

# 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. 5 TORONTO, JUNE 10th, 1926 Whole No. 215

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE INEVITABLE TRIUMPH OF FUNDAMENTALISM.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, April 25th, 1926.

"For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."—Psalm 119: 89.

(Stenographically Reported.)



WELL-INSTRUCTED scribe brings forth out of his treasures things both new and old; but this is one of the times when I propose to bring forth only that which is old: I have no particularly new thing to say to you. I think perhaps I may have told some of you of a friend of mine I knew some years ago who was a preacher, and who had a most extraordinary hobby—especially for a preacher—he carried about with him a bag of precious stones: opals, and emeralds, and rubies, and diamonds. He did not buy them with that which he received from the church treasury! I do not know how he got them, but he had them. He had pockets made all over his clothing, for he carried some of them with him. He was a great naturalist, and when he died he left a large collection to the city in which he had ministered. I went to see him one bright morning. He sat in his hotel room, and the sun was streaming through his window. He was sitting comfortably in an easy chair, and as I came in he said, "Come and sit over here, and I will introduce you to my friends." He picked up, first of all, a large opal. I had never seen such a stone. "Now," he said, "just hold that up in the sunlight", and I held it up. He said, "You know, that stone is almost a living thing to me. I never look at it but I admire the works of God; it never seems to be twice alike." Then he took stone after stone and held them up saying, "I just revel in their beauty." I do not commend that hobby to you—it is rather an expensive one, one in which I, at least, have never been able to indulge. But there are other kinds of jewels we may have with us: this Holy Word is a casket of jewels; and I know of nothing more inspiring than just to open it and take them out one after the other, and admire them, and praise God for them. That is what Mr. Stockley did for us this morning when he held up that great truth of justification by faith. And how our hearts rejoiced in it!—not because it was new, but, being old, it is ever fresh. It came to our hearts like fresh water to a thirsty traveller.

So I want to talk to you for a little while this evening about some very old things. I know of nothing older than this text itself: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." The subject announced for this evening was, "The Inevitable Triumph of Fundamentalism." What is Fundamentalism? I heard of a prominent preacher in this city saying quite recently to his congregation that he was neither a fundamentalist nor a modernist; that both represented extremes of thought. And there are those who seem disposed to think that that body of truth for which fundamentalists stand is something other than the old gospel; that it is something new, or, otherwise, a fanatical expression of the old. But it is nothing of the kind. I have known some of the men who have been prominent in this fundamentalist movement for years: they have not changed their message; they are preaching the same old truths they preached years ago. There is nothing new in Fundamentalism: it is simply a modern name that is given to that body of truth which represents revealed religion, the evangelical interpretation of the gospel. I suppose we shall have to be willing to be called "fanatics" and "extremists"; but the fact is, we have not changed; other have changed, but we are merely standing by the old truths; and in obedience to the divine admonition working still by the old Power.

In a word or two, what is Fundamentalism? Of course, that is a large subject, in the discussion of which this Convention will be engaged to the end. Yet I think I can summarize it in a few words: Fundamentalists hold that it is fundamental to Christian faith that we should accept the Bible as the Word of God. I need not, technically, define the inspiration of Scripture. There are thousands of people who could not do that, but who know from their own experience that the Bible is the Word of God. If to take that position be fanatical, we gladly and proudly wear the name.

And then the main Subject of which the Bible speaks is the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ: He is in Genesis, as I have often said to you—at least, to those of you who regularly worship with us—and He is in Revelation, and in every verse between,—the whole Bible from Genesis to Revelation is the record which God has given to us of His Son. Do not be deceived by those who say, "We stand upon the New Testament"; for there is no New Testament if you destroy the Old. Absolutely not!—it is impossible for us to rest in the New if we reject the Old. I say, the Subject of the Bible is our Lord Jesus Christ. Here He is presented as the manifestation of Deity. Back there in the Old Testament there are occasional appearances of the Angel of the Covenant; but He "was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory", when He came and lived His life before us as a man.

And, of course, as a necessary corollary of that truth, the virgin birth of Christ we accept. That is to say, we believe that Matthew tells the truth—that it is the Word of God; and that Luke tells the truth; that they all tell the truth. So we accept the divine record, and glory in the fact, that Jesus was not only the Son of God, but God the Son.

And out of that comes this great fact that, as such, He came into the world to die for sinners. That is the heart of the whole gospel. Is there anything new in that? That is the gospel the churches have believed all down through the ages, that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures"; and then following upon that, attesting that truth, certifying to the divine purpose running through that experience, we have the tremendous fact of the resurrection of Christ, the literal, physical, resurrection of Christ. Oh yes, they call us literalists; they say, "The literalists believe so-and-so." Well, we are literalists, in this sense, that we believe that God means what He says, and says what He means; and that Jesus did actually rise; that He disappeared yonder beyond the clouds; and that He carried that human body with Him, a pledge of a redeemed human nature,—a cloud received Him out of their sight. And we are extreme enough, and fanatical enough, and foolish enough, to be able to sing with grateful hearts as you were singing when I came in, "Jesus is coming again." We believe that.

I suppose we might take that as a body of truth respecting the Person of Christ: His essential Deity, involving His virgin birth, His vicarious atonement, His physical resurrection, and His personal return.

Then, of course, fundamentalists believe something about man: that he is lost, and that he is saved by the blood, regenerated by the Spirit, and that he grows in grace, and is preserved unto eternal life.

I have really been covering in this simple way ground covered by a very great authority, that is to say, a very great authority in his own estimation! I heard the late lamented Dr. Hinson who went home but a week or two ago, speaking of the one to whom I refer as a champion of the modern mind, as a man who would lead us to the heights of modern thinking—I heard Dr. Hinson say that he is a very great authority, that he is a most distinguished scholar, that he knows more than almost anybody else. He said, "It must be so, for the gentleman tells us so himself!" The one who thus outlines the fundamental position is no other than the famous Dr. Fosdick, in his sermon, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" Well, I do not know about the fundamentalists' winning—I am not particular whether the fundamentalists win or lose, but I am absolutely sure that the fundamentals will win, that the truth of God will stand; and it is all gathered up in this pregnant sentence of the text: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven".

That means that the Word of God is itself safe; it is in a safe place. Did you ever lose your Bible? We have had many people come, much distressed, saying, "I brought my Bible to church, and left it, and I came back again and I could not find it in the pew." Generally it turns up. But I am glad there is one copy of the Bible anyway that is safe, that cannot be lost. I have an idea that Heaven has a pretty accurate filing system, where things are duly registered and properly preserved. Our friends the modernists say, "Well, we have not the original manuscripts, have we?" No, we have not; but we have some very ancient manuscripts, and we cannot be too grateful for that reverent scholarship which has given us, by comparison, a pure text. I should not be surprised if the original manuscripts were to be discovered some day; I should not be at all surprised if even in our day somewhere the spade of the archaeologist were to dig some of them up. And what a great day that would be, would it not, if we had the very letters of Paul written by his own hand, those he did write, if we had the original manuscripts of the gospel! But I am sure there is one copy extant of every word of Scripture, and that is in Heaven itself. "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." And if it were legitimate, if it were lawful, to imagine such a thing as the absolute destruction of every Bible in all the world, and the elimination from all literature of every biblical allusion, so as to leave the world without a solitary word from God—if that were possible, there is no doubt but that God could give us a complete copy of the Scriptures the next morning.

"For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." That is very literal, is it not? I do not mean to say that there are actual parchments in heaven, you know. Some of my ministerial brethren know that when they write things, they remember them. I have about two thousand manuscripts at home. When I had time I used to laboriously write everything; and I found that after I had written an article I could recall it word for word. And I am positive that the Word of God is registered in the mind of God. He knows His own word, and it is settled and established in heaven; so that we need have no concern about it at all. Even though men oppose the Bible, that will make no difference to the Bible: the Word of God abides; it is settled in heaven. The Scriptures say we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth. So let us rejoice in that, that the Word of God is itself secure, and we need have no concern whatever about it. I think I have scriptural warrant for saying that the Word of God must somehow or another be held in memory in heaven. I wonder how many of you are burdened with a heavy correspondence? and if you have had difficulty sometimes in following up that which you yourself have written? I heard a business man the other day talking about a filing system, and he said something about a "tickler file". I said, "What in the world is that? What do you mean by a 'tickler file'?" "Why", he said, "that is a common expression in business-houses: it simply means that they have a record of firms or individuals with whom they have done business, and prospective customers—they have a sort of memory file where they put the names of those whom they have to remind of something, and they call it a 'tickler file'. I suppose that when you get a second notice of a bill that you have not paid, that comes from the

'tickler file'—and it is a kind of tickling that does not make you laugh!'. Is it not wonderful as you go through the Scriptures to observe how minutely the Scripture fulfills itself, how God fulfills His Word to Noah, and to Abraham, and to Joseph, and Moses, and Joshua, and David, and all the prophets! What an interesting study that is!

