it really means to come into the Ark, and how Noah and his family were saved. You know, nowadays there are many who talk of the New Testament as though there were some contradiction between the Old and the New. I do not believe there is any doctrine of the gospel which does not find confirmation and illustration in the Old Testament. I once heard Dr. Haldeman preach from the last verse of this eleventh chapter of Hebrews; I was in New York holding an afternoon and evening service, and having no morning service I went to hear that great preacher. (If ever you are in New York on a Sunday, be sure to hear Dr. Haldeman once at least. Like Dr. Munhall, he is still a young man of about eighty years!) He took us that day into Westminster Abbey: he talked of the kings who were lying there, and of the statesmen, the poets, the scholars—the great men by whose efforts and labours the British Empire has been made; and he compared this eleventh chapter of Hebrews to Westminster Abbey, as the chapter in which God has preserved for us a record of the heroes of faith. You will see that the writer goes back to the very beginning, back to the creation, and leads us through all the chapters of human history, and tells us that all who were saved, were saved in the same way as we are saved—they were saved by faith.

There is a verse in this epistle which speaks of the atonement, which I

believe to be one of the most convincing of all scriptures, in support of the doctrine of the substitutionary death of our Lord. How do you know that Jesus died instead of you? There are many who preach Christ crucified as an Example, and His death as the climax of an exemplary life; they say that He lived a life of sacrifice, and died sacrificially, died vicariously as others are privileged to die who have suffered in behalf of others. But there is a verse in this epistle which tells us that Jesus died for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant; it tells us that the death of Christ had a retroactive value. Christ is not only an Example—and oh, He is an Example: "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps"—but that is only a half truth, for dead men need no example. He is an Example to the living, but He is a Substitute for those who are already dead in trespasses and sins; and this epistle tells us that the death of Christ, the value of it, reaches right back to the beginning, and that He died for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant. The "moral influence" theory of the atonement, you see, cannot be fitted in there. Because these men died, not having received the promises but having seen them afar off, they were persuaded of them; but they did not follow the example of Jesus, for as yet the Son of God had not been manifested. So that His death stretches back to the very beginning, and one arm of the cross reaches forward to the judgment day, and by His propitiatory sacrifice and by that alone, salvation is made possible to poor lost sinners. We are told that he is "set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God: to declare at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth on Jesus."

I remember a man's bringing forward a strange objection to the Scriptures. He said to me, "On what ground could Jesus say to the sinful woman, 'Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more?'" "Well", I said, "what would you have had Him do?" "Why", he said, "she was a sinner, and ought to have been punished!" The passage I have quoted assumes that the moral consciousness of the universe challenges God's right to pass over sins done aforesaid. How was it possible for Him to throw wide the gates of glory to Abel, to Enoch, to Noah, to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses,—all the people of Israel? When we know that the blood of bulls and of goats cannot take away sins, how then was it possible for God to pass over sins done aforesaid? How can God be justified in permitting the world to continue in sin, and yet saving out of the world multitudes of people by His grace before their debts were paid? Why, my friends, the cross of our Lord Jesus not only justifies you and me, but it justifies God; and Jesus Christ is "set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past". It is God's unfolding of the promissory note given to Him by His Son before the worlds were made, and by virtue of which, on the strength of which, in the confidence of the fulfilment of which, God passed over men's sins. And when at last Jesus came and died, He justified the forbearance of God in thus waiting until the debt should be paid. So you see the Cross stands at the centre of all human history, and by the blood of the Cross all men are justified who are justified at all; and by the sacrifice of the Cross, God Himself is justified, if I may dare to say so, before the conscience of the universe. He is just, and yet the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

Now that by the way, just as a basis for our study of this Old Testament story. I need not rehearse it, you are as familiar with it as I am.

I.

NOAH WAS WARNED BY HIS FAITH, it was by faith Noah was saved; and this verse tells us that he began to be saved by being warned of God: "by faith" Noah was warned of God. That is a note that is not generally sounded to-day, but we need to "warn" men. I have no doubt that Noah had abundant opportunity to see round about him the evidences of the result of sin. "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death". You really do not need to take a course in medicine to know that diphtheria is a very dangerous disease; you do not need to be an expert to know that a diagnosis of cancer is generally a sentence of death: we all know that there are certain diseases which are beyond human

power to cure; and without any expert knowledge at all the ordinary observer can see round about him some of the fruits of these diseases. And so of the transgression of natural law: you do not need to read the Bible to discover that it is of the nature of the thing for fire to burn—just put your hand in the fire and you will find that out; you do not need a course in theology to learn that if you jump off the top of your house you will likely have a broken bone—and perhaps something more than that. These are matters of general observation; and I have no doubt that in that day of great wickedness, Noah had abundant opportunity to see what sin does in a human life. You do not need me to preach to you for you to know that the man who gets drunk is likely to die poor, and to get into a great deal of trouble; you can see that every day. There were plenty of opportunities roundabout in that day of great wickedness for Noah to see that sin was a deadly disease; and yet it was not because of that that Noah believed, nor was it because of that that he turned to God: we are told that Noah was "warned of God", and it was because God had spoken to him that Noah had faith. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," always.

I think those of us who seek to lead men to believe, would be well advised to make much of the Word of God. Let the people hear the Word of God, and the Word of God will take care of itself. I think it is quite possible that Noah did not try to explain the Word of God to those to whom he told it; I rather think it was beyond his ability to explain it. There are many things we do not understand, that we cannot understand: they belong to a realm of which we have no experience; and it will be the part of wisdom for us simply to declare them in the name of the Lord, and on the authority of His Word, and depend upon the Holy Ghost to work faith in the soul.

Now I say Noah was "warned", and *his faith rested upon a divine revelation*. That is where faith must find its foundation always. What is the difference? We have been discussing during these last days distinctions between Modernism and what is now called Fundamentalism—which is only another name for evangelical faith, Evangelical Christianity. What is the essential difference between the two? Just this: evangelical faith rests always upon a revelation from heaven: it hears the Word of God, it receives the Word of God, it rests upon the Word of God; and over against that divine Revelation, Modernism sets human reason. The difference between Modernism and Fundamentalism is simply this: that modernists are rationalists, and fundamentalists are revelationists. Fundamentalists believe in a divine revelation, and commit their souls to the truth therein revealed for time and for eternity.

