

The Southern Baptist Convention Repudiates Evolution: Dr. Mullins Overwhelmingly Defeated

(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. 5, No. 2.

TORONTO, MAY 20th.

Whole No. 212.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE GOSPEL IN SAMUEL—DAVID A TYPE OF CHRIST.

(Continued)

The tenth lecture of a series on "How to Study the Bible," by Rev. T. T. Shields, Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Tuesday Evening, April 24th, 1923.

(Stenographically Reported.)

IN the last lecture I spoke of "David—a Type of Christ"—speaking of David in relation to Saul, and to the kingdom, and to individuals; and as a type of Christ in his various offices and occupations; and last of all as our Example.

There is perhaps no character in the Scripture whose life's story more fully illustrates the character and work of our Lord. And there is a special value in finding our illustrations of the Gospel in the Bible itself. I have never been able to make use of books of illustrations. I have a number of them; most of them being presents—I think all of them; I do not think I ever bought one in my life—and they have scarcely been opened since the day I received them. There is no book of illustrations so rich and so full as the Bible. The Bible is a self-illustrating book; and every doctrine of the Gospel, every aspect of saving truth finds its most fitting, most perfect illustration in the Bible itself. Nor is it surprising that there should be so many anticipations in the Old Testament of the full-orbed glory which shines in the face of the Lord Jesus. Somewhere I read the story of a minister who sought to explain why we sometimes are brought into trouble. He said that the Lord's children were like some plants, they flourished better in the shadow than in the sunshine. And he explained that fuchsias always grew more luxuriantly on the shady side of the house, and that is why the Lord puts some of His own children in the shade. At the close of the service an old lady came up to the pastor and tearfully thanked

him for the great blessing she had received that morning. He said he was glad and enquired how the sermon helped her. "Well," she said, "I never did understand until this morning why I could not make my fuchsias grow. I shall go home now and put them on the shady side of the house." Some illustrations illustrate too much; they turn our attention from the subject they are intended to illustrate.

There is great value in calling the attention of people to an important subject, even if you are not able to say very much about it. If you direct the steps of a weary traveller to the well-side, although you have nothing to draw with and the well is deep, they may themselves with joy draw water out of that well. And though you did not actually provide the refreshing drink, you at least showed where it could be found.

Now, when you seek to illustrate scripture with scripture, you have two opportunities of doing good—not only to illustrate the truth in hand, but you direct your hearer's attention to a further important subject of study. That is why, I think, there is special value in using the Word of God. And then, further, the Holy Spirit is especially pledged to bless His own truth. There is always a peculiar blessing resting upon the very word of Scripture.

I cannot hope this evening to exhaust the subject, but I want to offer a few further suggestions as to the illustrative value of the story of David's life. We have already covered a very large part of this ground—and in this lecture I shall try only to gather up the fragments that remain.—You see that is a scriptural illusion, and at once an interesting story is brought before your mind.

I.

David illustrates the work of our Lord in His Conquest of the City of Jebus, or Jerusalem, which was called the City of David.* The Jebusites regarded it as an impregnable stronghold; and David offered a reward to any man who should capture the city and take possession of it in his name. When such an assault was first essayed, the Jebusites mocked at the audacity of David and his men in even venturing the attempt; and they laughed at what they called "the blind and the lame" presuming to come against such a mighty stronghold. But by the inspiration of David, and under the direct leadership of Joab, the forces of David broke down that mighty stronghold, and took possession of it in David's name: "Nevertheless David took the castle of Zion, which is the City of David . . . and David dwelt in the castle, therefore they called it the City of David."

And the heavenly Zion is in the same way the reward of the power and gracious prowess of "great David's great Son." "The kingdom of heaven," we read, "suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." The Kingdom of God has been established by the might of our David. Instantly, you will think of the second Psalm: it had its historic foundation in the experience of David: "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his anointed." David was the anointed one, and you will remember how that is brought into the New Testament by the apostles when they faced the enemies of the truth, and then gathered together, after one of their trying experiences, rejoicing before the Lord, and refreshing their spirits by drinking of this well of salvation: "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against His Christ. For of a truth against Thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done."

But what is to be the result of that attempt, that mocking opposition to the Lord's Anointed? They laughed at David; they mocked at the presumption of those who followed after him—just as men to-day laugh at the Gospel. Oh, how common that is getting to be. When going to New York the other

*I Sam. 5: 1-10; I Chron. 11: 1-9.

Saturday afternoon, I met with a man who tried to find out what I was. He did not know whether I was a lawyer or what I was. He said, "Please do not tell me. I am going to find out." And he found out before we parted. But he was full of contempt for the religion of the Lord Jesus. He magnified the men who deny the Virgin Birth, the Deity of Christ, and he was looking forward to the opportunity of going to hear Doctor Percy Stickney Grant, who denies that Jesus was God. And I said, "Who is he?" I thought I would get his opinion. And he told me all about him. "He is trying to make religion reasonable," he said. And that is the prevailing attitude. But it is written: "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. . . . Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." And when at last "the new Jerusalem shall come down out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband," she shall be the trophy of the invincible might of our David. He takes possession of His Zion; and as Joab and the men who were with him refused to allow themselves to become dispirited or in any degree disheartened by the jeers and the scoffs of the enemy, so ought we to have the same answering confidence in the ultimate triumph of the Lord's Anointed.

That, I suggest, is one fruitful line of study—David in his conquest of Jerusalem, in his establishment of the City that was called by his own name, as a type and an illustration of the work of our Lord.

II.

Then, in this connection,* I should like to remind you that David is a type of Christ in this, that He was The Maker of Mighty Men. If you study some periods of Israel's history, you will find that they are characterized by the influence of some one outstanding, dominating personality, in comparison with whom all other men seem to be but pigmies. There were not very many great men who surrounded Moses. When he had made his selection of twelve to spy out the land, you will remember that only two of them proved strong men. When Moses went up into the mount, the man who was his mouthpiece, his own brother Aaron, the high priest, proved to be a very weak man. And there are other periods in Israel's history which illustrate that: the time of the judges, for instance, when one man arises and, like a solitary oak upon some exposed mountain peak, he stands alone. There was a sense in which David was greater than all the men of his time, yet one of the chief features of David's regime was that he managed to impart his own spirit to others. David did not build great institutions, but he made great men. We read: "These be the names of the mighty men whom David had;" and the roll is called of man after man who did some daring exploit in emulation of their great leader and commander. David, somehow or another, inspired those who were about with him with his own dauntless spirit; indeed, they seemed to be but lesser incarnations of his own spirit, so that what he did they did after him.

How like he is to Him whose programme is the making of men! In the beginning God said: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." And the programme of the Gospel is the remaking of men: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." By a new creation He was to undo the effect of sin upon the first creation and to remake man after His own image and likeness. I remember hearing of a certain sermon—I did not hear it, I did not read it; but some one told me of hearing a man preach—on this text: "Honour all men." And he asked the question, "How can we honour all men when some are not worthy to be honoured?" And his answer was threefold: first, because man was made in the likeness of God; secondly, because God was made in the likeness of men in the Person of Jesus Christ; and thirdly, because the worst of men may be made into the likeness of God again. Now that is what Jesus came to do, and in these days we need to remind ourselves again and again of that great truth. As an illustration of what I mean, let me tell you this: I attended, I think it was the first meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church which discussed the question of Church Union. The debate lasted two days, and the giants of the Church were there. It was most ably conducted all the

*I Chron. 11: 10-47.

way through. But I was interested in the argument, and I observed that the argument was this: that the great desideratum was the building of a great institution; that the divisions of Christendom were dishonouring to God, and that it was desirable that we should have one great institution, called by a Christian name instead of a great many. And speaker after speaker insisted that we cannot have our own way; we must get together, and those of us who differ must compromise a little and find some common central ground upon which we can all meet. Not a word was said about a man being absolutely true to his convictions; not a word about a man incarnating in his own personality the great principles of the Gospel. Oh no. God's purpose was not the making of a man, but the making of an institution. And some time later I attended a Methodist Conference at which the Committee on Union presented its report. And the Chairman of that Committee in presenting his report openly argued for the setting aside of one's own views, saying in effect: "Here is the basis of union which your Committee has prepared. Vote for it. It may not agree with your deepest convictions; but vote for it anyhow. You may have to stultify yourself; you may have to smother the deepest conviction of our soul; but we are not here to make men, we are here to make a big institution." Now, my friends, that is the tendency of the time—the making of institutions instead of the making of men. And this is subversive of the faith, and it is absolutely contrary to the teaching of the Word of God. God's plan is not the making of institutions; God's plan is the making of men. And you and I have no right to participate in any movement which claims our allegiance at the expense of truth. Our Lord Jesus comes to make us whole: "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." These are "the mighty men whom David had"; but where are the mighty men whom the Lord Jesus has to-day? Let us come to His Word; for it is possible for us to be made strong, even as the men of David were made strong. His Spirit is given to us; His might is at our command; the whole armour of God is provided so that "we may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand."