That is one of the old things, it is of course commonplace; but if your faith is ever shaking, just go through, meditate through, the Bible—I hope some of you know it well enough to be able to recall the important events all down through the Word—and remind yourself of how God has been fulfilling His Word all down through the centuries, especially that grand climax where, in the smallest detail, it is fulfilled in the personal ministry, in the death and resurrection, of Jesus Christ. It all indicates that somewhere there is a record in the mind of God, and that He knows every word that He has ever spoken; and He is pledged to fulfil every promise He has made. Just as Scripture has been fulfilled thus far, so to the end of this dispensation—and, indeed, all through the millennial glory and beyond into the infinite eternity—God's Word will be found to be true, and He will keep it to the letter, because His word is for ever settled in heaven.

That means, of course, that a subject that engages our thought, and about which we debate a great deal in these days, up yonder has ceased to be a debatable subject: the truth concerning the Person of Christ is for ever settled. You are not going to make a new Christ, you are not going to strip Him of His Deity, or of His power; nor will you diminish the range of His knowledge, or in any way render Him less than absolutely infallible, by all your discussions; because that truth is for ever settled. Let us think of Him, then, as in the glory: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." What is His Word? "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." Jesus is the Word of God, gathering up in His Person and completely revealing in all its fulness, the divine testimony for all ages. How glorious it is to remember that "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins"—what did He do? Let me finish it—"sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high"—not "it" but "He" is settled in heaven ("Praise the Lord!") They resolved that He should never return: they nailed Him to the cross; they put Him in a sepulchre; they sealed the tomb, and set a guard upon its doors; yet notwithstanding all that, He is seated at the "right hand of the Majesty on high". So do not be nervous, dear friends, about what Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick—or some other more recent importation—may say, do not trouble about it, you need not worry about these modern notions of the book of Jonah; because, you see, all that was settled long ago. Even He, the Incarnate Word, as we observed in our class this morning, fulfilled in His own experience that prophecy and went through the grave into the glory. He is there; in Him, the truth of Jonah, and of every portion of Scripture, is established in the heavens.

We need not worry about the truth of His Deity, or of His virgin birth. They do not talk about that up in heaven; they do not discuss that: they simply worship Him, that is all they do. They know Who He is there: enthroned in glory, the truth of His essential Deity is eternally established, because He is seated at the "right hand of the Majesty on high".

And I love to think that there is no possibility of our losing the truth of the atonement. You know in the human realm many things have been lost: with all our engineering, I do not suppose it would be possible to reproduce the pyramids—I do not know; but certainly there are many ancient arts that have disappeared from the realm of human knowledge; and we wonder sometimes how the ancients did things. But we shall never lose the truth of the atonement. The books that have been written about it may be burned, or forgotten, or buried beneath an accumulation of modern thinking, so that it would be difficult to get back under it all to the truth—even if this Book could thus be buried, do you not remember that it is written by John, "I beheld,

and, lo, in the midst of the throne . . . stood a Lamb as it had been slain." He is there: that truth is for ever settled in heaven.

And as for the truth of the regeneration of the individual, and the perseverance of the saints,—the work of the Holy Spirit in the believer's life,—there are too many saved people in heaven for that to be ever forgotten. Do you not see, dear friends, that the whole matter has been put beyond the realm of uncertainty, of peradventure: it does not belong to the realm of hazard, to that which happened; it is for ever settled; we have a foundation for the feet of our faith. There are some things which cannot be shaken, and this is one of them. This truth is for ever settled in heaven.

I told you I was not going to say anything new. God's word about you and me—did you know He had ever said anything about you? He has talked a good deal about you, and all that He has ever said about you is settled in heaven. Yes, your record is there. We heard Brother Atkinson, of the Christie Street Baptist Church, at the Convention last Friday afternoon telling us of a sermon preached from this text, "Jesus knew what was in man." You remember where that is found, do you not?—"Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." And knowing what was in man, He knew that it was bad, not good. And that text says that because He knew what was in man, He did not trust them: He knew they were not worthy of trust; He did not commit Himself to men. Yet that text was made the ground of a sermon to teach that Jesus knew there was an angel in every man, and that beneath the ashes of our fallen human nature, the celestial fire was still burning! Men who thus handle the Word of God deceitfully are not safe leaders, or teachers, of young men. But, my dear friends, we need not be concerned about the truth itself, because that is registered up there.

And so of the depth of our human need. We had a man come into our Baptist Bible Union Conference, and, discussing one question, he said, "You have something in your Confession of Faith that excludes me." Then he told us that he believed in "conditional" immortality; and we told him that that was what the Confession of Faith was for—to exclude people who did not believe: we believe something. And, my friends, there are some people who are determined that there shall be some other way of salvation than through the blood of Christ. "Why", they say, even to God Himself, "if You make acceptance of the blood a means of salvation, a condition of salvation, that will exclude me." That is exactly what it will do, there is no doubt about that. "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." Oh no, these things are not settled down here—not in theological colleges, nor universities, nor anywhere else: all that has been predetermined; it is settled in heaven; and it will be the part of wisdom for us to find out what Heaven has to say about it.

That is almost repetition, but let me give you another jewel of truth, a commonplace I know: the truth respecting the Church is settled in heaven. What is going to happen to the Church? Organized religion is about to be defeated, people talk about the difficulties of the downtown church! They told me this was a downtown church when I came here sixteen years ago. Someone said to me, "Well, you have come to be pastor of poor old Jarvis Street!"—if we were poor then, we must surely be paupers now—and how solicitous they were for the future of the downtown! Before most of you church members came here I preached one Sunday evening—or Sunday morning, I forget which—on this text: "Because the Syrians have said, The Lord is God of the hills, but he is not God of the valleys, therefore will I deliver all this great multitude into thine hand, and ye shall know that I am the Lord." The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the God of the valleys as well as the God of the hills; and though some people do not seem to think so, He is the God of the downtown as well as the uptown—and I rather like staying downtown with Him!

What about the future of the Church? "Well, you know you will lose all the young people if you do not accommodate your gospel to the demand of the modern mind; you simply must adjust yourself to the change in conditions or you won't hold the people—especially downtown"! Why, my friends, God's programme for the church was settled before there was any downtown or uptown; and it was settled and determined quite independently of circum-

stances, or human conditions; the future of His Church was settled in heaven, and it has been settled ever since. You remember He said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—against what? Against His Church. What church? The Church that is built upon the Rock. What rock? That Jesus Christ is Lord, that is the Rock which is the sum and substance of the whole Book—that great truth is settled in heaven. I heard a Presbyterian preacher some years ago say that he was a little bit wearied, and sometimes almost annoyed, when he heard young students just appointed to go to China or India, when making their tours of the churches before they left, telling us all that organized Christianity has come to a great crisis; and unless we do certain things we will lose China, and we will lose India, and we will lose the educated classes at home! I do not wonder he was tired. Oh, my friends, what is the foundation of faith anyhow? Whom do we believe—not what—but whom do we believe? What is back of all our preaching and our praying? What is back of this Word? Why have we the Word? Why, it is answered in one word—GOD! We believe God, and because we believe God we are sure the future of His Church is secure: "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing."

"But", you say, "I have known some churches to go out of existence." My answer is, There are plenty of organizations called churches that, in the biblical sense are not churches at all. But the Church, whether you consider it as a local unit, or take the wider view of the body of God's elect now living, or those who shall yet be born of the Spirit, if it be made up of regenerated persons resting upon that eternal truth, we need have no concern about the future of Evangelical Christianity.—"For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." There is going to be a marriage some day: the engagement has been announced, and all heaven is preparing for the wedding. And when the great day shall come, and God's great hour shall strike, there will be no disappointment: the Bride and the Bridegroom will be there. How do I know? Because it is settled in heaven, beyond the realm or the range of these evanescent or changing things. O, blessed be God! the gospel, as our dear brother said in his prayer a little while ago, will not wear out. I know it will never wear out, because God has so determined—it is settled in heaven.

There is nothing else that could ever meet our human needs. I have a bunch of keys in my pocket, and sometimes I cannot tell one from the other; sometimes I have to try two or three keys before I know which is the right one. How do I know which is the right one? Not by any stamp upon them: I know which is the right one because it unlocks the door, that is all. I do not know the intricacies of the lock within—I am not a locksmith; but I do know when I get the right key that it unlocks the door. And I know what this Bible is, what the gospel is: it just fits, you see; it works, as our brother said, it just works, that is all. Yes, the gospel of God's grace opens the door into the great beyond, ensures our passage in peace, and eternal felicity in the home of God Himself. So you need not be afraid that the gospel will wear out. My brothers who are preaching—you younger men, I would not dare to speak to others—but you younger men who have had perhaps a little less experience than some of us, you who are just looking forward to your life's work, do not worry; you have an everlasting job, it will never wear out. I remember to have read once in a great address of Spurgeon's, a passage something like this (I quote from memory): "Brethren, shall we have a pulpit some day amid the spheres? Shall we have voices so strengthened as to reach attentive constellations? Shall we be messengers of the Lord of grace to unfallen worlds, who will be wonder-struck when they hear the story of redeeming love?" Then he said, "I think so", and quoted that great passage in Ephesians, "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." We who preach this gospel have a great calling, for it never will go out of date; and there never will be a time when men can be saved in any other way than through the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. How do I know? The same story: it is settled in heaven that thus it shall be.