Let us accept that. Are you a believer this evening? Have you the beginnings of faith in your heart? Are you just feeling after Him, if haply you may find Him? You say to me, "Well, sir, I don't know whether I have the beginnings of faith or not, I cannot put faith under a microscope, I cannot subject it to any kind of chemical analysis, I cannot resolve it into its elements, I cannot take it out and examine it. It seems to be simple sometimes, and yet its very simplicity staggers me, and I don't know what it is to believe." Well, I think I will try, with the Lord's help, to tell you this evening what it is to believe. What is faith? It is something which leads the soul to rest itself—its present and its future—upon something that God has said, upon a revelation from heaven. Do you believe that God has spoken? Do you really believe that we have a divine revelation? That is a simple word, but let me press that question. Do you believe that in a literal sense God Himself has spoken, and that the record of His Word is preserved in the Bible? That this Bible is the Word of God? Are you prepared to believe what God has said?

Let us examine it a moment. What was *the content of that revelation?* What was Noah asked to believe? Some of you would say to me, "Well, sir, I would be glad to believe the Bible, I wish I could believe it." I remember Clarence Darrow, that great lawyer, saying to me once when crossing the sea—I was sitting on the upper deck discussing these matters with him, I think I have referred to it before—and he said, "You know, your religion is just dope, that is all it is. My wife and daughter take it, and it seems to do them good, and I don't begrudge them it; and I sometimes wish I could take it myself. But it is just dope, that is all it is." We shall see whether it is just dope to us. "I would like to believe the Bible, but there are a great many

things in the Bible that I don't understand, that seem to me to be quite impossible." Well, what was Noah asked to believe? What was the content of that divine revelation? What is the function of divine revelation? What is the Word of God for? We have heard a lot of discussion about science—and I agree with my brethren that the Bible is not unscientific—but was the Bible given to teach science? Was it given to teach history, primarily? What was it given for? You remember how John sums up the record which he had given—and what he says of his gospel may be applied to the entire Scripture—he said, "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." That is what the Bible is for: it is given to us that we may believe.

And let me tell you this, before I go further, that just as the air is given us to breathe, and water is given us to drink, and food to eat, there are some things that are given to us just merely to be believed whether we understand them or not! "Oh", but you say, "that does violence to my reason if you ask me to believe things that I don't understand"! Why, my friends, you are believing the word of men when you don't understand it. There are a great many young men going to colleges and universities in this city, and they are accepting that which their professors teach them: they don't understand it at all, they simply accept it—and they are receiving the word of men by faith. I wonder how many of you drive cars? Some of you are mechanics, some of you understand what happens when you move a lever, when you change the gear; but I have known some people that if something went wrong with the engine they would look in the back tire for it! They don't know what happens, they have no mechanical knowledge in their heads; they don't know what has gone wrong with the engine, and they don't know how to put it right, but they know how to drive the car. They know if they do certain things the machine will go—but they could not build an engine or put it right when it goes wrong. We don't understand the processes through which our food passes, and why certain foods have a larger nutritive element in them than other things: we just take them. I declare to you that I am very glad I don't have to analyze the milk I use like those gentlemen who publish the health bulletins! I don't often read it, but occasionally I glance at it and I discover that there are a hundred million less bacteria in a spoonful of milk this week than there were last! I am glad to hear that, but I have no time to count the things if I had a microscope big enough to see them. (Laughter).

But we are, in all realms, actually living by faith. Why, the very dollar bills that you use are only Government notes. Do you know that the Government of Canada is sound? But that is hardly the illustration I want. Suppose you get a bill from a certain bank, with the stamp of the bank on it, what do you know about it before you accept it? If someone offers you a ten-dollar bill on some one of the banks, do you say, "I cannot accept that until I see their records, their last year's statement, what the amount of their reserve is"—and all the rest of it? You know you don't do anything of the kind: you will put your temporal interests in jeopardy on the principle of faith, just accepting the word of men, and leaning upon men in every direction, and being guided by what men say.

And yet that man comes and says, "I have difficulty, sir, to believe the Word of God". I suppose Noah might have found it difficult. What was the content, then, of revelation? Listen: "Being warned of God of things not seen as yet"—that is what God talked to him about: He did not talk to him about the stars, about the flowers, about anything about him. He said, "Noah, a hundred and twenty years from now something is going to happen which never did happen in all human history. The end of all flesh is come before me." Supposing Noah had consulted the scientists of his day—if there were any—supposing he had assembled them and said, "Gentlemen, I have had a revelation from God, and I should like to have your confirmation of what God has said, I should be greatly obliged if you would draw upon your resources of knowledge, and tell me whether this is true." Supposing he had done that, what would have been the result? "Why," they would have said, "Noah, that element in your divine revelation is utterly unscientific, it is contrary to all

analogy, there is nothing in human history to support it; you are asked to believe that something will take place such as never did take place. The evidence of your senses is actually against it, and there is nothing anywhere to corroborate it. If you believe that story, then we shall have to call you a fool for your pains!" And don't you see, dear friends, Noah would have answered thus, he would have said, "Ah, but God has spoken to me about things not seen as yet; He has told me of something that is beyond the range of human wisdom, and of human knowledge; and it makes no difference to me if there is not a man in all the world to confirm what God has said. I will believe the Word anyhow"—"By faith Noah was warned of God."

Let me give an illustration of what I mean, the principle I am discussing with you. The papers have been full of a reference to that marvellous section of Scripture—let no one ever speak lightly of it—the book of the prophet Jonah. I frankly say that I am not at all concerned about the testimony of science so-called, respecting that matter: if science agrees, so much the better for science; and if science disagrees, so much the worse for science. But it does not make any difference to the Word of God. I don't care whether the Word of God is in accord with science so-called at any point. Why should I? I remember years ago reading an address of Spurgeon in which he said something to this effect: "We pass by sets of scientific hypotheses as rapidly as a traveller on an express train passes the telephone poles beside the road. And", he said, "I hold no debate with men of science, I simply hand them over to each other, and when they have done rending each other in pieces, I say, 'Gentlemen you have not been half so kind to each other as I should have tried to be.'" I do not believe there is anything in Scripture unscientific, but it would not make a bit of difference to my faith if all the scientists in the world specially qualified to speak in that special department of human knowledge, were to come to me and say, "There never was a fish that could swallow a man", I should say, "That is quite possible." If they were to say, "Man never did see a fish that could have swallowed Jonah", I would say, "That is quite possible." What does the Bible say? The Bible says that God "prepared" a fish. Did God not make all the fish, "and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas"? And if He had wanted to do so, He could have made one special creature spring into being at His almighty fiat to serve His purpose on that particular day, and, having served His purpose, He could have annihilated it, so that there should have been left in all human history no solitary record—and man would have been shut up to what God has said. Would that have made any difference? Not a bit.