And so I suggest that you study the life of David in respect to its inspirational quality in the making of great men. For example, there is the case of Benaiah who "went down and slew a lion in the midst of a pit in time of snow." Then there is Eleazar who stood in the midst of a plot of lentiles and smote the Philistines, right and left, "until his hand was weary, and his hand clave unto the sword: and the Lord wrought a great victory that day." You remember, too, the men who heard David say, "Oh that one would give me drink of the water of the well of Beth-lehem, which is by the gate." And you remember how "the three mighty men brake through the host of the Philistines—under the inspiration of that plaintive and almost homesick cry—and drew water out of the well of Beth-lehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David." But David would not drink thereof, but poured it out as a sacrifice to the Lord, because it was an offering brought to him at the price of blood. Now, if we follow our Lord Jesus, if we do as these men did—keep close to our own Leader and Commander, pushing past all institutions and all secondary matters, coming into personal relationship to Jesus Christ, He will remake us into His own image and likeness: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . And he gave some apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." What for? "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all came into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man; unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." That is His programme to-day—nothing less than that.

III.

There is another suggestion in a very interesting chapter of David's history. David As a Restorer of That Which was Taken Away illustrates the work of our Lord Jesus. You will remember how in the personal absence of David from the city of Ziklag, the Amalekites came down in a raiding party, and they carried away the women and the children and burned the city with

fire. And when David and his six hundred men returned he found nothing but a heap of smouldering ashes. "The people spake of stoning him but David encouraged himself in the Lord his God." And he pursued after the Amalekites and smote them with the sword, and he recaptured those who had been taken away. He brought back his two wives; he brought back the children and the cattle and the silver and the gold. And there is this significant line: "David recovered all." The victory was overwhelming and complete. And then the fruits of David's victory were gathered together, the people, who now had changed their attitude entirely—for even in that ancient day it was true, that there was nothing succeeded like success—the people who had spoken of stoning him were then prepared to crown him. And of the results of that day's battle, they said with one voice, "This is David's spoil." Others had fought with him, others had gone forth to the battle, others had been moved by his example and stirred by his spirit; but it was recognized that the whole victory was to be placed to the credit of David. And they said, "This is David's spoil." What a text! "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong." Oh what spoils our Lord Jesus will bring back with Him! On one occasion they took the crowns of the kings who had fallen before David in battle and they put them all upon David's head in recognition of the fact that he was the real victor: "And on his head were many crowns," "This is David's spoil."

"Where He displays His healing power,
Death and the curse are known no more;
In Him the tribes of Adam boast,
More blessings than their father lost."

Let us rejoice in that doctrine of restitution: "And he shall send Jesus Christ . . . whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things." "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now . . . waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." The whole creation is to be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. And when sin has altogether vanished, not only from these hearts of ours, but when every trace of sin has been removed from our natures; when we have been made holy as He is holy; and when the whole creation has been delivered from the curse, and when there shall be a "new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness;" when our Lord Jesus shall be the King and we shall reign with Him, we shall say of everything that His grace has bestowed upon us, "This is David's spoil. He earned it for us. He won it for us. It is all of grace."

IV.

There is enough to occupy you for many an hour also in the study of THE VARIOUS REBELLIONS WHICH MARKED THE PROGRESS OF DAVID'S REIGN. David was a man of war from his youth. Indeed, he was described as a man of blood; for David had to fight his way, although he was the Lord's anointed. He was opposed at every turn of the road. Even when Saul had fallen, and the hearts of the men of Israel turned toward David, Ish-bosheth, the son of Saul, conspired to take the kingdom from the hand of David; and Abner, the son of Ner, the captain of Saul's host, made himself strong in Ish-bosheth's behalf and for the house of Saul. Yet that rebellion was put down. Joab and Abiathar, notwithstanding their splendid and devoted service in some directions, marked their careers at length by disloyalty to their king. There are some dark passages in the history of the Christian Church—the story of Ish-bosheth over again, the story of the treachery of Absalom, the story of the ambition of Adonijah; again and again there have been movements in the course of the history of the Christian Church which seemed to threaten to overthrow the very Kingdom of God. And yet David proceeded by the plan and purpose of God to ultimate victory. And so will the Lord Jesus Christ.

V.

I pass by one of these rebellions for the moment, because it may perhaps more fittingly be reserved to the conclusion, to remind you of another line of

study, and that is DAVID'S LIFE IN RELATION TO THE TEMPLE OF THE LORD AT JERUSALEM. David, you will recall, planned the building of an house for the Lord. He said, "I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains." And he purposed in his heart to build an house for the Lord. But it was revealed to him that it was to be his privilege only to lay the foundations of that house, and, upon the foundation which he should lay, another should erect the superstructure.

No single character in Scripture can possibly fully portray the character of our Lord. He is more glorious than any, and more majestic than all. And so we must have all the types and all the symbols, that each may illustrate some aspect of the Infinite, for the Infinite cannot be mirrored in the finite, and no mere man can possibly, in its completeness, illustrate the work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Perhaps you may think what I now say is a little far-fetched, and I am not going to speak of it as a type, but I do suggest it as an illustration. There is a sense in which we have to take the life of David and the life of Solomon together. Solomon was a prince of peace. His name was called Solomon because he was to be peaceable. And, whereas his father had been a man of war, he was to be a man of peace. His father had laid the foundation of the temple and had gathered much material; he had allied himself with Hiram of Tyre: he brought down cedars from the forest and fir trees from the mountains, and gold from Tarshish and all manner of precious stones; he had laid up a great store of selected material for the erection of the house; he even showed to Solomon, his son, the pattern of the porch and the fashion after which the house was to be constructed, and he gave Solomon explicit directions as to how the house was to be built of the materials which he had gathered. Thus, too, we should read the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles together. If I may venture to say so, we find in the Gospels the story of our David, and in the Acts of the Apostles the story of our Solomon—the work of the Holy Spirit carrying on the work of the Lord Jesus, taking the materials which His finished work had gathered, building upon the one Foundation which is laid: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." The Church is built upon "the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." And it is the work of the Holy Spirit to-day to complete this glorious temple: "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Solomon, it is said, "built the house, and finished it." And the House which our David has begun will most certainly be finished, completed in glory at last. There is no perhaps or peradventure in the divine promise; it is all to be rounded out at last to the glory of Him Who has fashioned it all.

VII.

Just one other thing, and I think that we will close this address and this series for the present. Perhaps next season we may take it up where we laid it down, and go through the Book. Chronologically, the story to which I now refer belonged to what I said a little while ago, yet logically, in its typical significance, may be mentioned here. I refer now to THE REBELLION OF ABSALOM, which was the greatest grief of David's life.* There was a time when David reigned, not only in Hebron, but in Jerusalem, and the kingdom seemed really to be established under his hand. And then a very subtle foe, in the name of David, and in the name of religion, honeycombed the whole kingdom of Israel with the spirit of treachery. "Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel." And there was a general defection, a wholesale apostasy, so that one after another came to David telling him of friend after friend who had forsaken his standard. There was, for instance, Professor Ahithophel—I think he was a Professor, or a Doctor of Divinity, because when one heard the word of Ahithophel it was as though one had enquired at the oracle of God. Ahithophel's word was regarded as the last word of wisdom upon any subject. And after a while it was said that Ahithophel had joined the ranks: "and the conspiracy was strong, for the people increased continually with Absalom, and

*II Sam. Chaps. 15, 16, 17.

there came a messenger to David, saying, "The hearts of the men of Israel are after Absalom." And you know what happened. David left the city. He went up by the ascent of Mount Olivet, weeping as he went, with a company of people following, weeping, because of the failure of his kingdom, and for the utter destruction of all his hopes, the abortion of all God's promises and prophecies. They thought David was going to reign, but he is not going to reign after all. Instead, Absalom was reigning in Hebron, and everywhere people were turning their backs upon David. And even as he went, one who would have formerly prostrated himself before him, threw stones at him and cursed him, and said, "Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Bellial: the Lord hath returned upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul." And David was despised and rejected for the second time.

Do you see any analogy? There was a time when the Church of Christ was prosperous and when we read those passages in the Psalms about Zion and Jerusalem as though they were even now finding their ultimate fulfillment. And we began to believe, at least some people did, that gradually Zion would spread her wings over the world and that little by little evil would be dispossessed and that the Kingdom of God would thus gradually come, and we should wake up some fine morning to discover that at last the millennium had dawned. And then, all at once there seems to be a reversal of everything: every fundamental of the faith is denied, everywhere the Book itself is thrown upon the scrap-heap, the Deity of Christ is repudiated everywhere, and the Ahithophels, the very men who were ordained to preach the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, everywhere turning their backs upon our David, until they say, "The hearts of the men of Israel are after Absalom. It is all over now with you poor simpletons, who do not know that the Gospel is obsolete, and who are still holding fast to your old views! Haven't you heard the news that Absalom reigneth in Hebron? Do you not know that David is for ever dispossessed?" But David said, "Let them curse. If the Lord will bring me again into the city, it will be all right. He will bring me again. But I am in His hands." And as Shimei cursed, Abishai said to the king, "Why should this dead dog curse my lord the king? Let me go over, I pray thee, and take off his head." But the king answered, "It may be that the Lord will look on mine affliction, and that the Lord will requite me good for his cursing this day." And you remember how the battle was at last set in array; and how this opponent of the Lord's anointed—"anointed" means "Christ," putting the New Testament language back into the Old Testament—a suggestion as an illustration of anti-Christ, how at last he was laid low, and then how the hearts of the men of Israel turned back to David. And it is said, "He bowed the heart of all the men of Judah, even as the heart of one man; so that they sent this word unto the king, Return thou, and all thy servants." And the king came back again, and as he came back he rewarded every one that had stood by him in the day of his distress. It was a day of grace and of mercy, and he dispensed his goodness to everybody and at last he rode triumphantly into his city and was crowned once again.