I have left to the last a very simple word that I might have included in the first: the word of truth concerning the coming of our Lord. That, too, is

settled in heaven. He is coming again—do you know that Jesus is coming again? ("Yes!" "Praise the Lord!") In the beginning of my ministry my attention was directed to that truth, and I rejoiced in it; but I did not see the necessity of it in the beginning as I am coming to see it now. Oh, sometimes I wish Moses were here, so that I could talk over that problem of the Pentateuch with him. I would like to have an hour with Moses—I would rather have one hour with him than a whole theological course in McMaster University. Do you not see how easily he could tell all that? And would it not be glorious to sit down with David and say, "I read some pamphlets issued by the Methodist Church of Canada when I was living down below there, and these pamphlets said that the one hundred and tenth Psalm was not written by you, and had no relation to Christ—Did you write it?" I rather think that his memory would be very keen at that time, and I think that he would be able to tell to Whom he referred! I think he would probably say, "I did not know when I wrote it, because the Spirit of God spoke through me", for the New Testament says that some of the Old Testament prophets did not know what they wrote when they testified concerning the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow: they searched "what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." It would be a great thing to have a talk with Moses and David. These problems of the New Testament—shall we not have a great time with Paul? Mr. Stockley said this morning that he would love to hear Paul preach on, "Justification by faith". So would I, I would go a long way to hear him preach on anything at all; and I really believe that just as Moses and Elijah appeared with Jesus on the Mount, and the three disciples saw them, and heard them talking, and knew what they were talking about (they were all talking about the cross, the decease, the exodus He was to accomplish at Jerusalem)—I think the day will come when we shall be able to talk these matters over. But glorious as that will be, my dear friends, it is nothing to the presence of the Lord Himself. Problems will be settled then, won't they? And I do rejoice that there is a day coming when what is settled in heaven will be settled on earth, too. Is that not a great thing?—for the Lord is coming again.

There is one thing they do not know in heaven—a great many people on earth know all about it!—but they do not know anything about it in heaven—and that is, when He is coming. Did you ever think of that? It is settled when He is coming, but the angels do not know it: they know He is coming, but they do not know when. And that great truth even the Son Himself has put without the range of His knowledge by an act of His infinite will. Surely it ought to teach us that it is the height and depth and length and breadth of presumption for us to try to know what Heaven does not know; so you had better keep away from that date-fixing habit. That is one thing they do not know, and don't you try to be wiser than they are in heaven. You be ready, and it will make no difference just when; and seeing we do not know when He will be coming, we had better be ready all the time.

And then I have noticed lately that our modernist friends seem especially antagonistic toward the doctrine of the Lord's return. Have you noticed that? How they ridicule the idea of His coming on "the literal clouds of the skies"! I do not wonder that the unbelieving heart does not love the truth of His appearing; for when He comes it will be an end of all human speculation, and that which is settled in heaven will be manifested to men, and in God's good time will be settled on earth: His kingdom will come, and His will shall be done on earth even as it is done in heaven. They did not want Him when He came before "in the days of Herod the king". The religious world did not want Him, and did not welcome Him when He came: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." There was one man who waited for the consolation of Israel. Yes, there was someone who was alive and who remained until the coming of the Lord when He came the first time, and when he took the Babe in his arms you remember what he said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." And the world does not want Him now; and will not want Him when He comes again. One of our speakers is to speak on the subject, "The days of Noah and Now"—there is no likeness, no analogy, surely? O yes, even

when He shall come down the skies, He will find the world unwilling and unwelcoming—but He will come, because that is settled, it is already settled in heaven.

How many of us want to be on the winning side? Someone says, "Is it legitimate to want to be on the winning side?" Yes, if you get the eternal view of things. I am quite willing to be on the losing side for a while, but I do not want to be on the losing side in the end, do you? I should be quite willing—although I cannot say that I am coveting it, I could not frankly say that—but I think I can say I should be willing to go with Stephen and say, "That is the end so far as this life is concerned, so good-bye, old world, I am coming back again when my Lord comes." But I do not want to be on the losing side in the end.

Will Fundamentalism win? Yes, it will win. Will Fundamentalism triumph? Yes: if Fundamentalism be merely an unwavering belief in the Word of God, that is settled in heaven; there can be no doubt about that. I beg of you who are professing Christians, if some strange blindness has come upon you, and you have been turned away from the simplicity of faith in Christ—I beg of you to come back again, come back again. Why did you ever leave Him? No!—it was not because you found any difficulties for yourself: it was because you listened to the voice of men instead of to the voice of God; you have no deep-seated conviction respecting your doubts on the negative side. Why not come back again? I remember a friend of mine telling me of his preaching in New York to a great congregation, and many were saved. In the crowd there was a fellow-student, a man who had been a student with him in the university years before. One had abided by the truth of God, and the other had drifted off into Modernism. The preacher preached, and crowds were converted. The modernist came up to him after, and clapped him on the back and said, "I am glad to see you, and I really did enjoy the service. And," he said, "although I have not been keeping step with you, old man, I have to admit that your gospel is the only gospel that does the business." O yes; it is the only gospel that does the business. And so I think you had better come back and get into harmony with heaven. It is settled there; let it be settled in your own heart, and in your own life.

Are there some unconverted people here to-night? What will you say, dear friends? You look at your watch—I am not asking you to look at it now—but what is the use of it anyhow? Well, it approximates the movements of the sun. What do you expect to do to-morrow? "Well, I am going to business in the morning." What time? "Such a time." Who will determine the time? "Oh", you say, "Old Sol will rise in the morning." Are you sure? How do you know? How do you know? What power put that clock in the heavens and wound it up so that it has never lost a fraction of a second since first it was swung into space? "God said"—that is what did it. The Word of God! Did you not hear this afternoon that "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork"? Why, the word of God is registered, its power, its—what shall I say—its inevitability, or the inevitability of the results which flow from the utterances of Omnipotence, are registered in heaven. "God said", and the universe sprang into being; He upholdeth "all things by the word of his power." That is how it keeps going. It does not have to stop, and go to get more gas; it does not need to be oiled: He has settled it.

You will not try to stop the sun, will you? And you will not try to sweep back the tide, will you, like that ancient king? And you will not be foolish enough to try to cap Vesuvius, will you? Is there any engineer here that would presume to try to dam back Niagara? What are these forces? They are only the manifestations of the power of the Word of God. And in the spiritual realm, the Sun will rise, Jesus will come, the Tide will come in, and by-and-by the knowledge of the Lord will fill the earth as the waters cover the sea. All the theological seminaries on earth cannot stop it—God's judgments will come, and we cannot turn them back. Jesus Himself will come to take "vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." He is coming to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." Just as you make your programme for to-morrow by the



sun, and observe all the physical laws, so I remind you that the spiritual laws are for ever settled; and they are just as inevitable and as inexorable. Would we be wise, we shall trim our lamps accordingly, and receive Him Who is the Word, as our Saviour and Lord.

And you know the Scripture tells us how that great company in heaven breaks out into song as they see the Lamb, saying, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing"; and as they sing it all congregations join: "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, Blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Do you want to get into step with that great triumphal procession? Do you want to learn the song of the redeemed? Then I call you to put your faith in the eternal Word of God which is for ever settled in heaven; and which may be, for you at least, this hour for ever settled upon earth too. Trust Him, and you shall never be ashamed. Will you confess Him to-night as we sing our invitation hymn? We are going to confess Him some time, let us confess Him now.

### SHALL WE "CEASE FIRE"?

*The Canadian Baptist* of this week has an editorial entitled, "Cease Fire", in which reference is made to Dr. Masee's proposal for an armistice of six months between fundamentalists and modernists; and *The Canadian Baptist* says that this proposal was accepted. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Dr. Masee, as we pointed out in our report of the Northern Convention two weeks ago, absolutely surrendered to the modernistic element in the Northern Convention. The great bulk of the Fundamentalist Committee, together with the Baptist Bible Union members of the Northern Convention, as well as some fundamentalists who possibly belong to neither organization, stood like a rock against such proposals. Dr. Masee's proposal was made when large numbers of the delegates had left. Dr. W. B. Riley, who for years was almost as a twin brother to Dr. Masee, spoke most strongly against Dr. Masee's proposal.

As applying to the Northern Convention, the proposal was absurd. How could it be possible for fundamentalists to unite in a campaign of evangelism with men who repudiate every principle of evangelical faith—men, who in the first place, do not believe that men need to be saved, who do not believe that Christ died for sinners, that He was born of a virgin, that He was one with the Father and Holy Ghost, and who do not believe that the Bible is the Word of God? Dr. Masee must have taken leave of his senses before he made the proposal.