Let us be glad when human knowledge keeps up with the Bible. I read a lecture by a certain theological professor to theological students, in which he advised them to read the old masters, to read the old preachers who lived centuries ago, to be students of history. And one of the students said, "But, professor, must we not keep abreast of the time?" To which he answered, "By all means, young gentleman, but get abreast of the times first!" And the difficulty with a lot of us is, we have not even got abreast of the times; and when science says, "I find that the Scripture is in accord with my discoveries," I simply say to the man of science, "I am delighted to know that you are getting on"; that is all. But if he says it is not, I only say, "I am sorry, sir, for your blindness; but the Word of the Lord standeth forever." Don't you see that Noah's faith rested upon what God said? And that revelation was unique, it had to do with things about which men naturally were absolutely destitute of knowledge.

That is the function of the Bible. What is it for? Never is it untrue to fact, never is it contrary to truth in any realm; for truth can never contradict itself, and is in agreement in all realms. There is no doubt about that, but listen: this Book is given to us to tell us of things that we don't see; it is given to us to tell us of a judgment to come, just as surely as God told Noah. He said, "The windows of heaven shall be opened, and the fountains of the great deep shall be broken up, and the waters will rise until the tops of the highest hills are covered, and all flesh in whose nostrils is the breath of life shall die, except those who are preserved in the ark." And Noah might well have been staggered by such a revelation, and said, "I don't see how it can be, Lord, I never saw anything like that, I have spoken to people about it and

they never heard of it, I have searched the records of the past, and there is nothing to confirm my faith; but inasmuch as God out of heaven has spoken, I will cast my all upon what He has said, and I will get ready for that judgment day."

That, my friends, is the truth I bring to you this evening. In spite of Russellism, in spite of all that men say, "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." And just as surely as the judgment fell in Noah's day, judgment will fall upon every sin, and every sinner out of Christ, and if you are a wise man you will be "warned" by faith, you will say, "My professor does not agree with me, I cannot find agreement in any of the things I read, but I will take this, and I will believe when God speaks He speaks the truth and only the truth, and I will commit my soul to what God has spoken." Well, if that is so, and you are out of Christ, you will be warned.

II.

Then, NOAH'S FAITH MADE HIM WISE: he was "moved with fear". "Why," you say, "you are not going to preach that?" Somebody said to me last night when I was coming away from Massey Hall, "You ought to stop preaching about hell." I don't know who the man was, except that I know he was a Russellite of some sort. Oh, yes, I know it is said you cannot drive men to-day—you can win them, but you cannot drive them. Some brave fellow says, "I am not afraid, you cannot make me afraid." No!—of the wicked it is said, "There is no fear of God before their eyes", that is the sorrow of it. And yet many preachers are terrified by the shadow of some professor! Noah could not make the men of his generation afraid: he told them of coming judgment, but they laughed at him, they knew no fear, and they knew not, notwithstanding his preaching, the record says in the New Testament, "until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all." They would not believe it; they would not be "moved with fear". Our brethren sang just now about the trumpet of the Lord, about God calling us in the thunder, and in the lightning. I am a little bit hesitant about attempting to label or to date events, specifically to identify the happenings of the day as being the particular horrors which the Scriptures predict, so well do I know, and you know, that there have always been wars and rumors of wars, and earthquakes, and famine, and pestilence; and yet we have seen in our day such things as the world never saw before. I wonder if you have thought of this—just give me your attention for a moment—do you remember a few years ago when the news of the sinking of the Titanic reached us, how the whole earth shuddered at that fearful catastrophe? It was such a terrible calamity! And men began to talk of God, and to think of God: just a little jab, you know, from one of God's icebergs which came floating along and elbowed that great creation of man's genius out of existence. A little while later we had the Empress of Ireland disaster in the St. Lawrence, and men shuddered and said, "What next?" Then came the Great War, and during the course of that war we got used to hearing every day of the sinking of ships whose total tonnage was far greater than the Titanic and the Empress of Ireland combined—we got so used to reading of the loss of thousands, and tens of thousands of lives, we actually became so calloused that we could look upon rivers red with human blood without alarm.

I wonder are we becoming insensible? I wonder if there is a kind of judicial blindness falling upon the world, so that men cannot see or apprehend the signs of the coming judgments of God? Oh, my brother, if we are wise, we shall learn to be afraid. You are afraid of some things, are you not? How lightly we turn this thing on (turning on the electric light)! I read only this week of a man touching a common electric light like this in his bathroom, and being struck dead, electrocuted. It is not power to be played with. You cannot play with God's lightning. I read of a man last week who had gone over Niagara in a barrel—I never could understand why men try to make themselves famous that way, I never had the slightest temptation to do that.—I have been at Niagara Falls a great many times, and am always thankful for that good solid iron rail! I am glad there is that between me and the Falls—and that man later slipped on a piece of orange peel and died. Oh, how little we know about the great forces of nature!

But Noah heard God speak, and the Scripture says he was "moved with fear". What if it be true, that this overwhelming judgment shall sweep over the earth—what then? What then, young man, who has been persuaded that it is rather old-fashioned to be concerned about your sins, or to be afraid of God? "Oh," somebody says, "preach the love of God, preach the love of God, talk to us about the Cross as an example, a manifestation of love." No, No, my friends, the background of the Cross is sin, and judgment. It is impossible for me to conceive of God's giving His Son to die as He died, to be spat upon, mocked, crucified, just that He might set me an example: there must have been some awful thing seen in the wisdom of God from which His grace desired to save men for Him to be willing to give His Son to die! We talk to-day about lawlessness—and we have enough of it everywhere—but much of our lawlessness is due to bad government, that is all, it is due to the fact that we don't enforce our laws. Talk about prohibition! Somebody says it is a failure because there are bootleggers. Are you going to repeal the law against murder because there are murderers? Are you going to repeal the law against dishonesty because there are some people who are not honest, or are we to enforce the law? Every kind of human government in the world to-day points to the necessity of another Government over and above it all, and of a Judge upon the throne Who will enforce His laws. And such a Judge is God, even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. I heard of an old sailor being out in a boat on Georgian Bay, he was a man who had sailed the seven seas, he had braved the fury of many a storm, he was familiar with all the dangers of the deep and he was out in a storm in a frail craft. He had some young men from the city with him. Suddenly a storm came up, and the waves began to roll up and the wind to blow, and the old man became very nervous. He was piloting the boat, and the boys about him were rollicking about having a good time in the midst of the storm; and when he cautioned them to be quiet and careful, and spoke as though there might be danger, they teased him, taunted him, and said, "Aha, are you afraid? We are not afraid." "No," he said "you fools! You don't know enough to be afraid!"