It is an illustration of the great truth that the Church of Christ has had its vicissitudes; there have been eddies in the stream; there have been times when the Absaloms seemed to be in the ascendancy; there have been times when those who followed after our David seemed to be in the minority. But, remember, the day is coming, O the day is surely coming, when the King will come back—there is no doubt about that: "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory." Does it not thrill you to reflect upon this truth that our Lord Jesus is going to arise and vindicate His own Word? "There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, 'Where is the promise of his coming?' for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." They say that the Old Testament is worn out, that the Old Testament is obsolete; but the Old Testament is not half fulfilled yet. We need Genesis because it stretches forward to the second advent of our Lord. I believe it is wrapped up in practically every verse of the Book, that "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. . . . So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto

them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

There is a point of contrast: I think I have spoken to you of it once, but I will suggest it to any here who have not thought of it. In all these stories, the contrasts, as I have so often shown you, are as suggestive as the comparisons, because I like to see that our Lord Jesus transcends everybody. The story of a human life parallels the story of Jesus Christ only so far. Jesus is like Saul among his fellows. "From his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people." There is no one to be compared to Him. And you remember how Barzillai came to meet the king and to welcome him back. And the king said, "Come thou over with me, and I will feed thee with me in Jerusalem—I am going back to my city now, Barzillai. When I was in the open, without the camp, you brought to me lentils and cheeses, and you ministered to me. Now it is my turn. Come along, you are my guest." And the poor old man said, "I am this day fourscore years old: and can I discern between good and evil? can thy servant taste what I eat or what I drink? can I hear any more the voice of singing men and singing women? wherefore then should thy servant be yet a burden unto my lord the king? Thy servant will go a little way over Jordan with the king: and why should the king recompense it with such a reward?" O how true that was of David's house! I suppose his table was bountifully spread. And his house was noted for its music. He was a cunning player upon the harp, and how beautifully he sang! His songs have never been surpassed. There never has been music to surpass the music that David made. And so the old man said, "I wish it had been earlier, before I was so old." There is coming a day "when the keepers of the house shall tremble, and the strong men shall bow themselves, and the grinders cease because they are few, and those that look out of the windows be darkened, and the doors shall be shut in the streets, when the sound of the grinding is low, and he shall rise up at the voice of the bird, and all the daughters of music shall be brought low; also when they shall be afraid of that which is high, and fear shall be in the way, and the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail: because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets: or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern." But, do you know, when our Lord Jesus comes back none of us will have to say, "I am too old to enjoy the dainties of the King's table," for "the Lamb which is in the midst of the Throne will feed them." We have only had a sample of what is coming. By and by, we shall be brought into His banqueting-house. And it is a good thing to cultivate a taste for spiritual things here. For, by and by, the old man in us is going to be put off; the "old man" will not go to heaven,—only "the new man" will go to Heaven, and he will never lose his capacity for appreciating spiritual things. And as for the music of Heaven, there is a song which none but the redeemed can learn, and we shall be able to enter into the gladness of that happy day. For when the King comes back He will impart to us a capacity for all the enjoyments which His grace will bestow. We shall share the mind of the Infinite, that "unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." I think I know how some of you feel about it, but when I read the books of the Modernists, they remind me of little children paddling around with a little home-made canoe in a little pond in the midst of a field, and strutting around and calling themselves navigators with a quest for the open! When I come to this Book I set sail in a Mauretania on the shoreless and unfathomable ocean, with Jesus my Lord as Captain on the bridge, and we will sail on and on until He will, at last, bring us into our desired haven. May He bless us every one for His Name's sake.

THE PASTOR GOES TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

Tuesday evening of this week the Pastor left for Washington, D.C., to attend the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union, May 19th to 24th, and the Northern Convention which follows.

The publication of this paper as a missionary enterprise is made possible by the gifts of members of Jarvis Street Church and others, and is sent to subscribers by mail for \$2.00 (under cost) per year. If any of the Lord's stewards who read this have received blessing, we shall be grateful for any thank-offering you may be able to send to The Witness Fund at any time; and especially for your prayers that the message of The Witness may be used by the Holy Spirit for the defence of the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the exaltation of Christ. As our funds make it possible, we hope to add to our free list, from time to time, the names of ministers at home and missionaries abroad.

Editorial

THE AXE FALLS ON PROFESSOR CAMPBELL.

In the Convention of Ontario and Quebec we are moving rapidly toward a solution of our problems. Nothing is so likely to defeat a man as for him to lose his temper. Solomon said, "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city." Our fellow-Governors of McMaster University seem to have lost control of their spirits; and apparently have determined upon committing suicide. We recommend to their careful attention the report of the Southern Baptist Convention printed elsewhere in this issue; and we would bid them remember the wise man's saying: "Promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is judge: He putteth down one, and setteth up another. Beyond all question the judgment day is in store for McMaster University.

The last act of folly of which the Governors have been guilty is the superannuation of Professor P. S. Campbell. It is true that Professor Campbell is not a young man; but he is a vigorous man, and just as able to teach as he ever was; and is so abounding in physical energy as to put many a young man to shame. The announcement is made that he has been "retired". Certain officials have declared that Professor Campbell's superannuation has absolutely nothing to do with the letter of protest he issued some weeks ago. We are sorry to be compelled to speak so plainly and strongly in this connection, but we are sure nobody having any sense in the Denomination will believe that Professor Campbell's retirement is not directly the result of his protest. We are aware that his superannuation was mooted a year or more ago; but it was suggested then for the same reason that it is effected now: that his presence in the University as an old-fashioned believer in Baptist orthodoxy was not wanted. His action in speaking out in meeting evidently determined the authorities to tolerate his testimony no longer.

We are not sorry the axe has fallen. The Lord Himself will look after His faithful servant. Mordecai will not always wear sackcloth and ashes at the King's gate; neither will Haman the son of Hammedatha for ever occupy the chief place at court. It really does not matter who builds the gallows, so long as the proper person is hanged! The lions may be very hungry, but God's angel can keep them waiting a little while longer for their dinner until the time shall come for them to appease their hunger by feasting upon Daniel's enemies! Nebuchadnezzar's furnace is never vainly heated seven times hotter than is its wont: it serves to set three faithful witnesses to God's grace and power free; and rid the earth of those who thirsted for their blood!

It would be useless for the Chairman of the Board of Governors, or the Chancellor, or anyone else to try to explain the Board's action in retiring Professor Campbell. Were they to use all the words in all the English dictionaries ever published, and talk till their tongues cleave to the roofs of their mouths in declaring that Professor Campbell's retirement was not an act of revenge for his having dared to protest against Professor Marshall's appointment and retention, we do not believe a baker's dozen in all the Denomination would, in their hearts, believe them. The Baptists of Ontario and Quebec will now know that the same spirit reigns in McMaster as that which kindled the martyr-fires of Smithfield: it is a something that is devoid of conscience, and has little short of murder at its heart.

The Evening Telegram, of Toronto, expressed what all the Denomination will believe when, in a large line across the paper, it announces,

CAMPBELL IS RETIRED FROM McMASTER

and then in a two-column heading states,

McMaster Retires Professor Who Condemned Modernism.

Everybody will recognize the connection of the two; and the churches will remember when Convention time comes.

At this writing we have just read an announcement in the evening paper that Professor E. M. Keirstead also has retired. He too, we have known, was, for the same reason, marked for the axe. Dr. Keirstead has been an uncompromising witness for the truth in McMaster University, recognized by all as a true scholar and a profound theologian. It has been an open secret that his presence has long been irksome to the modernist elements in McMaster. We do not believe there is any other man on McMaster's Faculty who is in the same class as Dr. Keirstead. He stood apart; and to those who had the mental equipment necessary to appreciate him, he was recognized as being head and shoulders above his fellows. His health has not been wholly satisfactory for some time, and we are not surprised to hear that Dr. Keirstead has voluntarily laid down his burden. At the same time, we believe that even he might have been able to continue longer had not his life been made a purgatory in the Institution. We regret Dr. Keirstead's retirement, especially if, as we fear, it has been occasioned by ill health.