But what of the application of the principles to Ontario and Quebec? *The Canadian Baptist* says among other things:

"The front page daily newspaper publicity that has come to Canadian Baptists in recent years is abominable to every right thinking Baptist. One does not criticize the dailies for making the most of a good 'story'—the offenders are those who make the publication of such 'war' reports possible by their fightings.

"It is time to call a halt in Ontario and Quebec—just as across the line—and get down to the real work of the Master. There ought to be a general order to 'Cease Fire' and every sniper and bomber—big and little—should turn in his gun and become a worker for the Lord—rather than a wrecker of his brethren. Why fight each other until only the silence of death reigns over the field? If this policy of persistent battle continues the Baptist churches will suffer an eclipse from which they will be long in recovering."

What shall we say of the assumption that those who contend for the faith are neglecting to preach the gospel to sinners? We claim to have some acquaintance with the Baptist churches on this Continent, and what are the facts? Take a few conspicuous examples: Dr. Norris, of Fort Worth; Dr. Ragland, of Lexington, Ky.; Dr. W. B. Riley, of Minneapolis; Dr. John Roach Straton, of New York,—what is the record of their churches? It is a record of a continuous stream of conversions and additions to the church. The ex-

perence of every one of these men is that in the midst of the hottest conflicts God sets His seal to their testimony in the conversion of great numbers of people.

We will even dare to refer to our own experience. Jarvis Street Church has been in the heat of conflict for five years—ever since April, 1921. Probably it is to Jarvis Street *The Canadian Baptist* refers when it says: "The front page daily newspaper publicity that has come to Canadian Baptists in recent years is abominable to every right thinking Baptist." And yet we will venture to say that in that time, by the blessing of God, Jarvis Street has been used to make more Baptists than any other half dozen churches in the Convention. Our record shows that one thousand and seventy in the five years have been baptized, two hundred and sixty-eight have united with the church by experience, and three hundred and forty by letter, or a total of sixteen hundred and seventy-eight; while at least half as many more have professed conversion, not a few of whom have joined other churches. In the five years thirteen hundred and thirty-eight people have come into Jarvis Street Church who were not in other Baptist churches; while the Sunday School probably has the largest average attendance of any Sunday School of any denomination in the entire Dominion of Canada; and the membership of Jarvis Street Church is now well past the two-thousand mark, and is the largest Baptist membership in Canada. So far as Jarvis Street Church is concerned, at all events, there seems no probability that our conflict will issue in "the silence of death."

Or take another example. Students W. G. Brown and James McGinley of McMaster University have taken a hand in this controversy. Last week the Alton Baptist Church was reorganized. These young men went into a village where there were no Baptists eight months ago. They built on no man's foundation, but as wise master-builders, laid their own. The Alton church has a membership we believe of over fifty members, and has been self-supporting from the first day. They have great prayer-meetings and great congregations, and a strong treasury—over \$2,500.00 raised in eight months. Do the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec want more churches like Alton? Controversy over the truth hurts nothing but error.

Notwithstanding, there is one side to the "Cease Fire" article worth considering. Some one asked a French statesman if he favoured the abolition of capital punishment, to which he replied, "Certainly; let the murderers begin." And we reply, Let Modernists cease their efforts to destroy the faith, and Fundamentalists will be under no necessity of defending it.

But what is the meaning of this editorial? When did the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* develop a passion for evangelism? When did the members of the McMaster Faculty become flaming evangelists? Now that Professors Campbell and Keirstead are gone, who is left that has ever been noted for his evangelistic zeal? And what of the Senate of McMaster? Some of them we used to know quite intimately; and it would be as fair to accuse a block of ice of making the furnace red-hot, as to attribute any sort of evangelistic interest to the gentlemen we have in mind! The case in Canada is nothing like as bad as it is in the Northern Baptist Convention: the majority of our pastors are sound; but some of them have allowed a bitterness to take possession of them which is spoiling their ministry and threatening to disrupt their churches. For this, we are not to blame; but we do think that if some of our brethren were to defend the faith instead of defending McMaster, they might regain some of the blessing they have lost.

*The Gospel Witness* will not "cease fire". On the contrary, we intend to press the war more vigorously than ever, and trust to the Lord to vindicate our course as He has done hitherto.

Without making a separate article of it, we may refer to another editorial in *The Canadian Baptist* entitled, "The Prayer Meeting", in which the Editor remarks that pastors confess that nothing gives them so much anxiety as the weekly prayer-meeting. We must ask to be excused from that list. For five and a half years Jarvis Street Church has held three prayer-meetings every week; for more than a year past we have had a fourth meeting which is really a prayer-meeting, when the Sunday School workers come together to the number of more than one hundred and fifty every Monday evening. But the regular prayer-meetings of the church continue with unabating interest. Every

meeting lasts about two hours; and three-quarters of the entire time is always spent in prayer. The Jarvis Street prayer-meetings are not an anxiety to the Pastor: they are the great power which relieves him of anxiety, and makes possible the church's and his own ever-multiplying activities.

If this sounds like boasting, we can only say with the apostle, that we have been "compelled." We give it as our humble testimony, that if a church will pray, and recognize Christ as its Head, if its membership will separate itself from all worldly practices and give itself to a biblical, spiritual ministry, no power on earth can stand against it.

*The Canadian Baptist's* cry of "Cease Fire" reminds us of the Kaiser's peace offensive during the war. When those who are now so bitterly opposing Jarvis Street can show that their compromise with Modernism is more fruitful in real conversions than is the ministry of such men as we have mentioned, it will be time enough for us to take breath long enough to listen to their cry of, "Kamerad". Meanwhile, we intend, in the name of the Lord, to set up our banners.

## OUR CONVENTION "ORGAN".

(Organist Unknown).

*The Canadian Baptist*, in yesterday's issue, tries to be censorious and succeeds in being funny. We consider we are doing ourselves a good turn when we recommend all our readers to subscribe to that extraordinary journal (Please mention *The Gospel Witness!*). Baptists of Ontario and Quebec cannot well afford to be without it, for they will generally arrive at the truth of a matter by remembering that the facts in the case are in the direction exactly opposite to what *The Canadian Baptist* says.

This week our hard-pressed contemporary attempts to give a report of the Southern Convention. Its main object obviously is to discredit Norris, Ragland, and Shields. A sample of its reliability is found in its report of the protest meeting in the Big Tent: "One report of the meeting said the tent was filled with Convention delegates; another report said perhaps one-third were Convention delegates, and one brother who was at the tent told us personally that those who were there *seemed to him* (italics ours) to be mostly Houston people; he saw very few wearing Convention badges."—This is journalistic accuracy with a vengeance. The gentleman who was present very probably sat in a back seat, and it is rather difficult to see badges worn on the lapel of one's coat from the back.

It is true that the Machine press of the South has tried to cover the Machine's retreat by lauding "the leaders", and denouncing Norris and his associates, and the Baptist Bible Union. But what are the facts? At the 1924 Southern Convention a Committee on Statement of Faith was appointed. From then until the 1925 Convention the Southern Baptist press was occupied with the discussion of the subject of evolution and the Confession of Faith. At Memphis, Dr. E. Y. Mullins reported for his committee and refused to include "not by evolution" in his statement. Dr. C. P. Stealey stood alone in the Committee, and his amendment was voted down two to one. Dr. Mullins was supported by Dr. L. R. Scarborough and all the rest of the Committee except Dr. Stealey.

A short time before the Houston Convention, Dr. Mullins wrote Dr. Stealey saying the introduction of "the evolution matter" at Houston would be "about the most unwise and untimely thing that could be done." On his way to the Convention he said his self-respect would not permit him to recede from his position taken at Memphis.

Notwithstanding all this an anti-evolution resolution was passed at Houston. The Southern Convention said "not by evolution" at Houston, though Dr. Mullins had said it must not at Memphis, and for a year thereafter he had said it must not at Houston. *But it did!* Will somebody wake up *The Canadian Baptist* please! The Southern Convention at Houston said what for two years Drs. Mullins and Scarborough and others had said it must not say—viz., "Not by evolution."

Once more will our somewhat befuddled contemporary observe that in the meeting in the Big Tent on Thursday night a resolution was passed by a company of messengers to the Southern Convention in the following terms:

"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."

A lawyer may be employed to draw up a bill for parliament relating to matters in which he has no personal concern. We shall have to admit that we knew something of that resolution before it was passed in the Big Tent.

But what has that to do with the decision of the Convention? Our rather out-of-temper contemporary quotes Dr. Scarborough as saying that his Seminary adopted the Memphis statement along with the statement on evolution adopted at Houston. That is true, and it is also true that the proposal to adopt the anti-evolution statement was made and moved in the Trustee Board by a member of the Baptist Bible Union.

*The Canadian Baptist* follows the lead of some of the Southern papers in representing the Baptist Bible Union as loving strife, and proposing measures which can only engender more strife. On the contrary, we have consistently contended only for loyalty to the Baptist position.