And that is what I say of every man who is not afraid of the wrath of God, in view of the black record of his own sin. If we know what sin is, and are not assured that it has been blotted out by the blood of Christ, if we had an infinitesimal grain of spiritual sense we should not close our eyes until we had accepted the divine warning. Noah prepared an ark to the saving of his house; and in that he was eminently wise.

When Dr. Riley was speaking this morning about the preparation of Noah's ark, I said to myself, "That was a great engineering feat. I wonder where Noah learned to be a ship builder? I wonder how he did it? Read the story. Who was the Architect Who designed that great ship? Why, the ark was built just like the temple after the pattern that came down from heaven. And let me tell you, my friends, that if that ark had not been planned in heaven Noah never would have been able to build it—he might have desired to do so, but he never would have saved himself or his family; and the salvation in which we glory is a salvation that was conceived in the mind of the Eternal before the worlds were formed: the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world is the Ark. We need no preparation save to come just as we are, and be shut up with Christ Who died "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."

III.

So, my friends, there are these elements: the warning of faith, the wisdom of faith, and, next, THE WITNESS OF FAITH. What was the witness by which he condemned the world? When that door was shut and the ark floated upon the bosom of the waves of judgment, I don't know that Noah said it, but he might have said, "I told you so. This day the word of the Lord is vindicated, and the fact that eight of us are saved by divine direction and through believing the Word of God is the condemnation of all the rest of you, because you would not believe the same word by which we are saved." I sometimes think that God has a record, say, for example, of a place like this church, I think perhaps He has a record of every pew, and of the very place where you are sitting. Perhaps it is written down in heaven that somebody has been saved sitting right there. Perhaps this very night sitting beside you someone will be

saved hearing the Word, or under the same preacher somebody will be saved; and that fact will be a witness against every one of us if we receive not the Word of the Lord Jesus.

IV.

Well I have done with this simple word: "He became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." THE WEALTH OF FAITH—how rich he became by simply believing what God said! Mr. Stockley spoke to us last week, and one thing he said—I suppose I have thought of it before, but it came to me with peculiar sweetness when he spoke of the imputed righteousness of Christ, and declared that God delights in the believer even as He delights in His Son. Sometimes we think that God just tolerates us—that He merely tolerates us. A dear fellow came to me the other day and told me how he was let out of Kingston, a tragic thing, after twenty years. He said, "They gave me a suit of clothes, a ticket to Toronto, five dollars, and turned me adrift". They don't want him back in the penitentiary, but he says they don't want him anywhere else. That is not how God forgives. Oh, no! But Mr. Stockley said this, that when God looked upon His Son He said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased"; and when the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, poor sinners that we are, God is just as "well pleased" with us as He is with His Son, that He takes a positive delight in His people, and He loves to look upon them. When I was travelling recently I saw a mother and her little boy, they were just in the opposite seat from me, across the aisle, and I travelled two days with them. I watched the mother as she gazed lovingly at the little boy; whenever he moved, she followed him with her eyes; and sometimes she could not stand it any longer, and she just reached forward and clasped him to her breast, as though he were the very delight of her life.

If I could but remember that God has provided a way of salvation whereby He not only takes my sins away but He imputes the righteousness of Christ, the beauty of Christ, the attractiveness of Christ—all that Christ is—to me, a poor sinner! And that He loves to look upon me! I find comfort in that sometimes when I find that some folks don't like to see me, and when I know some folks don't like to hear me, I say, "Well, I know Somebody Who likes to hear me when I talk to Him, and I know Someone Who finds a positive delight in me—not because I am worthy, but because I am made complete in Christ." Oh, what a blessing! "Heir of the righteousness which is by faith."

My brother, you can put all your record of sin behind you, you can do better than that: you can not only put it behind you, but you can bury it in the grave of Christ. There is a wonderful phrase in the Scripture—I don't know what it means and I don't want to know,—where one of the prophets said, "Thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back." Where is that? Behind the back of God! I don't know where it is except that I know it is a place where the devil will never find them. Yes, we can get our sins behind us, and the whole record of the past buried in the grave of Christ, and cast behind God's back; and we can rise to "walk in newness of life", clothed in His righteousness, and at last we may sweep through the gates into the Eternal City.

Is it not a great thing to have a salvation like that? Receive it as Noah did, believe the Word of God, believe His promise and thou shalt have everlasting life.

THE PULPIT LAST SUNDAY AND NEXT.

At the morning school last Sunday there was an attendance of 1,139. Mr. James McGinlay, Pastor of Alton Baptist Church, preached morning and evening to large congregations; and a number confessed Christ at both services. The Pastor will preach morning and evening this Sunday.

PASSING OF MRS. R. E. NEIGHBOUR.

As we go to press, a telegram from Dr. Neighbour tells of the home-going of Mrs. Neighbour who has been ill for some months. Dr. Neighbour has ministered to us often in Jarvis Street, and the hearts of the entire membership go out to him and his family at this time of sorrow.

Editorial

HOME MISSION BOARD MATTERS.

The Editor of the Gospel Witness:

There have been matters discussed at recent meetings of the Baptist Home Mission Board and the Executive thereof in which the whole Denomination is vitally interested and this is my reason for writing this letter.

I have been a member of the Board for over thirty years and have taken an active interest in the work thereof and have, until recently, felt that the Board had exercised great fairness in their dealings with missionaries and students engaged in Home Mission work, as well as keeping free from any entanglement with the difficulties of any other Boards. Now we have the Board itself, by a large majority, approving of a resolution which, if carried out, will in my judgment, be disastrous to the work of the Convention, but like a runaway horse, a majority of the members of the Board took the bit in their teeth and issued commands to our missionaries who were assumed to be employees of the Board, directing them regarding the denominational subjects they should discuss on their fields, thus attempting to muzzle the missionaries and take away the freedom of speech enjoyed by every Baptist pastor. Further, the Board endeavored to put a ban on members of the Board discussing matters outside the Board which vitally affected the life of the Denomination.