The announcement of the retirement of these two veterans creates an entirely new situation in the Denomination. What are we now facing? Last summer the Governing Bodies appointed Professor L. H. Marshall, who has unmistakably proved himself to be a modernist. The evidence already produced of this fact is absolutely overwhelming; and we are learning from all parts of the Convention that the information furnished is making hundreds of new converts every week. We venture the assertion that it will prove impossible for Professor Marshall to continue very long at McMaster. But what if by any chance—what if by any political scheme—it were possible for the Governing Bodies to obtain endorsement of their action in retaining Professor Marshall at the next Convention? Surely an endorsement would involve a repudiation of Professor Campbell's protest; it would involve approval of Professor Campbell's dismissal—for that is what his retirement virtually is: it would be interpreted as being tantamount to a mandate from the Convention to the Governing Bodies immediately to convert McMaster University into a modernist institution.

If this could be, what would follow? There are now two vacancies in the faculty, both of them important, that occasioned by the retirement of Professor Keirstead—Department of Systematic Theology—being especially important. What sort of professors would be appointed to fill their places if this could be? Can anyone doubt that they would be professors of the modernist type? If the Governors were to receive a vote of approval at the next Convention, it would simply mean that McMaster University would cease to retain even a semblance of loyalty to evangelical truth. It is well, therefore, that the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec should face the facts, and prepare to meet them at the next Convention. We can only believe that a kind of judicial blindness has fallen upon the Governors and Senate of McMaster University.

We find a parallel in the action of the body of people who withdrew from Jarvis Street Church and formed the Central Baptist Church. We have not before referred to their action; and we do it now only as an illustration. They have among them some lawyers of distinction, and men who have proved their ability in successful business careers; but they are now excavating for the erection of their new church building. The lot upon which they propose to build is on the corner of two back streets, both of them very narrow streets—one of them a one-way street, and a blind street. Anyone studying a similar situation in any great city would know that such a street is bound to become the back lane of business houses on Bloor Street. Yet the collective wisdom of these brethren has selected a lot on the corner of these two back streets. If someone who was a bitter enemy of the Central Baptist Church could have engaged a company of men of persuasive speech for the purpose of persuading

the church to do the most foolish thing possible, they could not possibly have given them worse counsel than to advise them to build where they are now building.

The same blindness seems to have fallen upon McMaster University. What other folly it will be guilty of between now and Convention which will still further open the eyes of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec, we do not know. It would seem, however, that it would be difficult for them to exceed their folly in dismissing Professor Campbell. We shall see what we shall see!

AMONG THE BAPTIST HIERARCHS.

All Baptists of Ontario and Quebec are aware that Rev. George W. Allen, former pastor of Ossington Avenue Baptist Church, was dismissed from his pulpit for daring to protest against McMaster. A company of loyal souls who stood with him formed the Grace Baptist Church, and a month ago, or thereabout, by one of the most representative councils ever convened in Toronto, the Grace Baptist Church was recognized as a regular Baptist church.

We are informed that recently the Rev. C. E. MacLeod, secretary of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, has raised the question as to Mr. Allen's ministerial standing, and has gone so far as to enquire whether by his action in withdrawing from Ossington Avenue church without a letter, and forming a new Baptist church, he did not forfeit his ordination. To settle this question the Credentials Committee of the Convention was called, and we have been told that the Committee felt they had troubles enough on their hands already.

Mr. MacLeod has proved an excellent secretary, who has, so far as we know, faithfully executed the will of the Convention's executive. We are now wondering whether Mr. MacLeod took this action on his own initiative, or whether he was inspired to do so by others. Whatever the genesis of his action, however, it stands out as a piece of ecclesiastical impudence and we think it is necessary that somebody should say it in plain speech. We respectfully suggest to Brother MacLeod that if he sticks to his business as secretary and refrains from interfering with his brother-ministers, he will be likely to retain his position as secretary much longer than if he attempts a repetition of his blunder in Mr. Allen's case.

Surely there is some measure of Baptist independence left and we have not come to the day when ministers will consent to be deprived of their liberty by such secretarial interference. We have always credited Mr. MacLeod with a fair measure of Scotch sense. We hope that this folly is only a passing aberration from which he will completely recover.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS' BIRTHDAY.

Last week, on account of the absence of the editor, the birthday of *The Gospel Witness* was passed by unnoticed. The first issue of this paper appeared under date of May 17th, 1922. For some time we were confined to eight pages and we increased to twelve and then to sixteen. During the four years past, 210 numbers have been issued. Each number but the first two or three has contained a sermon by the editor. At least 200 sermons have been published which, if printed in book form, would make at least fifteen volumes.

These have circulated around the world, and have been copied in other periodicals, and in the course of four years must have reached many hundreds of thousands of people. *The Gospel Witness* is now read by at least 2,500 ministers every week, as well as by many thousands of others. We are grateful for the opportunity of service this paper has afforded, and for the splendid co-operation we have received from thousands of readers: We must confess that we frequently have some anxiety as to ways and means. Continued publication would be impossible were it not for the generosity of the members of Jarvis Street and numbers of outside friends. During the last year we have published many special editions, some single numbers 24 pages, some 32, some 44, and all this has involved a great deal of extra cost. Hundreds of our readers have written expressing their appreciation of the ministry of this paper. So far as Ontario and Quebec is concerned, whatever the enemies of *The Gospel Witness* may say, friend and foe will admit that it is due to

The Gospel Witness that the Convention constituency has been informed of the danger to our denominational life resident in McMaster University.

But aside from this protective and defensive ministry, *The Witness* has sought to bring a constructive Biblical message week by week, and we are confident from the testimonials received, multitudes of people have been helped.

It may be that among our readers there are some who would like to send *The Gospel Witness* a birthday gift. We hope soon to announce a plan whereby we expect to double our circulation within the year. It would greatly help us if we should receive many large contributions. Thus far we have never received more than a hundred dollars in a single gift for *The Witness*, but we are hoping and praying that some who recognize the value of its ministry will some day come to our help with thousands. The great victory in the Southern Baptist Convention recorded in this issue, beyond all question is principally due to the circulation of *The Searchlight*. Other papers, of course, have helped, but *The Searchlight* has a circulation which will very soon equal that of nearly all the other Southern papers combined. In the same way, if we can circulate *The Gospel Witness* more generally through our churches and thus inform the people of what is going on denominationally, we shall make it impossible for anyone to turn the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec away from the faith. We shall be very grateful for any help our readers may be able to send us.

IS THIS TRUE?

We have been informed that Dr. J. H. Farmer has very strongly recommended Dr. A. L. Huddleston of Halifax to the Park Baptist Church of Brantford. What we know of Dr. Farmer's activities in recommending men to churches leads us to believe that this report is exceedingly probable. Furthermore, it would be just like Dr. Farmer to recommend such a man as Dr. Huddleston.

However orthodox Professor Farmer may be, the record of his recommendations shows conclusively that he is able to recommend Modernists with great heartiness. We have no doubt that our compromising Dean would be glad to see a man like Dr. Huddleston established in this Convention. He could be absolutely sure that he would stand by the University, even if they proposed Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick as Chancellor. In *The Gospel Witness* of September 24th last we published a letter from the Maritime Provinces by the Rev. J. B. Daggett of Prince Edward Island, giving an account of the Maritime Baptist Convention held at Wolfville, N.S., August 26th to 30th, which was attended by upwards of four hundred persons. We quote a paragraph from Mr. Daggett's letter:

"The splendid spiritual tone that was maintained throughout the Convention, was a complete answer to the modernist element, which found an expression in a paper read by Dr. Huddleston of Halifax, upon what he called 'The Religion of the Future' in which he declared we ought to be thankful for Dr. Fosdick who had brought a new idea and conception of religion. His paper fell like the proverbial water on the duck's back. It ran off and left no mark."

We wonder if the Park Church, so long noted for its orthodoxy, has so declined from the faith that it will willingly call to its pulpit one who is in accord with Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick? Surely Dr. Farmer knows Dr. Huddleston's position! If it be true that he recommended Dr. Huddleston to Brantford, and we are morally certain that it is true, we have in this fact further evidence of the quality of Dr. Farmer's loyalty to evangelical truth.

ABOUT THE HOME MISSION BOARD.

We have received resolutions from several churches dealing with the action of the Home Mission Board in attempting to muzzle its missionaries in connection with the present denominational controversy. Space forbids their publication in this issue, but we shall have more to say on this subject in the near future.

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION AT HOUSTON.

There is no Baptist body in the world equal in size to the Southern Baptist Convention. In 1895, in Washington, D.C., the Convention had 870 enrolled messengers; in the same city in 1920, or twenty-five years later, it numbered 8,369 messengers; the average enrolment for the past six years has been 5,559. We have not the exact figures for this year, but we feel sure the attendance was well up to the average.

Last year the great issue at the Convention was the report of the Committee on, "Baptist Faith and Message". Dr. C. P. Stealey then presented a minority report respecting article No. 3. The article recommended by the Committee read: "Man was created by the special act of God, as recorded in Genesis", and the scriptures followed; Dr. Stealey presented an amendment to that article: "We believe that man came into this world by direct creation of God and not by evolution." This, too, was followed by the scriptures, so that the essential difference between the two articles consisted in the words of Dr. Stealey's amendment—"not by evolution".