*The Canadian Baptist* hails the passing of the resolution calling for subscription by the leaders to the anti-evolution resolution, as a pacific measure which made for unity. And such it was. This was the resolution:

"RESOLVED, that this Convention request all its institutions and boards, and their missionary representatives, to give like assurance to the Convention, and to our Baptist brotherhood in general, of a hearty and individual acceptance of the said action of the Convention to the end that the great cause of our present unrest and agitation over the evolution question be effectively and finally removed in the minds of the constituency of this Convention and all others concerned."

Will the half-awake *Canadian Baptist* please compare this resolution with that passed in the Big Tent? Will the higher critics who are so expert in identifying sources compare the two? No, the Editor of this paper had absolutely nothing to do with the last-quoted pacifying resolution. We were well on our way to Toronto when it was written. But a comparison of the two will show that they say precisely the same thing in different words. But of course such disturbers of the peace as Norris, Ragland, or Shields (Riley was not there) could not possibly have had anything to do with that which had so happy an issue?

The indisputable truth is that the resolution moved by Dr. S. E. Tull, which brought the great Southern Convention to an unanimous vote was written by Dr. George Ragland, of Lexington, Ky.

Thus *The Canadian Baptist* in its belated attempt to report the Southern Convention, in respect to the facts of the case is, as usual, about as wrong as wrong could be. The action of the Convention, so the *Canadian Baptist* thinks, completely vindicated the "leaders" by doing exactly the opposite to what the "leaders" demanded. Our anticipatory contemporary must be practising the art of reporting so as to be sufficiently skilful to report the next meeting of the Ontario and Quebec Convention as a complete vindication of McMaster University.

#### LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

Sunday morning there was a great service. The attendance at School was 1,095. The Pastor preached on, "Who is on the Lord's Side"? To the invitation to confess Christ ten or twelve responded. Then a call to renewed consecration and avowed separation from the world, and whole-hearted dedication to the service of Christ and the defense of the faith was given. In response to this they came first in twos and threes, then in scores, until every inch of space was taken and aisles were crowded, and tears were on nearly all faces, as at last the great congregation stood in solemn dedication to the cause of contending for the faith. It was a great hour. At night the church was filled again. Five were baptized and twenty-five received the hand of fellowship at the Communion Service following.

## MORE ABOUT THE EXCITING TORONTO ASSOCIATION MEETING.

Dr. J. H. Farmer Speaks.

Among those who spoke at the Toronto Association, Dr. Farmer was one of the most prominent. Had our space permitted, we should have been glad to print Dr. Farmer's speech in full. Among other things he quoted from *The Gospel Witness* of the 19th. of November, 1925, as follows:

"There is a conspiracy at McMaster University to defeat Baptist fundamentals at all points. The present Chancellor and the Deans in association with him are among the chief conspirators."

Dr. Farmer then said: "I deny that with all my soul. How dare that man say a thing like that about me? I deny it again. There is absolutely no foundation for that." Dr. Farmer has long depended upon his reputation for orthodoxy to protect him from criticism of his course; and in his speech he insists that he has consistently, on all occasions, endeavoured to act in the interests of the conservative Baptist position.

What are the facts of the case? Dr. Farmer surely will not attempt to deny that through all the long course of Professor Matthews' occupancy of the Chair of Old Testament in McMaster, he was his defender. Dr. Farmer never has admitted, and does not now admit, that Professor Matthews is a rank modernist. Even since Dr. Matthews published his book, "Old Testament Life and Literature," which, implicitly or explicitly, denies the supernatural throughout, Dr. Farmer has failed to make any acknowledgment of the unsoundness of Professor Matthews' position.

In his speech at the Association Dr. Farmer said, "I know, as Dr. Shields does not know, what brought about the appointment of Professor Curr; and I know that the then Chancellor and myself were the men who found that man and took the responsibility of recommending him and bringing him here." That is not denied. The Editor of *The Gospel Witness* was aware of that fact, and was informed by some in England of having received enquiries from Dr. Farmer. Dr. Farmer fails to state that the Senate and Board of Governors received a letter from the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* immediately after Professor Matthews resigned, respectfully warning the Board of what must inevitably happen if another man of the Matthews school was appointed; and we wrote that letter at the earnest solicitation of some who were within the University who were fearful that another man of the Matthews type would be appointed. Wiser counsels then prevailed in the Board of Governors than have obtained in the last three or four years.

The next time the modernist question came to the fore was at the Ottawa Convention in October, 1919. What was Dr. Farmer's attitude then? We challenge Dr. Farmer to deny that his attitude was one of abject surrender to the element in the Denomination which expressed itself in the modernistic editorials in *The Canadian Baptist*.

Once more: Dr. Farmer has accepted responsibility, jointly with the Chancellor, for Professor Marshall's appointment. In view of Professor Marshall's utterances, both in the pulpit and in the class-room, how dare Dr. Farmer say that he has not helped to introduce Modernism into the Ontario and Quebec Convention? Dr. Farmer is too intelligent not to know that Professor Marshall's theological position is utterly out of harmony with the theological standards of McMaster University as represented by the Trust Deed of that institution. There is a very large element in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec which does not, and will not, agree with Professor Marshall's position. If Dr. Farmer and those associated with him are determined to retain Professor Marshall and establish Marshallism in McMaster University, they will divide the Convention into two camps. We do not know on which side the majority will stand at present; but we are sure that when the membership of the churches of the Convention have been informed, the majority will be against Professor Marshall. Dean Farmer can no more stop the rising tide of opposition to the doctrines of Professor Marshall in this Convention than he can dam back Niagara Falls.

The Chancellor's defense of Professor Marshall is, of course, well known. Dean McLay has gone on record as defending the position of Professor Matthews.

If these three men have not been sponsoring Modernism, what have they been doing?

We come now to Dean Farmer's objection to the resolution passed at the protest meeting in Jarvis Street Church, which charged him with interfering with the churches in the matter of the settlement of pastors. Dean Farmer actually takes to himself the credit—or blame, as the case may be—of having had something to do with recommending the Editor of this paper to the Adelaide Street Church, London, more than twenty years ago. Here let us say that we have never objected to Professor Farmer's meddling with the churches on our own account: so far as we are concerned, he is perfectly welcome to do what he likes; we have never sought, nor desired, anybody's recommendation. We believe that if the Lord Himself does not put a man into the pastorate of a church he had better go and dig ditches, or something else, to earn a living, and conclude that he is not to preach. But so far as London is concerned, we absolutely deny that our going to London was the result of Dr. Farmer's recommendation. It is Dr. Farmer's practice to say, "Amen", to the inevitable; and then to felicitate himself that he brought it about! We were in Adelaide Street Church for nearly six years; we knew intimately all the members of the Committee, and all the facts of the case; and we know that Dr. Farmer's recommendation had absolutely nothing to do with our going to London; and that the attention of the church was called to the Editor of this paper by someone else.

Then Dr. Farmer said in his speech: "I rather approved, when the matter was mentioned to me, of his being called to Jarvis Street." What does this mean? Dr. Farmer was following his regular practice of saying, "Amen" to the inevitable, for he had absolutely nothing to do with the matter. He does not tell us to whom he expressed his approval, but certainly his approval was never officially sought. But Dr. Farmer stands out as an apostle of accuracy. At the risk of being called unfair, we must say that we are increasingly amazed at Dr. Farmer's confidence in appealing to his memory in respect to some matters.

We come now to Dr. Farmer's criticism of our editorial in *The Gospel Witness* of May 20th, 1926, entitled, "Is This True?" We print below a letter received from the Pulpit Committee of the Park Church, Brantford, and also a letter occurring in *The Canadian Baptist* of June 3rd from Dr. Farmer:

44 George Street, Brantford, May 27th, 1926.

To the Editor *The Gospel Witness*.

Dear Sir:

With reference to the editorial appearing in *The Gospel Witness* of May 20th, under the heading "Is This True?", I am instructed by the Pulpit Committee of the Park Baptist Church to inform you that it is not true. Dr. Farmer did not recommend Dr. A. L. Huddleston of Halifax, or any other minister, to Park Church. In justice to Dr. Farmer, the Pulpit Committee request that this letter be published.

Yours truly,

C. S. TAPSCOTT,

Chairman, Pulpit Committee, Park Baptist Church.

#### ANOTHER PERSONAL WORD.

Editor, *Canadian Baptist*:

May I ask you to insert the following letter which is self-explanatory: "Dear Dr. Farmer—

It is with the deepest regret that the members of the pulpit committee of our church have seen the heartless attack upon yourself in *The Gospel Witness* of May 20th, under the heading "Is This True?" We all know that what is written there concerning yourself is most emphatically untrue, and we deeply deplore the fact that your kind endeavour to help the church, when your help was asked, should meet such a malicious reward. It will be evident to you, as it is to us, that some ill-disposed person or persons are using your name for the sole purpose of embarrassing our church in its choice of a pastor, and of offering gratuitous insult to a Christian minister who has been invited to preach for it.