The issue in the controversy is not what the students' or missionaries' opinions are or may be. The issue is not Dr. Shields or those who support him. The issue is McMaster University and the teaching therein and the management thereof, and this is the issue the Convention and our churches will have to face and decide, and until it is decided right the controversy will continue and in the discussion thereof the mouths of our Pastors, our Missionaries, our Church members cannot be closed by the order of any Board.

A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Home Mission Board was held on January 21st, 1926, when the following resolution was moved by Rev. H. McDiarmid, and seconded by Rev. H. E. Green:

"The Executive Committee of the Home Mission Board ask the Executive Committee of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec to take immediate steps whereby Convention-wide action be taken with regard to the attitude of Dr. Shields and others whose propaganda is hindering the work in which we are engaged."

I had been at the meeting up to about 12.30 and had to leave the meeting to keep an important business engagement, and it was after I left the meeting that this resolution was presented and carried. I heard during the afternoon that important business had come up after I left and I asked the Secretary for a copy of this resolution, and I inquired regarding the discussion thereon and then learned that it was stated at the meeting that the Executive Committee of the Convention were arranging for a meeting of the Convention within a few weeks, but that the plan was being kept quite secret for the present. The matter leaked out—the newspapers got hold of it—and the Convention plan was abandoned. There were only nine members of the Committee present, I believe, when I left. This resolution was not on the agenda of the Committee and no notice had been given of its presentation in the call of the meeting and it was business which, in my judgment, the Committee had no right or authority to deal with.

When the minutes of this Executive meeting were sent out to the members of the Board, I received my copy on the morning of April 15th, for which date another meeting of the Executive had been called. This resolution did not appear in the copy of the minutes and at the meeting on April 15th an explanation was given by Rev. Mr. Coumans, a member of the Board, that some time (the date was not mentioned) after the meeting on 21st January, he had asked the mover and seconder of the resolution to withdraw same and they had agreed to do so, stating the resolution was embarrassing to the Superintendent. I cannot see how this resolution could embarrass the Superintendent, but I can quite understand it might be embarrassing to those who supported it. I under-

stood one of the sponsors for the resolution to say in reply to Mr. Coumans, that he did not agree to this withdrawal. I cannot see how, after the minutes of a meeting have been completed, any member, even though the mover and seconder desired to do so, could withdraw any motion which had been duly passed. At a subsequent meeting of the Executive there might have been a resolution rescinding the motion, but the minutes would have to stand as they were passed. It is to be noted that the minutes of a meeting are not inviolate if it is necessary to serve the interest of certain members. If I had not got a copy of the resolution, probably I would not have known that such a resolution had been passed.

A meeting of the Executive Committee was held on April 15th, 1926, and a copy of the minutes, as appears in the Secretary's book, are as follows:

"Re Summer Students:

Mr. Webb, chairman, stated that he had received three letters from three members of the Board—Brethren Burrell, Green and McDiarmid—in regard to the appointment of students on summer fields who had protested against the appointment of Professor Marshall to McMaster University.

For the consideration of this question this emergency meeting of the Executive Committee has been called.

Mr. McDiarmid stated that he had written a letter to the Superintendent, in which he protested against the appointment of these students unless they were first examined or their case fully considered by the whole Board. He felt convinced that all proceedings relative to their final appointment should be stayed or withdrawn if already accomplished, until after the general Board meeting.

There followed a discussion as to whether the Executive could deal with the work of the Examining and Stationing Committee.

Mr. Urquhart, the Solicitor, held that the Board only can revise the work of a committee that the Board has appointed and that one committee could not revise the work of another committee, as both committees are responsible, not to each other, but to the Board.

It was decided, therefore, to refer this question to the Board which it is expected will meet before the end of this month. It was then arranged that the date of the semi-annual meeting of the Home Mission Board should be Thursday, April 29th, 1926.

Upon motion by Mr. Green, and Mr. Boyd, the meeting was adjourned."

This is a fairly accurate report of the meeting, but it should be added, for the information of the Baptist constituency, that there was much discussion at that meeting regarding the matter and some of the members of the Committee were bound to take up the question of the allotment of fields to the student missionaries who had signed the protest against Professor Marshall's teachings. They were prepared, if they had the power to do so, to prevent those students (some of whom the Superintendent at the subsequent Board meeting stated to be among the very best workers the Board had) from expressing their opinion on a question which was of vital interest to the Denomination, namely, the teaching of Professor Marshall. They had practical knowledge. They were in his classes. Heard his lectures. Some even had personal interviews with him. They knew better than members of the Home Mission Board what the Professor taught, and what he believed and they, with this personal knowledge, were either to be muzzled or not appointed to fields. They also sought to suppress the members of the Committee reporting what was discussed at that meeting. I declined to be bound by any such agreement and several of the members used some very strong personal expressions regarding myself, but these are neither here nor there in the controversy. I stated, however, that I would give such publicity to the discussion as I might deem necessary and that I might use it in an address at the meeting called to organize a Baptist Bible Union for Ontario. (I did not, however, do so, as I decided it was better to see what the Board would do). Were they ashamed of what they were doing—were they afraid of Baptist public opinion? If their proposed action was just and right, why not broadcast it over the Denomination? The fact remains, they did not wish the discussion made public.

A meeting of the Board was held on Thursday, April 29th. The following members were present:

Members elected by the Convention: Rev. O. U. Chapman, Windsor; Mr.

W. J. Kerr, Hamilton; Rev. H. McDiarmid, Stratford; Mr. C. Cook, Brantford; Mr. Arthur Jones, Montreal; Rev. H. B. Coumans, Toronto; Rev. J. R. Webb, Kitchener; Thomas Urquhart, Toronto.

Members representing Associations: Rev. H. C. Bryant, Smith's Falls; Rev. P. C. Cameron, Orillia; Rev. D. W. Terry, Sherbrooke, Quebec; Dr. F. R. Watson, Georgetown; Rev. R. R. McKay, Sarnia; Rev. H. E. Green, Hamilton; Rev. J. D. McLachlan, Waterford; Rev. M. Hall, Timmins; Rev. W. R. Telford, Cornwall; Rev. C. R. Duncan, Brantford (now Toronto), Secretary of McMaster University; Rev. N. S. McKechnie, Belleville; Rev. W. E. Hodgson, Toronto; Rev. G. W. Connors, Mount Forest; Rev. F. G. Burrell, Leamington; Mr. A. D. Kitchener, Lindsay.