Ever since the Memphis Convention the papers of the South have been occupied by the discussion of this subject. In the issue of *The Baptist Messenger* of Oklahoma City, of which Dr. C. P. Stealey is the Editor, of March 31st, 1926, there is "a questionnaire", in which Dr. Stealey gives four pages of replies to a question he had sent out to prominent men, most of them Southern Baptists, the question being, "Do you believe that God created man in the beginning with a body practically like he has to-day, by an immediate act, and not by any process of evolution or development from a lower form?" Dr. E. Y. Mullins' reply to Dr. Stealey's question was as follows:

"Rev. C. P. Stealey, D.D., Editor,
Baptist Messenger,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

"Dear Dr. Stealey:

"Your letter of recent date asking me to take part in a symposium and answer your question about evolution, has been received. I must decline this request. My views on the subject of evolution have been published repeatedly and in various forms in all our Southern Baptist papers. These views are well known among our brethren.

"I consider that your proposed symposium would be inexpedient in view of the effort we are trying to put forth to push forward our common Kingdom work.

"Will you also permit me to say that I would consider the introduction of the evolution matter into the next Southern Baptist Convention as about the most unwise and untimely thing that could be done. Our brethren generally want to concentrate on the great Kingdom interests for which the great Southern Baptist Convention stands.

"If you make any reference to me in connection with the proposed symposium in the *Oklahoma Messenger* please publish this letter entire as I have written it.

"Sincerely yours,

"(Signed) E. Y. MULLINS."

Dr. Mullins' Attitude.

It will thus be seen that Dr. Mullins assumed the attitude of one who believed the evolution question was settled; and declared he would consider "THE INTRODUCTION OF THE EVOLUTION MATTER INTO THE NEXT SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION AS ABOUT THE MOST UNWISE AND UNTIMELY THING THAT COULD BE DONE". On the other hand Dr. S. E. Tull issued an announcement signed by twenty others—ministers and editors of prominence—declaring that "the evolution issue will come up at Houston". It was to be expected, therefore, that Dr. Mullins would throw the weight of his influence against the reconsideration of the evolution matter by the Southern Convention. A pastor from Florida reported that when sitting in the St. Charles Hotel in New Orleans he heard Dr. Mullins (he was not eavesdropping) openly discussing the Convention with another Southern Baptist; and in the course of his remarks, he

said to this other Baptist that his self-respect would not permit him to consent to any other statement than that which had been adopted at Memphis. He also declared that the whole agitation involved a conflict between ignorance and education, and that it would never do for them to yield to the demands of the uneducated element in the Convention. He also expressed the opinion, according to this report, that the matter would have to be taken from the Convention into a committee, and there "stified".

On the other hand, it was evident that there was a body of men who were just as determined that the evolution matter should be considered. For two days before the Convention opened many of the leaders had assembled in Houston, and there were many conferences between the various groups. Dr. Mullins, we have been informed, held his ground and strenuously objected to the consideration of the matter at all. On the other hand, the anti-evolutionists refused to be content with the passing of any resolution which did not specifically name and repudiate Evolution.

The President Takes the Lead.

What, then, was to be done? In the President's address Wednesday morning this statement occurred:

"I am happy to believe that this 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."

When this had been read the following motion by M. E. Dodd, of Louisiana, was adopted:

"That the statement of the President on the subject of Evolution and the origin of man be adopted as the sentiment of this Convention and that from this point on no further consideration be given to this subject and that the Convention go forward with the consideration of the main Kingdom causes to which God has set our hearts and hands."

A Blow to Dr. Mullins' Prestige.

We can only conclude that the anti-evolutionists in the Southern Baptist Convention were too strong to be resisted. The thing which the great Dr. Mullins said would be "about the most unwise and untimely thing that could be done", was done and that by the President himself. Whatever may be said of Dr. Mullins' influence in the South, in general, this action on the part of the President of the Convention himself, under pressure of the anti-evolutionist element, which was, however, no doubt an expression of the President's own conviction, surely involved an utter and overwhelming repudiation of Dr. Mullins' leadership on the evolution question. No other interpretation is possible. The Convention did what Dr. Mullins said must not be done! The Convention did what Dr. Mullins said would be "about the most unwise and untimely thing that could be done"! And the Convention did it under the leadership, and on the initiative of the President of the Convention himself!

The blow to Dr. Mullins' prestige in the South, however, was but an incident: the all-important matter is that the great Southern Baptist Convention has put itself on record, in the most unequivocal terms, as being opposed to Evolution.

The President's Fine Action.

The action of Dr. George W. McDaniel, the President of the Convention, shows what one man of conviction and determination can accomplish. We understand that for the terms of the statement accepted, Dr. McDaniel was wholly responsible. If he had been a weaker man, and had attempted to compromise by offering a mild and ambiguous statement, it is certain he would simply have set the Convention on fire; but in making the strong and unmistakable statement he made, apparently the Convention instantly recognized it as a statement of its own conviction, and, by resolution, said, "Amen".

The President A Great Leader.

Dr. McDaniel issued a statement in reply to our report of the Southern Baptist Convention last year, entitled, "Alien Censorship". We made no answer at the time, because we understood that Dr. McDaniel was shortly

after taken quite ill. We are quite willing to accept Dr. McDaniel's rebuke (although we have to confess that we have not repented of anything we wrote last year). We are only happy that the President himself did practically what our report of the Southern Baptist Convention last year said ought to have been done; and thus showed himself capable of taking good advice! So far as the President is concerned, this is not "alien censorship", but alien approval. We believe President McDaniel showed himself to be a great leader, having the courage of his convictions. Two or three men of the same sort can save the Southern Baptist Convention out of all its distresses. We have heard many things about Dr. McDaniel which suggest that he has little kinship with ecclesiastical politicians of the Mullins type.

We quote the following from the Convention bulletin:

"BAPTISMAL RECORD FOR 1925 SHOWS ADVANCE OVER 1924.

"While the mere fact that 224,191 baptisms were reported by white Baptist churches of the South, last year is gratifying in itself, a more significant feature of the baptismal record for last year is that the number of churches reporting no baptisms at all was reduced from more than 10,000 in 1924 to 6,448 in 1925, according to Dr. E. P. Alldredge, statistical secretary of the Sunday School board and statistician of the Convention.

Here is the record as compiled by Dr. Alldredge:

| | |
|--|---------|
| Churches baptizing none | 6,448 |
| Churches baptizing only one | 1,535 |
| Churches baptizing 2 to 10 each | 9,709 |
| Churches baptizing 11 to 25 each | 4,818 |
| Churches baptizing 26 to 50 each | 1,498 |
| Churches baptizing 51 to 100 each | 465 |
| Churches baptizing 101 to 200 each | 91 |
| Churches baptizing 201 to 300 each | 5 |
| Churches baptizing 301 to 400 each | None |
| Churches baptizing over 400 each | 1 |
| Total baptisms reported | 224,191 |
| Baptisms reported in 1924 | 209,676 |
| Gain over last year | 14,515 |

Dr. George Ragland Presents Kentucky Memorial.

Thursday morning at the hour for miscellaneous business Dr. George Ragland, of Lexington, Ky., was recognized by the Chair as he took the floor to present a memorial sent from the Elkhorn Association of Kentucky to the Southern Baptist Convention. This memorial said in part:

WHEREAS Dr. E. Y. Mullins, the honored president of our Great School of Prophets, the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, is pursuing a policy which offends the convictions of the members of the churches of this association as evidenced specifically in his action at the Southern Baptist Convention at Memphis in opposing the article of faith on creation which says "And not by evolution" as offered by Dr. C. P. Stealey.

Let it be understood that these resolutions do not make any charges against the brethren herein named as being evolutionists or modernists. Their own statements are adduced as evidence of their attitude toward evolution and modernism. On the attitude of Dr. E. Y. Mullins, three statements from him have been widely published.

1. On "Science and Religion," page 75 of the minutes of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. Mullins wrote the following:

"The evolution doctrine has long been a working hypothesis of science, and will probably continue to be, because of its apparent simplicity in explaining the universe."

2. In the *Western Recorder*, October 1, 1925, page 16, published the following conversation between Drs. Mullins and J. B. Leavell in which, among other things, Dr. Leavell said: "Would not Baptists go as far as the legislature of Tennessee and pass directly on this question?" Dr. Mullins replied, "They did wrong." Dr. Leavell said, "The difference

between us, then, is that you are in an attitude to see the theory proven, and I would say anywhere that it will not be proven, and that it is a false theory." Dr. Mullins replied, "You would make a fool of yourself."

3. Dr. Mullins in the sessions of the committee appointed to present the Confession of Faith to the Southern Baptist Convention and in his address to the Convention stated under the plea for "fair play" to recognize the different groups among Southern Baptists, the following language: "The committee felt that if it were possible we ought to find a common standing ground for all Southern Baptists, in this doctrinal statement.

"All of us agreed on one point that if possible we wanted to get unity of action; if possible we ought not to divide; if possible we ought not to let the division form in the great work of the kingdom of God."

This attitude of Dr. Mullins assumed one of two things: Either all Southern Baptists are orthodox and anti-evolutionists or that the committee aimed to frame a statement which would be sufficiently elastic to include everybody.