You did not recommend the minister to us. He was in fact highly commended to us by others. When, after these recommendations, you were asked concerning him and others, you replied with great frankness, suggesting that we ascertain his theological opinions from himself.

It is idle, of course, for us to say what indeed you must know, that we have the fullest confidence in your own Christian orthodoxy.

Yours sincerely (signed) C. S. Tapscott, Chairman, Pulpit Committee, Park Baptist Church, Brantford."

How Dr. Shields can indulge in this recklessness of statement I am at a loss to understand. It is apparently a part of a settled policy to discredit me in the eyes of the denomination, and is of a piece with the resolution passed at the Jarvis Street protest meeting, which I have already answered.

J. H. FARMER.

We ask our readers to go back and read the two letters printed above over again. What are the facts? Dr. Farmer was at Brantford; he talked over the matter of the vacant pastorate with the Pulpit Committee. The letter says he was endeavouring to help Park Church to get a pastor, but that his help had been "asked". The letter acknowledges that the name of Dr. Huddleston was mentioned to Dr. Farmer, and that Dr. Farmer suggested that they ascertain his theological opinions from himself. The information which reached us, and to which our editorial referred, came from a member of Park Church, Brantford. Dr. Farmer tells us that he did not recommend Dr. Huddleston; if he did not, he certainly said nothing in opposition. This, perhaps, would be considered by some a perfectly proper procedure. Nor should we be disposed to criticize Dr. Farmer for such a course, did we not know that he has not always been so neutral as we are asked to believe he was in this case.

We think it scarcely possible that Dr. Farmer could be ignorant of Dr. Huddleston's position. In *The Canadian Baptist* of this week there is a letter from Halifax, signed by E. L. Curry, eulogizing Dr. Huddleston and his preaching. We have no doubt that Dr. Huddleston is a very amiable gentleman; we have never heard a word from anybody to the contrary: it is with Dr. Huddleston's teaching we are concerned. We have before us the full text of the sermon under criticism printed in *The Maritime Baptist* of May 19th, and taken from the volume entitled, "Great Canadian Preaching". Unless it be the case of Professor Marshall's First Avenue sermon, we have never known a more glaring instance of the misuse of Scripture than this sermon affords. The text is, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him." There is nothing to suggest the application of the text to the individual believer growing in grace and in the knowledge of Christ, and ultimately finding his place among the spirits of just men made perfect and without fault before the throne of God. There is the usual vainglorious boast of the radio and other things which are making us so superior to those who have gone before. We quote a few paragraphs:

"I believe it will become more and more an intelligent religion. By that I mean that the permanent reality of the Christian religion will be re-expressed in the forms that will be in harmony with the intellectual development of our day. Not that men will throw overboard all that they fail to understand. Life will always transcend man's ability to know, as well in the realm of the physical as in the realm of the spiritual. But in so far as they may understand they will use to the benefit of the Christian life the scientific method of approach.

"This view is not shared by all. There are those who, in the supposed interests of the Christian religion, would muzzle science. They would expell from our Christian universities all professors who favor the theory of evolution. So far as it is possible they would force science to conform to the doctrines which they hold. For such a narrow and limited view of life, the light of history is the natural and sure cure. . . .

"Since that time the scientific method of approach has won many

conquests. Flushed with victories, it stands knocking at the doors of our churches. It calls for a reinterpretation of our Christian faith. This task we must seriously undertake in the interests of our young men and women, many of whom have attended in our schools and colleges. They are steeped in this method of study. They demand the right to investigate any topic and come to their own conclusions. It is not strange that they are not at home among the dogmas of a church that spurns their method of study; or that some of the doctrines that were born in the middle ages should conflict with their convictions that are the outcome of modern study.

"In any attempt to restate the doctrines of the Christian Faith in harmony with the advancing knowledge of our time we have nothing to fear. The spirit of Christianity can stand this test. It is not a static, but a living, vital force. One has but to read carefully such books as Clark's 'Sixty Years with the Bible,' or Fosdick's 'Modern Use of the Bible,' to be convinced that a reverent scholarship, employing scientific methods, does not rob us of our Bible, but by enabling us to understand and utilize its sacred treasures it restores this Book of books to thousands of our young men and women to whom it would be otherwise lost. May we not, then, conclude that the religion of the future will be better understood and more intelligently explained? Is this not in keeping with the promise of Jesus, 'Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free'?"

With Dr. Fosdick's book, "The Modern Use of the Bible", we are familiar. It is surely a fair inference when Dr. Huddleston so highly commends Dr. Fosdick's book that he approves of Dr. Fosdick's position. We do not know anything that so fairly represents Dr. Fosdick's general position as the book in question.

What would our readers think if they heard that Park Baptist Church, Brantford, had invited to their pulpit a man who, in a sermon had said that "One had but to read carefully such a book" as Tom Paine's "Age of Reason" "to be convinced that a reverent scholarship, employing scientific methods, does not rob us of our Bible, but by enabling us to understand and utilize its sacred treasures it restores this Book of books to thousands of our young men and women to whom it would otherwise be lost"? Dr. Huddleston did not say that of Tom Paine's "Age of Reason"; but he did say that of Dr. Fosdick's "Modern Use of the Bible." But we fear there is little to choose between Fosdick's book and Paine's "Age of Reason." We print below extracts from both these books in parallel columns. The pages are given in each instance so that the reader may get the books and verify them for himself.

### The Devil was Imported

PAINE

"Gentile." "Mythology."  
"The Book of Job does not belong to the Bible . . . It has been translated from another language into Hebrew, and the author of the book was a *Gentile*; that the character represented under the name of Satan . . . does not correspond to any Hebrew idea" (p. 112).

"The Christian *Mythologists* tell that their Satan made war against the Almighty, who defeated him, and confined him afterwards, not under a mountain, but in a pit. It is here easy to see that the first fable suggested the idea of the second; for the fable of Jupiter and the Giants was told many hundred years before that of Satan" (p. 13).

FOSDICK

"Persian." "Outgrown."  
"He [Satan] never appeared in the Old Testament until after *Persian* influence had begun its work, and then he was spoken of in three connections: Job. 1: 6-12; 2: 1-7; Zech. 3: 1, 2; 1 Chron. 21: 1" (p. 119).

"Unembarrassed by any intellectual difficulty . . . Satan and his satellites were supposed to work miracles continually" (p. 137).

"Having frankly recognized, therefore, the *outgrown* nature of the category [demonology] we need not be troubled by it when we read the Bible" (p. 121).



## What these Unbelievers Think About Miracles

PAINÉ  
Not "Credible." "Self-evident."  
"Fables."

"The advocates for the Bible have no claim to our belief of the Bible because that we believe things stated in other ancient writings; since that we believe the things stated in these writings no further than they are probable and *credible*, or because they are *self-evident*" (p. 77).

"Since appearances are so capable of deceiving, and things not real have a strong resemblance to things that are, nothing can be more inconsistent than to suppose that the Almighty would make use of means, such as are called miracles, that would subject the person who performed them to the suspicion of being an imposter, and the persons who related them to be suspected of lying, and the doctrine intended to be supported thereby to be suspected as a fabulous invention" (p. 62).

FOSDICK  
"Incredible." "Evidence."  
"Ghosts."

"Credence of ancient miracles in the Bible or-out of it is not properly a matter of faith; it is a matter of *evidence*" (p. 162).

"No kind of miracle is related in Scripture the counterpart of which cannot be found and found repeatedly in the records of other religions" (p. 151).

"This endeavor to believe in miracles and to make faith in them significant, when all the time we are thinking of miracles as indissolubly associated with ancient ignorance and as vanishing when intelligence arrives, is not Christian faith at all. . . . Biblical miracles will more and more become unreal *ghosts* lost in antiquity and, gradually becoming dimmer, will disappear in utter incredulity" (p. 157).

"Certainly I find some of the miracle-narratives of Scripture historically *incredible*. Others puzzle me. I am not sure about them" (p. 164).

"The whimsicalities and the irregularities of the age of miracle makes the narratives of miracle unreal to the modern man" (p. 155).

## The Morality of the Bible

PAINÉ  
"Shocking."

"There are matters in that book [the Bible] said to be done by the *express command* of God, that are . . . shocking to humanity, and to every idea we have of moral justice" (p. 74).

"It is because ye are sunk in the cruelty of superstition that ye listen to the horrid tales of the Bible, or hear them with callous indifference. The evidence I have produced . . . will free them from all those hard thoughts of the Almighty which priest-craft and the Bible had infused into their minds, and which stood in everlasting opposition to all their ideas of his moral justice and benevolence" (p. 100).

"Could we permit ourselves to suppose that the Almighty would distinguish any nation of people by the name of *his chosen people*, we must suppose that people to have been an example to all the rest of the world of the purest piety and humanity, and not such a nation . . . that had

FOSDICK

"Shock." "Shocked."