The question of summer students and student pastors was brought from its place on the agenda after the first hour of the meeting and was discussed (except during one hour adjournment for lunch) by the Board until about three o'clock in the afternoon. Rev. J. R. Webb was in the chair in the absence of the President, and explained how he received letters from Rev. H. McDiarmid, Rev. H. E. Green, Rev. F. G. Burrell and Rev. R. R. McKay, and also referred to another letter from a layman in Guelph, whose name was not mentioned. Several of these letters were read and there was some discussion and comment thereon. Then Mr. Hodgson asked if this meeting of the Board was a public meeting and referred to the discussion of the Executive Committee when Mr. Urquhart refused to be bound not to report anything that happened at the Executive meeting. The Chairman suggested that the discussion should not be made public, there should be what he called, a gentleman's agreement. There was some discussion about this. Mr. Jones, of Montreal, held that this was not a secret meeting and that its doings could not be kept secret. Mr. Webb thought that the Board should express an opinion regarding it. Mr. McKay thought the decisions only might be given out. Dr. Watson thought that any statement made by Mr. Urquhart would be correct. I suggested that the business of the Board was the business of the Denomination and that every Church that was interested in the Home Mission Board had the right to have knowledge of the work that was carried on by the Home Mission Board and declined to be bound by such an agreement.

It is again seen from this that, not only did the members of the Board seek to stifle or muzzle the opinions of the students in their discussion of the teachings of McMaster University, but they sought also to stifle and muzzle the discussion thereof in the Denomination by a member of the Board. Why such a desire if their project was just and right?

Rev. H. McDiarmid read a resolution which he moved, condemning in the strongest possible way Dr. Shields and his friends with their propaganda, and particularly dealing with the question of the students on summer fields, and particularly those students who had the temerity to sign a protest regarding the teachings of Professor Marshall. I have asked the Secretary for a copy of this resolution, but he advises me that he has not got a copy as it was not left with him. While the resolution itself was not seconded, yet there afterwards was a motion made and seconded that it be discussed, clause by clause, and it was so discussed, and this resolution of Mr. McDiarmid should be on the files of the Board. I did not make a copy at the meeting as I thought it would be on file. The resolution proposed to instruct all students not to discuss matters now in controversy in our Denomination on their fields, if the discussion or opinion would be in opposition or contrary to the expressed will of the Convention.

There was a very long discussion on this resolution. It is not possible to give it all. Mr. Telford thought it would be very difficult to compel students not to talk about the matter, and said that there was discontent regarding the teachings of McMaster University. Mr. Coumans strongly supported Professor Marshall. He was all right in his opinion. Mr. Bryant, Smith's Falls, said that his church was opposed to Professor Marshall and that he himself was opposed to retaining Mr. Marshall. Mr. McDiarmid claimed that he was not trying to muzzle anyone, but he was endeavouring to safeguard the interests of the Convention, and later on, in speaking again, he stated that they had the right to make any demands dealing with treason in our Denomination. It was time to fight the results of treason. Men in employ of the Board should in

every respect support the attitude of the Convention. Mr. Jones said it was not treason for students to say Professor Marshall's appointment was wrong, but the students should carry out the wishes of the Convention, and the regulations should be carried out in as far as possible. Mr. Burrell claimed that he would not become a servant of a Church if he was not in harmony with its views. This Board is the servant of the Convention and when the Convention speaks a man should agree or should resign. The Churches will say that they are not going to support the Board if they send us students to criticize the policy of the Board. This Board has the Convention's will to exercise. Mr. Duncan, speaking after lunch, thought they ought to follow the intention of the Board as expressed in the morning meeting. Mr. McKechnie thought they should have some resolution passed. Mr. Jones said they should bind down students as against either side. Mr. Kitchener said he was no friend of Dr. Shields. Steps should be taken that students should not agitate, but passing a resolution might affect his church.

Mr. Cook thought to deliberately appoint students to fields who were opposed to McMaster University would be wrong; to deliberately appoint men to pull down would be wrong, but must be careful not to go too fast or too far. He read a resolution prepared by himself, but it was not seconded. The writer of this letter spoke and stated to the members of the Board that they were playing with fire, that they might as well pass a resolution directing what the missionaries' wife should wear as to say that the missionaries should not discuss questions of interest to the Denomination. They could not by a resolution, close the mouths of our missionaries or students.

Mr. McKay stated that he had made up his mind while sitting on the Board in the morning that he was opposed to any attempt to bind or muzzle, but there should be a resolution that the Superintendent and members of the Stationing Committee be instructed to request all students going to summer fields to refrain from anything that would be divisive.

Mr. Duncan finally moved, seconded by Mr. Green, the following resolution:

"In view of the fact that the present controversy disturbing the churches must be dealt with by the Convention which sanctioned the appointment to which some exception is now being taken, the Home Mission Board instructs the Superintendent to confer personally or by letter with all missionaries of the Board and make it clear to them that the Board does not desire any Pastor supported by denominational funds and under their direction to bring the controversy into the churches or to influence the members of the churches in a manner which may interfere with the loyalty of the Board to the work of the Convention as a whole."

This resolution was discussed by a number. Mr. McDiarmid, Mr. McKechnie and others desired the Stationing and Examining Committee be associated with the Superintendent. Mr. McLachlan questioned the wisdom of passing the resolution. Mr. McKechnie desired to know if you could call Home Mission pastors appointees of the Board. Mr. McDiarmid claimed the Board had the right to make any demands. They were dealing with treason in our Denomination. Time to fight results. A man in the employ of the Board should in every respect support the attitude of the Convention. It was at this point that Mr. Jones said it was not treason for students to say Professor Marshall's appointment was wrong, but they should carry out the wishes of the Convention.

Mr. Chapman thought that students should appreciate a guiding hand like the Superintendent's upon their shoulders. Mr. Hodgson, supporting the resolution, said that students should be advised to keep out of controversy. Dr. Watson asked for Mr. Schutt's, the Superintendent's, report, and Mr. Schutt stated the Board could not get along without the protesting students named, that among them were found the very best men that we had, and he particularly mentioned the splendid work of some of these men and naming the fields on which they did their work. As he went on to do this the Chairman stopped him in the midst of his explanation, and the writer asked that Mr. Schutt be allowed to finish and the Chairman claimed that he did not desire to stop Mr. Schutt, but the result was that Mr. Schutt ceased his explanation and the Board did not have the full explanation of the Superintendent regarding the work of these students.