WHEREAS Dr. John R. Sampey, professor of Old Testament interpretation, in his writings has greatly grieved the churches of this association by questioning the "scientific accuracy and trustworthiness" of the book of Genesis, as specifically evidenced by him on page 51 of the System Bible which reads as follows:

"In 1:1-2:3 is found the stately and majestic account of the creation of the world and of mankind. The fact that the creation of the sun is placed in the fourth day is proof that we do not have in this chapter a strictly scientific account of the events sketched; for no modern scientist must admire much in this sketch of the creative process as anticipating some of the views of modern students of nature, he would not interpret the Hebrew story as a cold and scientifically accurate account of the order of events. It is a popular account with the emphasis on the religious element, attention being drawn to the Divine activity throughout the story. The long creative process is compressed within the limits of a week of days."

And further evidenced by the following statement in the Syllabus of the Old Testament where he straddles the question of Evolution as found on page 67 of the fourth edition of his Syllabus, to-wit:

"The method of creation is not explained in Genesis. Science may pursue its research on this subject without hindrance from the Bible. Whether God took a million years to make man or only a second matters little—if only God made him."

In this connection it is fair to quote from the telegram sent to Dr. J. Frank Norris, March 20, 1926, in which Dr. Sampey says, "I have never been an evolutionist."

We are grieved at the contradictory position Dr. Sampey places himself in and we only quote his widely published writings in the System Bible and the Syllabus of the Old Testament.

WHEREAS Dr. A. T. Robertson, professor of the New Testament interpretation, has also greatly grieved the churches of this association by his tolerance and defense of evolution as specifically evidenced in the following statements found in his book "The Teachings of Jesus Concerning God, the Father," to-wit, page 3:

"If the evolutionary view of the world's origin be correct, it does not follow that originally man did not have adequate knowledge of God."

And as follows on page 4: "The facts of human nature do not justify us in saying that sin is merely the remnant of the animal nature brought on from our animal ancestry. Sin is far more of the spirit than of the flesh. It is an easy way of shirking responsibility for wrong-doing to charge it to our animal nature. Evolution as an agent fails to explain the origin of man. Evolution as God's method of working can offer an adequate explanation of man's history."

And as found on page 8, to-wit: "Evolution, instead of ruling God

out of the world, has restored him to his true place in the minds of scientific men."

And as found on page 11, as follows, to-wit: "If Evolution stops short of opening men's eyes to God, can revelation sufficiently remove scales from the eyes of the heart for God to be seen?"

And further evidence in his "New Testament Interpretation—Notes on Bible Lectures" taken and neo-styled by W. E. Davidson, 1914-15; second edition, June, 1916, in his lecture on "The Miracles of Jesus," section 3, page 77, we find:

"Evolution, I am willing to believe in it, I rather think I do, but not in Atheistic Evolution. I take not a primordial germ, but God and start with Romans I, that the things around me are enough to prove God. They cannot prove God was not before matter. I cannot prove that He was. Lincoln at Hampton Roads Conference said, 'Write Union at the top and I don't care what you write under it.' I say write 'God at the top and what if He did use Evolution? I can stand it if the monkeys can.' The thing that differentiates you from a monkey is that you have a soul—if He did do it that way, He still did it." And,

WHEREAS only a short time ago the seminary invited and had Dr. T. R. Glover, the well-known English Modernist, to address the students of the seminary and that in the face of the fact that Dr. Glover is commonly known as the Harry Emerson Fosdick of England, and further since Dr. Glover's extreme modernistic writings are widely published in his books and in the press.

WHEREAS the Seminary has greatly grieved its orthodox constituency by having Reverend W. S. Abernathy of Washington, D.C., to deliver the Commencement Sermon Sunday, April 25th, in the face of the modernism of Dr. W. S. Abernathy, which has been well known and which was particularly evidenced in his defense and support of the Park Avenue Church delegates at the Northern Baptist Convention, held in Seattle, last year, on the issue of inclusive membership, which the Park Avenue Church on May 22nd, 1925, declared to be as follows:

"After full and careful consideration the two Boards unanimously recommend to the Church that it call Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick as Pastor to this Church, provided the Church would adopt the principle of inclusive membership. Inclusive membership as explained to your Boards by Dr. Fosdick means the Church will receive persons into its membership upon proper letters from churches of any evangelical denomination, and that, following the Baptist principle of individual freedom and responsibility the Church will not insist upon immersion of candidates for membership who have conscientious objections to undergoing that rite."

And furthermore, the defense of modernism as evidenced by Dr. Abernathy speaking, voting and working against the Henson resolution as offered at the Seattle Convention, which resolution required as a qualification of all missionaries, that they sign a statement affirming their belief in and acceptance of the authority and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the Virgin Birth, the Deity of Christ, the Abonement of Christ, the Bodily Resurrection, the Personal Return, and the New Birth—said resolution being defeated by a majority vote of 168, Dr. Abernathy working, speaking and voting that with the majority. And,

WHEREAS these honored leaders in our denomination and teachers in our great seminary have thereby given comfort to the forces that are now threatening to destroy the unity of spirit and oneness of purpose which are indispensable to genuine and brotherly co-operation in the denomination by their attitude and tolerance of Evolution and Modernism as aforesaid.

NOW THEREFORE, we the members of the Baptist churches of the Elkhorn Association, do resolve in mass meeting that we declare and publish to our fellow Baptists everywhere that the attitude of Doctors E. Y. Mullins, J. R. Sampey and A. T. Robertson is subversive of the faith distinctively held by our Baptist people, and that therefore, because of their strategic position precipitate a crisis in our denominational life

and menaces the spiritual life of our churches, and that in view of all these distressing revelations, we are compelled to urge all our fellow Baptists to join in a protest against the tendency toward and endorsement of modernism in our beloved seminary, and we urge our brethren to join hands in an effort to remedy the present condition by giving forth a clear and unequivocal pronouncement against Evolution and Modernism; and we call upon all our Baptist churches and pastors to resist to the utmost not only the present menace of Evolution and Modernism, but an unscriptural ecclesiasticism which covers up, protects, and defends the false teachings creeping into our midst.

Consideration Objected To.

When Dr. Ragland had read perhaps two-thirds of this memorial a Mr. Barton, we believe a brother of the Dr. Barton who moved the previous question last year, moved to object to consideration. This required a vote to be taken immediately. The President made every effort to make the matter clearly understood to all the delegates, explaining to them that if they wished the memorial to be read they were to vote "aye"; if they were opposed to its being read they were to vote "nay". No one could possibly have been fairer than the President was, nor, it would seem to us, could anyone have explained in clearer terms just what was involved in the vote. Notwithstanding, a prominent pastor of Missouri, perhaps because he was a little hard of hearing, turned to us and said, "Tell me how to vote; I want that memorial to be read?" Whereupon we explained to him what the President had said, and when the vote was called for, he voted "aye". But in a great assembly like that it seems to us to be somewhat hazardous to take a vote in that way: it is much easier to shout a word beginning with a consonant than a word beginning with a vowel. Judging by the sound we should say the President was correct in ruling that the "nays" had it. This stopped the further reading of the memorial. As a result a great protest meeting was called for the Big Tent for 7.30.

The Baptist Bible Union in the Big Tent.

And here we must introduce the Big Tent. It was under this same tent the Baptist Bible Union of North America was officially launched in Kansas City, in May, Nineteen hundred and twenty-three. This tent was set up in Houston for a pre-convention Bible Union Conference. It is an enormous tent, having an area that would easily accommodate three thousand people if the seats were set close together. The seating provided in the tent at Houston would accommodate something over two thousand. Meetings were held on Friday evening, Sunday afternoon and evening, Monday evening, and Tuesday morning, afternoon and evening before the opening of the Southern Baptist Convention. It was the privilege of the Editor of this paper to speak Sunday afternoon and evening, and Monday evening, also Tuesday afternoon. Tuesday evening the speakers were Mr. A. E. Roberts, of Lexington, Dr. George Ragland, and Dr. J. Frank Norris. The tent was crowded, and these brethren gave able addresses, pleading for absolute loyalty to the great fundamentals of the faith. Announcement was made on Tuesday evening that no further meetings would be held in the tent until the following Sunday afternoon unless some emergency should arise which would require the holding of such meetings. That emergency arose with the refusal to consider the Kentucky memorial, and a great meeting, which filled the tent, was held on Thursday evening. There was great enthusiasm. Drs. Ragland and Norris were the principal speakers; and at the conclusion of the meeting the following resolution was unanimously carried:

Resolution Passed in Big Tent.