"Ethical conceptions of Jehovah in the Old Testament *shock* the modern conscience." "Deeds in the Old Testament which from our youth have *shocked* us by their barbarity" (pp. 5, 18).

"Start now with this beginning in the Old Testament a God from whom one would wish to stand far off in awe and fear, a God localized so that his spiritual Presence is not available in secret prayer, a God who does not even care for individuals save as they are temporarily members of the social group" (pp. 17, 18).

"The idea of God in the earliest writings of the Bible was such that few would desire to have intimate fellowship with him" (p. 15).

"Again read the ninth chapter of Esther, where the writer rejoices in a vengeful massacre; or the closing words of the 137th Psalm, which even Gounod's glorious music cannot redeem from brutality" (p. 14).

"The ruthless extermination of the

distinguished themselves above all others, on the face of the known earth, for barbarity and wickedness. If we will not stubbornly shut our eyes and steel our hearts, it is impossible not to see, in spite of all that long established superstition imposes upon the mind, that that flattering appellation of *his chosen people* is no other than a lie which the priests and leaders of the Jews had invented to cover the baseness of their own characters" (p. 102).

"Elisha . . . cursed the forty-two children, in the name of the Lord, whom the two she-bears came and devoured . . . There is just as much credit to be given to this story of Elisha's two she-bears as there is to that of the Dragon of Wantley" (p. 133).

### They Treat the Gospels Alike

PAINE

"Presuming." "Manufactured."

"The story of the angel announcing what the church calls the *immaculate conception* is not so much as mentioned in the books ascribed to Mark and John and is differently related in Matthew and Luke" (p. 147).

"Mark, in detailing the circumstances of the crucifixion, makes no mention of any earthquake, nor of the rocks rending, nor of the graves opening, nor of the dead men walking out" (p. 149).

"Matthew says there was darkness over all the land from the sixth hour unto the ninth hour; that the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, that there was an earthquake; that the rocks rent; that the graves opened; that the bodies of many of the saints that slept arose and came out of their graves after the resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many. Such is the account which this dashing writer of the book of Matthew gives, but in which he is not supported by the writers of the other books" (p. 149).

"The *presumption* is that the books called the Evangelists, and ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were not written by them but that they are impositions. . . . The silence of one book upon matters related in the others, and the disagreement that is to be found among them, implies that they are the production of some unconnected individuals, many years

Amalekites—"both man and woman, infant and suckling" (p. 14).

"That the sun and moon stood still at Joshua's command, or that God sent she-bears to eat up children who were rude to a prophet, or that saints long dead arose and appeared in Jerusalem when our Lord was\* crucified? . . . SUCH BALD LITERALISM" (p. 181).

FOSDICK

"Wondering." "Invented."

"Comparing Mark and Matthew, we find that in the earlier Gospel there are no birth stories while in Matthew Jesus is virgin-born and the star of Bethlehem miraculously leads the Magi to the manger" (pp. 146, 147).

"Mark recorded no other marvels at the crucifixion than the rending of the temple veil, but that Matthew added the resurrection of 'many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep; who entered into the holy city and appeared unto many' (p. 147).

In John "we face a heightening of the miraculous element. In particular, among miracles that the Synoptists do not mention, we find some of the most astonishing wonder works" (p. 148).

"Wherever we possess successive renditions of miracle workers' lives we find this tendency to give entirely explicable events a miraculous twist, to *heighten the effect of marvels* by astonishing additions, and to *invent miracles* of which the earlier records bear no trace. . . . Nor is it surprising that men should turn to the Bible, *wondering* if the same process is at work there" (pp. 144, 145).

"When we compare Mark and Luke we get the same impression of heightened effect, and added detail. In Luke, though not in Mark, are the stories of the virgin birth and the angelic apparition to the shepherds.

In Mark, where 'one of them that stood by drew his sword, and smote

after the things they pretend to relate, each of whom made his own legend; and not the writings of men living intimately together, as the men called apostles are supposed to have done; in fine, that they have been *manufactured*, as the books of the Old Testament have been" (p. 147).

### The Trinity

PAINÉ

"Absurd Stuff."

"According to the Christian trinitarian scheme, one part of God is represented by a dying man, and another part called the Holy Ghost, by a flying pigeon, it is impossible that belief can attach itself to such *wild conceits*. . . . Acts 2:3 says that it descended in a mighty rushing wind and in the shape of cloven tongues; perhaps it was cloven feet. Such *absurd stuff* is only fit for tales of witches and wizards." "The belief of a God is a belief distinct from all other things and ought not to be confounded with any. The notion of a trinity of gods has enfeebled the belief of one God" (pp. 181, 183).

the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear; no miracle is recorded. In Luke, however, the ear is restored—the only example in Scripture of the restoration of an amputated member. Luke is especially rich in *dramatic additions* to the narrative" (pp. 147, 148).

FOSDICK

"Arithmetical Absurdity."

"Consider the doctrine of the Trinity. Many are puzzled by it, and who can blame them? As preached in our Protestant churches the Trinity has often been little more than a mathematical formula about three being one and one three. Let it be said to the credit of the early fathers who introduced the church to the philosophical treatment of the Trinity, that they did not deal in such *arithmetical absurdity* as has characterized our modern pulpits in their identification of one person with three persons. If, then, any one is troubled about this formula of the Trinity, the *liberal prescription* is familiar: translate the formula back into the experience from which it came. The Trinity that matters is the Trinity of experience" (p. 188).

"*The 'divinity of Jesus'* as a formula . . . is not in the New Testament" (p. 187).

"Yet the God who was in Jesus is the same God who is in us. You cannot have one God and two kinds of divinity" (p. 272).

"They take a phrase such as 'Jesus is God,' not to be found either in the Scriptures or the creeds, and set it up as a standard of regularity in doctrine. But to suppose that the phrase 'Jesus is God' is an adequate expression of the Christian faith even in its creedal forms is to display *abysmal ignorance* of what the church has stood for. That statement alone is not orthodoxy; *it is heresy*" (p. 257).

### The Angels an Outworn Category

PAINÉ

"The book of Matthew goes on to say (chap. 28, ver. 2), 'And behold, there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.' But the other books say nothing about any earthquake, nor about the angel

FOSDICK

"When we turn to the New Testament, angels are the common phrasing of God's ministry to man. They form an innumerable host; they serve men by causing useful dreams, by strengthening the spirit in temptation, by opening prison doors, by giving peace and power in time of stress.

rolling back the stone, and sitting upon it; and, according to their accounts, there was no angel sitting there.

"Matthew says that the angel that was sitting upon the stone on the outside of the sepulchre told the two Marys that Christ was risen, and that the women went away quickly. Mark says that the women, upon seeing the stone rolled away, and wondering at it, went into the sepulchre, and that it was the angel that was sitting within on the right side that told them so."

"It is not uncommon to relate stories of personal *walking* after they are dead, and of ghosts and apparitions of such as have fallen by some violent or extraordinary means; and the people of that day were in the habit of believing such things, and of the *appearance of angels*, and also of devils" (pp. 152, 166).

### Jesus Christ was only a man like other men

PAINÉ

"Jesus Christ founded no new system. He called men to the practice of moral virtues, and the belief of one God. The great trait in his character is philanthropy" (p. 24).

"He was the son of God in like manner that every other person is—for the Creator is the Father of All" (p. 24).

"That such a person as Jesus Christ existed, and that he was crucified, which was the mode of execution at that day, are historical relations strictly within the limits of probability" (p. 12).

Not only do they surround the heavenly throne and attend the divine Majesty, but they appear corporeally on earth" (p. 124).

"This need of angels—The Master, for example, so far as we know never spoke of his experience in terms of their ministry" (p. 125).

"Gabriel has no real place in our explanation of events. We cannot think with Jude of Michael and the devil *fighting* over the possession of Moses' body. We do not practically ascribe helpful dreams or anything else to the beneficent activity of individual angels. Indeed, we must confess that as a category of scientific explanation actually applied to daily life we are not Biblical in our thinking about angels" (p. 125).

"We are not clear gainers by our shift of thought away from angelic categories. *We cannot go back, to be sure*" (p. 128).

FOSDICK

"Wherever you look at the underlying presuppositions of men's thinking about God to-day you find, not the old dualism against which the ancient church had so long and fierce a conflict, but a gladly recognized affinity between God and man. In *our* theology no longer are the divine and the human like oil and water that cannot mix; rather all the best in us is God in us. This makes faith in the divine Christ infinitely easier than it was under the old regime" (p. 266).

"Yet the God who was in Jesus is the same God who is in us. You cannot have one God and two kinds of divinity" (p. 272).

"The historic Jesus: he has given the world its loftiest ethical ideals" (p. 226).

"To be ourselves of such a spirit that God can work his victory in and through us; to persuade others to be transformed by the renewing of their minds; to strive for the better organization of society that the divine purpose may be furthered, not hindered, by our economic and political life; and then to await the event in his way and time—such have been *our* attitude and *our* preaching, and they have seemed to *us* Christian" (p. 110).