I then moved the following amendment to the resolution, seconded by Rev. Morley Hall:

"That all words after the word 'view' in first line be struck out and the following inserted so that it will read 'In view of the discussion before the Board the Superintendent be instructed regarding students taking summer work on Mission fields to carry out the policy which has been in force in other years and give the student Missionaries such instruction as he has been in the habit from year to year of giving them before going to their fields'."

When the vote was taken on the amendment, I asked for the yeas and nays. The yeas were as follows: Messrs. Hall and Urquhart. Nays: Messrs. Kitchener, Connors, Green, McKay, Burrell, Chapman, Telford, Hodgson, McDiarmid, Kerr, McKechnie, McLachlan, Terry, Cook, Watson, Jones and Cameron—seventeen. I am not quite sure whether Mr. Webb, the Chairman, actually voted, but he supported the resolution, and I am not sure whether Mr. Coumans was in the room, but he also supported the resolution. Only two members supported the amendment, which approved of the policy which the Board has always carried out regarding students, and nineteen supported the radical change. Mr. Schutt and Mr. Bryant did not vote. Mr. Duncan's resolution was carried on the same vote, the same 17 or 19 voting yeas, and two nays.

In connection with the resolution, what someone called a covering letter was sent out by the Superintendent as follows:

"223 Church St.,
Toronto 2, April 30th, 1926.

My Dear Brother:

At the meeting of the Home Mission Board held on April 29th, 1926, which was very largely attended the following resolution was passed: (Then followed the resolution set out on page 5).

The Vice-Chairman of the Board, who presided at the meeting, has asked me to state that it is not intended that this resolution should in any way limit the usual liberties of Baptist workers, but rather that the considered opinion of an overwhelming majority of the Board is, that any propaganda one way or the other in connection with the present controversy is considered outside the purpose for which this Board has sent men into its fields, and can only hamper us in our preaching the Word of God, to which we all desire to be loyal.

Earnestly praying that large blessing may rest upon your labours, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

In His service,

"CHARLES H. SCHUTT."

It will be noted that this letter added to the resolution is the opinion of Mr. Webb, the Vice-Chairman. There is nothing in the minutes of the Board to suggest that the Chairman was to interpret the resolution but the letter seems to be an effort to extract the poisonous sting from the serpent but it may be found, that instead of the sting being removed, additional poison has been inserted.

Notice for a moment the wording of the resolution: It refers to all missionaries of the Board. They are treated just as simple employees, although they have been called by the Churches as pastors on their respective fields and they have been ordained by a Council representing Baptist Churches in the ordinary way in which a Baptist Minister is ordained, and it is to be made clear to these missionaries that the Board does not desire any Pastor supported by denominational funds and under their direction, to bring the existing controversy into the Churches.

This can only mean that being supported by denominational funds, they are under the direction of the Board and therefore the employees of the Board, and if an employer expresses a desire to an employee surely the desire must be interpreted as a command. It plainly means that no missionary of the Board shall be permitted an opinion that differs either with the Board or the opinion of the Convention as interpreted by the Board. It intimates further that the Home Mission Board must be loyal to the work of the Convention as a whole, even though the very existence of the Denomination might be con-

cerned. This is a principle which no loyal Baptist can support. The loyalty of our pastors and of our churches and of the members thereof should not be a loyalty to a Convention or to a Board but must be a loyalty to God and His Word, and any resolution that seeks to interfere with any pastor or missionary expressing his full opinion upon any matter concerning the religious life of our Denomination would be a muzzling and a stifling of the liberties which are one of the dearest heritages, not only of every loyal Baptist, but of every British subject.

In dealing with the covering letter it need only be said that the surest way of hampering the preaching of the Word of God is to direct our missionaries that they shall not discuss teachings which they believe adverse to the Word of God and directing them to support or give allegiance to a man as a teacher, who, from the evidence of those students in closest touch with the one involved, from the evidence of Professor Farmer who admits that Professor Marshall holds Dr. Driver's view, it is perfectly clear that his teachings are modernistic and are not in accordance with the principles of the Word of God to which our Denomination has adhered from the very beginning.

If my reading of history is correct, what is now the Roman Catholic Church was once really a Baptist Church, but bishops and others leading in the work began to take authority upon themselves and gradually an ecclesiasticism was established with an infallible pope at its head with absolute control and little or no freedom for the individual as to his belief or his principles. Will history repeat itself? The Committee on resolutions at the organization of the Baptist Bible Union must have had a vision of what would happen when they passed the following resolution:

"That we further desire to enter our protest against any unscriptural ecclesiasticism either by leading representatives of our University or by the Home Mission Board of our Denomination, and call upon all our Baptist Churches and pastors to assert their independence and to resist to the utmost any and every attempt to interfere with the independence of the local church or the liberty of its members."

I would like to deal with several other questions arising out of the situation but leave them over for the present.

THOS. URQUHART.

GLORIOUS NEWS FROM SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.

Telegraphic Despatch from the Editor.

"Houston, Texas,

"May 12th, 1926.

"By enormous vote which, at least, was technically unanimous, the Southern Baptist Convention to-day repudiated Evolution by endorsing a statement from the President's address in the following terms:

'The Convention accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation of God; and rejects every theory, Evolution or otherwise, which teaches that man originated in or came by way of a lower animal ancestry.'

"This constitutes the rejection of Dr. Mullins' leadership, and is an endorsement of Dr. Stealey, inasmuch as it is a reversal of the course to which Dr. Mullins persuaded the Convention last year; and this in view of his published insistence that the question of Evolution should not be raised this year; also his undisputed statement that his self-respect would not allow his acceptance of anything opposed to his position of last year. The President's proposal opened the way for a movement which has been sentenced to be hanged, to avoid the shame of execution by committing suicide.

"The Convention's action to-day is a glorious testimony to Southern Baptists' loyalty to evangelical faith."

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1. T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., Editor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada No. 2.

Lesson 10. SECOND QUARTER June 6, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE ANSWER JESUS GIVES HIS CRITICS

LESSON TEXT: Twenty-second chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Mark 12:13-37.
Luke 20:20-44.