As a company of Southern Baptists who are Messengers to the Southern Baptist Convention, assembled here to protest against certain matters hereinafter mentioned relating to the interests of the Denomination, we declare it to be our conviction that it is in the highest interests of the Denomination that all our educational institutions and missionary organizations be kept true to the great essentials of the distinctive Baptist interpretation of Evangelical Faith; and we further declare that any

criticisms we offer, of our institutions or organizations, we offer as Southern Baptists who are loyal in every particular to Southern Baptist interests; and that therefore we have no intention of bolting or withdrawing from the Convention, but are resolved to maintain our position within the Convention, and to strive together for the faith of the Gospel with a solemn sense of the responsibility of Southern Baptists to give the Gospel to the whole world; and

WHEREAS, the Convention adopted an anti-Evolution statement taken from the President's address with great enthusiasm; and

WHEREAS, a Memorial from the Elkhorn Association of Baptists in Kentucky, conveyed to the Convention by a messenger from Kentucky calling in question the loyalty of certain professors to the Word of God was refused consideration; and

WHEREAS, these movements taken together make it appear that the anti-Evolution statement is not to apply to anyone holding positions in the Southern Baptist Convention; and

WHEREAS, this latter action, as was inevitable, has engendered suspicion of the motive actuating the proposal to adopt the President's anti-Evolution statement; and

WHEREAS, it is known to all Southern Baptists that Dr. E. Y. Mullins has put himself on record as opposed to any consideration of the Evolution question at this Convention;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this assembly of messengers to the Southern Baptist Convention declare it to be their conviction that peace within the Convention and confidence in the leadership of its institutions and organizations can be restored, and co-operation of all our people secured, only when the leaders of our denominational work in our missionary and educational institutions shall openly declare that each is personally opposed to the doctrine of Evolution and all that it implies.

Telegram from Dr. Norris.

We were compelled to leave Houston Friday morning, so were unable, personally, to observe the Convention beyond this time. To-day, May 17th, we received the following telegram from Dr. Norris.

"Tremendously strong unequivocal second anti-evolution resolution passed Convention Saturday morning, requiring all boards, missionaries, agencies, seminaries, trustees, professors, and secretaries, to sign anti-evolution resolution. Scarborough's seminary signed on spot; and Mullins is repudiated and crushed. Unprecedented victory in Southern Convention will tremendously help Northern Convention. Tent full Sunday afternoon."

We have not the text of the resolution referred to, but the telegram will speak for itself.

We shall await with great interest fuller information about this later anti-evolution resolution with its recommended applications. It would appear from what we now know that the great Southern Baptist Convention has shown that it is sound at heart. It is well that we should recognize Modernism as a college movement. Its propagators and defenders are invariably professional educators. These men get into positions of influence and control in the various conventions, and, like a little Soviet Russia, endeavour to drive great multitudes before them like a flock of sheep. The action of the Southern Convention shows that the great need of the hour is information. Let the rank and file of our people be informed of what Modernism really is, and what it is doing and attempting to do in Baptist institutions and organizations, and they will everywhere repudiate it as they have done in the Southern Convention.

We have no doubt that the gentlemen who were determined that Evolution should not be discussed at this Convention will endeavour to turn defeat into victory, and it will be necessary for fundamentalists in the Southern Convention to be everywhere on their guard. The apparent temporary check to a fundamentalist victory which came by the refusal to consider the Kentucky Memorial was made much of in the newspapers and hailed as a great triumph

for Dr. Mullins. The newsboys on the street were shouting, "Read all about Dr. Mullins". At every corner they were shouting the name of Dr. Mullins. Somebody stopped one of the laddies and asked him what he knew about Dr. Mullins, to which he replied "I know he is a good man". "And how do you know it?" he was asked, to which the boy replied, "I met him", and they said "Where did you meet him", and he said "Down at the hotel—they took me down to meet him". Whether the boy was telling the truth we do not know, but it was a significant fact that all the boys in Houston were crying the same thing, "Read all about Dr. Mullins", and one of them said he had been taken to Dr. Mullins and introduced to him. This looks like playing politics with a vengeance. It may be that Dr. Mullins himself had no responsibility for this, but we know enough of newspaper ways and their manner of treating reports of religious meetings to believe that it was no accident that all the newsboys of Houston were crying together, "Read all about Dr. Mullins".

May God speed the day when our Baptist denomination will have done with ecclesiastical politics and when it will raise up men of conviction and principle who will dare to tell the world in unambiguous speech exactly what they believe.

Another very important matter submitted to the Convention was a report of the committee on changing the basis of representation. The report is too long to print in full, nor would much of it be interest to any outside the Southern Convention. The report was to the effect that the Convention had grown so large that it was difficult to conduct it as a deliberative body; and among the remedies suggested is one to reduce the basis of representation so that the Convention will consist of a few messengers, with one thousand as the maximum; or to divide the body into two or three Conventions with the Mississippi River as one line of division; and having the Convention proper to meet once in three years with representation of a few hundred messengers, say 250 or 300. One important recommendation of the Committee was as follows:

"6. We recommend further that the constitution be so amended as that a call may be made for a vote by states, when sustained by not fewer than 100 votes. In the vote by states, each state shall be entitled to as many votes as it is entitled to messengers. If there is division in any state vote, where there is not full representation from that state, the total vote of said state shall be counted in the same ratio as the vote actually cast by those present."

Thus the Southern Convention would follow the example of the Convention of the North. Notice of amendment to section 4 of the Committee's report was as follows:

"That Article 3 of the Constitution shall be amended so as to read as follows:

The Convention shall consist (1) of messengers who contribute funds or are elected by bodies contributing funds for the regular work of the Convention on the basis of one messenger to every \$250.00 actually paid into the treasuries of the Boards during the fiscal year ending the 30th day of April next preceding the meeting of the Convention, provided that no person shall be seated as a messenger who is not a member in good standing in some regular missionary Baptist church, and provided further that such messenger is a member of a church in co-operation with its local association, State convention, and is thus eligible to membership in both such bodies; (2) of one representative from each of the district associations which co-operate with this Convention and with its State Convention provided that such representative be formally elected at the annual meeting of his district association and the election certified to the secretaries of the Convention, either in writing or by printed copy of minutes."

Everybody of course knew that this was aimed at the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth.

What of the future? Nearly all the departments of the Southern Convention's work are heavily in debt. This is due, in large measure, to the attempt

of a few leaders to defend the policies of the educational institutions as against the known will of the people at large. If the Convention actually implements its resolution and the various educational institutions and missionary organizations adopt the resolutions of the Convention in good faith, and show that they intend to abide by their professions, we see no reason why the unrest which has obtained in the Southern Convention should not be allayed and the suspicion of its leaders dispelled, so that the churches once again may heartily co-operate in the great work to which Southern Baptists have put their hands. What a glorious thing it would be if, in this day of abounding apostasy, the Southern Convention with its almost unlimited powers, were wholly given to the propagation of the old-fashioned gospel: if in its educational institutions the presidents and professors could take an unequivocal stand on these issues and lead their students once again in the simple ways of evangelical faith: if thus this great host of three and a half million Baptists could march together, one in heart and hand, might it not easily be that they should become God's chosen instrument to bring to this weary world a great spiritual revival? Surely the brethren in the South have had enough of strife and contention. The great mass of the people must recognize that the difficulty has not been with the rank and file but with a few leaders who apparently have determined to bring their educational institutions up to date, by bringing them into agreement with modernism. And if they would insist that these particular leaders either declare themselves to be in hearty accord with the Convention's expressed will or else retire from their positions, nothing but blessing could result.

Everywhere the chief anxiety of Southern Baptists seemed to be centred in the Louisville Seminary. Among other things it is reported that a gift for one particular building of some six hundred thousand dollars has been received. One of the papers has suggested that the unknown donor is the Rockefeller Foundation. This, we were informed, has not been denied. That has been the bait that has been held out to nearly every Baptist institution in the country. McMaster University of Toronto is no exception. If we had the gift of a cartoonist, we could draw a correct representation of nearly every Baptist college President in America and Canada as being like the porter brushing the coat of a gentleman named the Rockefeller Foundation, the whisk in one hand and the other held out for a tip. The hope of obtaining some benefits from this Foundation has been the corrupting influence at work in nearly all our educational institutions.

It would be interesting to speculate on what led to this great victory for Evangelical Truth. The result is most directly due to the heroic stand of Dr. C. P. Stealey. God be praised for a Baptist Editor who is one hundred per cent. a man! He is not the only one in the South, but beyond any question if Dr. Stealey had allowed himself to be swayed by the majority in his committee last year, and had not presented a minority report, the propagation of the doctrine of Evolution would have continued without check. But Dr. Stealey's stand aroused the whole brotherhood of the South; and the discussion which has continued in all the papers of the South throughout the year did much to prepare for this great victory.

We question whether there are any who can honestly deny that Dr. Norris and *The Searchlight* played a large part in securing this result. *The Searchlight* has been hammering away against Evolution for years. Evolution masqueraded in college cap and gown in Southern institutions, representing itself as a type of superior modern intellectuality. In the glare of *The Searchlight* it was shown to be the same old serpent that wrought such deadly havoc in the garden; and that its chief work was to discredit the Word of God. We believe that *The Searchlight's* continuous bombardment for several years, supplemented by the later heroic and intensive attack of Dr. Stealey, and his associates, made this victory possible; and we believe that the Big Tent, always open for discussion, making the application of gag rule impossible, exercised a salutary influence upon the would-be Baptist "bosses" at this particular Convention.