GOLDEN TEXT.—"He said unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's, and unto God the things which be God's" (Luke 20:25).

I. THE PARABLE OF THE MARRIAGE OF THE KING'S SON.

1. The Kingdom of Heaven is like a marriage. It is not likened to a funeral or to anything that is mournful and sombre, but to that which symbolizes love and joy and pleasures abounding. This aspect of the Gospel needs special emphasis. The Gospel is "good news",—not a funeral dirge, but a marriage bell. 2. The message the servants were sent to proclaim: (1) That all things were ready. That is the message of the Gospel,—nothing remains to be done. When Jesus bowed His head on Calvary, He cried, "It is finished". He rose from the dead, He ascended to Heaven, received the promise of the Father, and sent the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. Now the Atonement has been made, the Gospel has been given us in God's Holy Word, and the Holy Spirit is ready to make that Word effective in the believer's heart. All things are ready. (2) The servants were bidden to "call men to the marriage". What a joyous task, to go everywhere summoning men to witness and participate in the marriage of the sinner to the Saviour, of time to eternity, of earth to Heaven! (3) There was no price to pay, no wedding garments to prepare; for these, too, were ready for the guests. So are we sent out to bid men come, and to come just as they are. 3. How the message was received: (1) Some made light of it; they ignored it; they put other things first. So men treat the Gospel to-day. They are utterly indifferent toward its gracious invitations, and its solemn warnings. (2) Others displayed an unaccountable antagonism toward the messengers and their Lord; and slew those who came to invite them to the wedding. How strange it is that the preaching of the Gospel should call forth that attitude still,—that so many when they are cut to the heart by the Word of God gnash their teeth and seek to destroy the preacher! (3) A terrible judgment awaits the rejectors of the Gospel (vs. 7). 4. The king sent other servants bidding them to go into the highways and invite whoever they might find to the wedding. Thus we are not to be turned aside because the Gospel proves unacceptable to some. If those who are honoured with the first invitation foolishly suppose they have other interests in life which are more important, then we must go into the highways and call them to the marriage. If so-called respectable, church-going, religious people will not really respond to the Gospel's spiritual appeal, we must under Divine direction carry it to others. But nothing must be permitted to turn us back from the discharge of this duty. 5. The wedding was furnished with guests, and the king was not disappointed. So we may be sure that when the marriage of the Lamb is come, there will not one seat be vacant; the Bride and all the guests will be there. 6. Yet one presumed to come to the marriage without a wedding garment. What is the wedding garment but the robe the King provided,—even the righteousness of Christ. Let it be remembered that the King will some day come to inspect the guests: He will not be careless of their attire; and if one be found unclothed in the righteousness of Christ, a terrible fate will await him. 7. The grace which provides all that we need in order to our standing before God will leave men "speechless", and without excuse should they presume to come unprepared. 8. This man also was brought to judgment. Here is a terrible warning to all false professors.

II. HOW MEN ARE ANSWERED WHO ASK QUESTIONS TO DISCREDIT JESUS—Vss. 15-22.

1. The Pharisees' attitude was typical. They came to "entangle Him in His talk" (vs. 15). The worldly-wise man, the scribe, the disputer of this world, still approach the written Word as these men approached the Word Incarnate, with no higher object than to discover and disclose its alleged discrepancies and contradictions. 2. They come to the Word with hypocritical compliments. As the Pharisees praised Jesus, so do these modern critics praise the Bible as the most wonderful of all books. And yet while praising it, they seek utterly to destroy it. 3. They endeavoured to elicit some word which could be made to represent Him as in opposition to the state. Thus in our day many endeavour to make it appear that the Word of God does violence to reason; that it is opposed to science; that it is out of harmony with the spirit of the age. The particular application may be slightly different, but the principle is precisely the same. 4. Christ perceived their wickedness. The Bible is a Living Word; it is the temple in which the Holy Spirit dwells; and it perceives the wickedness of those who approach it as foes instead of friends. 5. Christ's answer is an example of His superhuman wisdom (vss. 18-21). 6. The teaching of Christ's answer. He recognizes the state, and the institution of human government; and bids us to our duty in that realm,—at the same time, insisting that there is a moral and spiritual realm into which even Caesar must not be allowed to enter.

III. ANOTHER UNBELIEVING QUESTION ANSWERED.

This is a very human story. The Pharisees and the Sadducees were the common foes of Christ, but they were far from being in agreement with each other. Like Herod and Pilate, they united their forces only on the ground of their common opposition to Christ. See Acts 23:6-10. Hence, we may understand that the Pharisees were rather pleased than otherwise that the Sadducees had been put to silence,—not because they loved Christ, but because they hated the Sadducees. But now a lawyer, a Pharisee, one versed in the Law—not the Law of the state, but the Law of Moses, tried his hand at tempting Jesus, and asks which is the great Commandment. Again the perversity of the human mind is revealed when employed in opposition to God as revealed in Christ. Christ's answer to this question (vss. 37-40) means that the First and Second Commandments are not only such in numerical order, but in their order of relationship and value: that is to say, man's relation to God is of first importance, and all other things must yield precedence to that. When life is properly adjusted perpendicularly in its relation to God and Heaven, it will find its inevitable natural adjustment, horizontally, to our neighbor and all the things of earth, of time, and of sense.

IV. THE ONE QUESTION IN WHICH ALL OTHERS ARE SUBMERGED AND SILENCED.

It is thrilling to the enlightened mind to observe Incarnate Wisdom anticipating every device of the carnal mind, and bringing the cavillers to silence; and to observe how our glorious Lord goes to the heart of every question, and when He has spoken leaves nothing else to be said.

1. The question itself. Upon its answer the soul's destiny depends. "Whose Son is He?" is the emphatic part of the question. It is not enough to think of Christ as an example, as a teacher, as a social reformer, as poet, philosopher: the supreme question is, Whose Son is He? 2. The question was answered by Christ Himself, and that from the Scripture. Christ here declares that Messiah is David's Lord as well as his Son. In this he quotes the 110th Psalm—the Psalm whose messianic character the critics deny. 3. Incidentally, again Christ's view of Scripture is shown. He had no doubt of its inspiration; it was His final court of appeal. We may wisely follow His example, and answer the enemies of the truth by quoting the Word of the Lord. 4. It is by the quotation of Scripture the critics are silenced, and are made afraid to ask any more questions.

Note:—Owing to lack of space in this issue, we were compelled to shorten Lesson notes.