The result in the South has shown conclusively that the proper thing for Baptists to do in their respective conventions, is not to run into a corner and sulk, nor to withdraw altogether from their Conventions, but to come out into the open and fight, and drag this crawling beast of Evolution out into the open

light of day. We believe the victory in the Southern Convention will not be without its echoes in the North, and in Canada. We are sorry for Dr. Mullins. He is undoubtedly a man of great powers, who has accomplished much good. It is a thousand pities that he should have stepped down from his high position as a great teacher to play the ignoble part of a petty ecclesiastical politician. By the action of the Southern Convention he has suffered a loss of prestige from which we fear it will take him many years to recover.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

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

Lesson 11. SECOND QUARTER. June 13, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE WOES PRONOUNCED ON FALSE TEACHERS

LESSON TEXT: Twenty-third chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Mark 12:38-40.

Luke 20:45-47.

GOLDEN TEXT.—"O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (Matt. 23:37).

I. OUR LORD DIFFERENTIATES BETWEEN THE TRUTH AND ITS ADVOCATES.

1. He teaches us to receive and obey the Truth for the Truth's sake. One of the commonest excuses for the rejection of Christ is that professing Christians are no better than other people. There is too often ground for the accusation. Our sins and short comings should never be excused, but acknowledged and amended. Notwithstanding, it should never be allowed that a man is justified in rejecting Christ because of the unfaithfulness of His followers. The scribes and the Pharisees sat in Moses' seat, i.e., they were official teachers of the Law. Christ tells His hearers that what they teach is true, but that "they say and do not". He admonishes them, therefore, to heed what they teach but to shun their example. We should wisely observe this principle, and while refusing to condone unfaithfulness and inconsistency in ourselves or others, insist that the Truth should be received for the Truth's sake, and because it is Truth, and that without regard to the person by whom the truth is communicated. The Apostle Paul expounds the same principle in Phil 1:12-18.

Here is an opportunity for the teacher to urge upon his scholars the acceptance of Christ in spite of the carelessness of His professed followers. The Gospel should command our utmost loyalty irrespective of the coldness of the church, and, perhaps, in some cases, the indifference of some of its ministers.

II. CHRIST TEACHES US TO FIND WARNING RATHER THAN JUSTIFICATION IN OTHERS' SINS.

Too often men justify themselves by observing the sins of others. "Everybody does it" can never justify wrong-doing. Said Nehemiah in reference to similar unfaithfulness: "So did not I, because of the fear of the Lord" (Neh. 5:15). Our Lord admonishes "the multitudes and His disciples" to shun the Pharisees' (1) false profession (vs. 4); (2) their passion for human observation—"to be seen of men"; (3) their love for great names (vss. 7-10); and bids them find their highest joy in sincere and humble service.

III. HOW CHRIST DEALT WITH FALSE TEACHERS.

1. He did not seek to win them from their false teaching by a highly complimentary diplomacy. No one will question that false teachers abound in our day. How ought we to treat them? A certain type of mind recommends that we avoid any denunciation of their false doctrines; that we should never fail to credit the blind guides with the purest motives; that we should go as far as possible in recognizing that they have some truth on their side,

and by this means endeavour to meet them half way; and above all things avoid any sort of personal mention, or the utterance of any word that could be construed as questioning their fitness for the position they occupy.

In contrast with this counsel of pacifism, observe the Master's method: He does not talk about them, but to them. Seven times in this chapter He calls these false teachers "hypocrites"; twice He calls them "blind guides"; twice "ye fools and blind"; once, "thou blind Pharisee"; and once, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers".

We must, of course, bear in mind that our Lord had perfect knowledge, and therefore could justly say many things which would be unwarranted in our lips; notwithstanding, the principle of dealing with flagrant error frankly, uncompromisingly, and sternly, yes, and publicly, establishes a precedent which we may safely follow.

2. He specifically named their false teaching and practice. He accused them of insincerity and inconsistency (vs. 4); of pride and love of prominence (vss. 7, 8); of keeping others out of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of not entering themselves (vs. 13); of cloaking covetousness with religion (vs. 14); of a passion for propagating error which made their victims "two-fold more the child of hell than themselves" (vs. 15); He characterizes their teaching as being the teaching of "fools and blind" (vss. 17-22).—He did not compliment them on their learning or their "scholarship", but called them by their true name, "fools". He charged these false teachers with leading people astray: they were "blind guides", their teaching made men "children of hell"; it concerned itself with comparative trifles and omitted weightier matters (vs. 23); it made much of externals to the utter neglect of inward purity (vs. 25). Having condemned their teaching, Christ accused the Pharisees of being personally as corrupt as their doctrine (vss. 27, 28).

False teaching and teachers must be judged by the light of God's Word. We may safely deal with these matters severely only when we are sure we are actuated by a passionate love for the truth, for the souls of men, and above all, for the glory of God.

IV. THE REASON FOR THE SEVERITY OF CHRIST.

There is a disposition on the part of many to make light of false teaching. Doctrine, which is another name for teaching, is discounted. We hear contemptuous talk of "heresy hunting", as though those who contend for the faith were engaged in a silly search for butterflies which do nobody's fields any harm, and the one who catches them, no good. "Doctrine" is made light of as though it were of less importance than the feathers or ribbon on a woman's hat, or the toys of which the children weary in a day.

We have in this lesson Christ's estimate of the importance of teaching relating to the destiny of the soul. For a blind man to assume the responsibility of a guide is to incur the risk of sacrificing life. To deal lightly with matters affecting the soul's relation to God is to handle the Word of God deceitfully. The exalted Head of the Church, speaking from Heaven through John to the Church at Pergamos, said: "So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes which things I hate". Here the same Voice warns false teachers, "Ye shall receive the greater damnation"; their teaching makes each of their victims "a child of hell"; and to the false teachers, He said: "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

V. CHRIST TEACHES THE STARTLING DOCTRINE OF UNBELIEF'S INHERITANCE OF THE ACCUMULATED GUILT OF REPEATED REJECTIONS OF THE TRUTH.

1. How often have we flattered ourselves that had we been in Pilate's place we would not have yielded to the clamor of the multitudes. That, in principle, is exactly what the Pharisees said (vss. 29, 30); and while building the tombs of the prophets who were dead, they had murder in their hearts toward the living prophets, and were thus filling up the measure of their fathers (vs. 32). That is a solemn word which reminds us of God's Word to Abraham: "The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full". The balances will be turned with the weight of sin; the cup of iniquity will fill to the brim, and their judgment will fall.

2. The great Prophet and Teacher declares that every slain prophet

speaks again in his successor, and the rejection of the last involves the rejection of all who have gone before, while the final rejection incurs the responsibility for the blood of all (vss. 34-36). To the name of Zacharias we must now add the name of the greatest of all, Jesus Christ Himself. His Blood represents the blood of all the prophets, as well as His own. He is God's last Word; and to reject Him, is to refuse to hear God speak at all,—to "refuse Him that speaketh from Heaven".

3. But this principle has a present application to us. Of the Jews, Paul says, "Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (I Thess. 2:15, 16).

Thus the rejection of the Gospel message to-day involves the endorsement of Pilate's decision and incurs responsibility for the shedding of the blood of all the prophets. Here let teachers appeal to their scholars to avoid this terrible responsibility by immediate acceptance of Christ.

VI. IN WRATH OUR LORD REMEMBERS MERCY.

The pathetic cry with which the chapter closes must have moved any but hearts of stone. The invariable attitude of God toward His people is disclosed as that of one who would mother a helpless brood; while the invariable attitude of the carnal mind toward Heaven's message is represented as that of one ever ready to kill the prophet. The responsibility for the impending judgment therefore rests with themselves,—“I would—ye would not”;—the will of man immovably set in opposition to the will of God.

Only desolation can follow, and the Voice so long rejected will lapse into a long silence; and the Visage so sadly marred shall be seen no more until He comes again in power and great glory.

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 689, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

LAST SUNDAY IN JARVIS ST.

The Pastor was unable to reach Toronto from the Southern Baptist Convention at Houston, Texas, in time for the morning service, and the pulpit was ably supplied by Mr. W. Gordon Brown, B.A. Dr. Shields arrived in Toronto at five o'clock and preached at the evening service. At this service Dr. C. J. Holman, K.C., in behalf of the church spoke a few words of felicitation to the Pastor on the occasion of his beginning the seventeenth year of his pastorate in Jarvis St. Dr. Shields spoke from the text, "Because thou hast been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice." There was a great congregation, eight were baptized, and the hand of fellowship was given about thirty new members.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

One Dollar per year to all new subscribers during 1926. (Regular subscription, \$2.00 per year). This paper contains weekly a sermon by the Editor, an exposition of the Whole Bible Sunday School Course, and Editorial matter dealing especially with the battle between Fundamentalism and Modernism.

SPECIAL OFFER.

A Volume of Sermons by Dr. Shields entitled "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man," being a series of eight sermons on Luke 15, The Prodigal and his Brother, will be sent with *The Gospel Witness* for one year for One Dollar and a Half.

Send your subscription to:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS - 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto 2, Canada.