(It "*seems Christian*," but it is not!)

"Surely this is clear in the Gospels. The Master's body was normal like our own . . . it suffered and *it died like ours*" (p. 253).

### The Future Life

PAINÉ

"I trouble not myself about the manner of future existence. I content myself with believing, even to positive conviction, that the power that gave me an existence is able to continue it, in any form and manner he pleases, either with or without this body; and it appears probable to me that I shall continue to exist hereafter" (p. 67).

FOSDICK

"Personally I do not pretend to know the details of the future life. I am sufficiently sense-bound so that I do not easily imagine a completely disembodied existence. I wonder just what we mean by the persistence of personality" (p. 102).

"I believe in the persistence of personality through death, but I do not believe in the resurrection of the flesh".

### The Indispensable Item—the Acid Test!

PAINÉ

"I now come to the last scene—that of the ascension into heaven . . . It was necessary that this last scene should preclude the possibility of denial and dispute . . . at least it ought to have been as public as the crucifixion is reported to have been. . . . But the writer of Luke says that the ascension was from Bethany; that he (Christ) led them out as far as Bethany, and was parted from them there, and was carried up into heaven. So also was Mahomet; and, as to Moses, the apostle Jude says (ver. 9) that Michael and the devil disputed about his body. While we believe such fables as these, or either of them, we believe unworthy of the Almighty" (pp. 156, 157).

FOSDICK

"In such an easily picturable [flat] world the farewell of Jesus to the earth could be *imagined* literally as a physical levitation until he was received into heaven a definite distance above the ground, and his return could be literally *imagined* as a physical descent from the place where he had gone. The marvel is not that such a picture of the Master's going and return should arise in the setting of such a world-view; the *marvel* is that after that world-view has been so long outgrown, after we have known for centuries that this earth is a globe whirling through space with no ups or downs any longer meaningful in the old sense, so that if one man ascend from Melbourne and another from London they go in opposite directions, many folks should still retain the old picture of our Lord's ascent and *descent from the sky* and should regard that picture as a *test* of a standing or falling church and an indispensable item in the evangelical faith" (pp. 104, 105).

### The Bible and Science

PAINÉ

"It is, I believe, almost impossible to find in any story upon record, so many and such glaring absurdities, contradictions, and falsehoods as are in those books [the four Gospels] . . . The Bible and the Testament are impositions upon the world . . . all fabulous inventions, dishonorable to the wisdom and power of the Almighty" (p. 158).

"There was no moral ill in believing the earth was flat . . . any more than there was a moral virtue in believing that it was round like a globe . . . When a system of religion is made to grow out of a supposed system of

FOSDICK

"The strange ways of thinking that the Bible contains" (p. 35).

"The science of the Bible is not our science" (p. 53).

"We know now that every idea in the Bible started from primitive and childlike origins" (p. 11).

"In the Scriptures the flat earth is founded on an underlying sea; it is stationary; the heavens are like an upturned bowl or canopy above it; the circumference of this vault rests on pillars; the sun, moon, and stars move within this firmament of special purpose to illumine man; there is a sea above the sky, "the waters which

creation that is not true, and to unite itself therewith in a manner almost inseparable therefrom, the case assumes an entirely different ground. It is then that errors, not morally bad, become fraught with the same mischiefs as if they were. It is then that the truth, though otherwise indifferent itself, becomes an essential, by becoming the criterion that either confirms by corresponding evidence, or denies by contradictory evidence, the reality of the religion itself" (pp. 43, 44).

were above the heavens" and through the "windows of heaven" the rain comes down; within the earth is Sheol, where dwell the shadowy dead; this whole cosmic system is suspended over vacancy; and it all was made in six days, each with a morning and an evening, a short and measurable time before. This is the world-view of the Bible" (pp. 46, 47).

### Here they Sum up their Destructive Work

#### PAINÉ

"I know that this bold investigation will alarm many, but it would be paying too great compliment to their credulity to forbear it upon that account. The times and the subject demand it to be done. The suspicion that the theory of what is called the Christian church is fabulous is becoming very extensive in all countries" (p. 16).

"I have gone through the Bible, as a man would go through a wood with an axe on his shoulder, and fell trees. Here they lie; and the priests, if they can, may replant them. They may, perhaps, stick them in the ground, but they will never make them grow" (p. 141).

#### FOSDICK

"The position represented in this book will of course be *distasteful* to those bound by a theory of literal inerrancy in their approach to the Bible" (Preface).

"We have analyzed the Book into its constituent documents; we have catechised each fact that might bear witness to the truth about the ancient writings, their authors, times, and circumstances; we have let no sentiment of reverence, no time-sanctioned taboo deflect our search. We have gone at this investigation of our sacred books counting courage a duty and hesitant sentimentality a sin." That is "the *new approach* to the Bible" (p. 177).

(The above quotations are taken from a booklet entitled, "The Deadly Parallel", a comparison of Tom Paine's "Age of Reason" with Harry Emerson Fosdick's "Modern Use of the Bible", by George H. Dowkontt, M.D. Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, 1 East 13th Street, New York.)

#### Dr. Farmer and Dr. Fosdick.

We have always insisted that in his personal teaching Dr. Farmer was always true to the Baptist position; but this is what Dr. Farmer said at the Association: "I don't agree with Dr. Fosdick in all his views. I admire his spirit more than I admire the spirit of some men who are orthodox." What does Dr. Farmer mean by Dr. Fosdick's "spirit"? What does he know of Dr. Fosdick's spirit? Personally, we know nothing at all beyond Dr. Fosdick's written words; but we ask our readers to judge of Dr. Fosdick's spirit by the quotations we have given. If it is not the spirit of antichrist, what is it?

Dr. Fosdick speaks of the new approach to the Bible, and Dr. Huddleston speaks of "the scientific method of approach." The "approach" is at least as old as Paine, and, actually, is as old as the "approach" of the serpent who "approached" Eve with the question, "Yea, hath God said."

What do Canadian Baptists think of this glorification of Fosdick whose teachings so closely parallel those of Thomas Paine? Think of Paine's "Age of Reason" being recommended from a Baptist pulpit! What will Park Church Baptists think of it? Are we to have a "Park" Church case in Ontario and Quebec as in the Northern Convention?

Dr. Huddleston, in the sermon already quoted, says, "As the scientific interpretation of Christian experience will hold for us the student who otherwise would be lost to the cause of Christ," etc. What driveth these pseudo-intellectuals talk! Who is "the student"? Only a limited acquaintance with the past can lead men to talk such nonsense. Were there no "students" until

this generation was born? What of the scholars of the past who yielded their intellects to Christ, and rejoiced to call Him Lord? If a little learning is so new to these gentlemen that they must parade it as a child does his new toy, they must not think that others are without acquaintance with the profound and massive thinking of the past. Dr. Huddleston's sermon is not a deep-keeled ship for deep-sea sailing, but only a little flat-bottomed boat fit for paddling around the pond on the farm. "Student" indeed! If that sort of twaddle appeals to present-day "students", they would be paralyzed by a little honest thinking. The Lord God Almighty revealed in God the Son as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, must recast His gospel and change His eternal Word to insure that "the student" will not turn away from the church! This may be very flattering to "the student"; but it is most dishonouring to God. Notwithstanding Dr. Farmer's criticism of our "spirit," we will not change a word of what is written. It is time somebody poured upon such religious inanities, as Dr. Huddleston's sermon contains, the contempt it deserves. Its one saving quality is that it is too weak to do any thinking person any harm.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1. T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., Editor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada No. 3.

Lesson 1. THIRD QUARTER. July 4, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

### THE JUDGMENT.

LESSON TEXT: Matthew, chapter 25.

#### I. THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS.

1. The second advent is an event of supreme interest to the true believer. To such, Christ is not the Judge, but the Bridegroom; His coming, for the believer, heralds not an assize but a marriage, and is the consummation of all the believer's hopes. Hence it is, in very truth, the "blessed hope". 2. Who are represented by the ten virgins? "The Church in her aggregate and ideal unity, is the bride; the member of the Church, as individually called, are guests; in their separation from the world, and expectation of the Lord's coming, they are his virgins" (Lange). Sometimes a good deal of ingenuity is displayed in an attempt to identify the ten virgins; but we can afford to be dogmatic only on matters which are supported by the plain teaching of Scripture. 3. The wise virgins had lamps that could give light: they had both a profession and a possession. Christians must not be merely ornamental as lamps; but they must shine as lights in the world. 4. The foolish virgins had lamps, but no light. There is a kind of religion which has a form of godliness but denies the power thereof; there is an orthodoxy of words which is destitute of spiritual vitality. The genuine Christian is as a lamp filled with the oil of the Spirit, giving light to the world. 5. While the bridegroom tarried, both the wise and the foolish virgins slept. Thus the church, both the true and the false, because of the long tarrying of the Bridegroom, has allowed the truth of the Lord's coming to be neglected. This is also predicted in II Peter 3: 3 and 4. 6. While the Bridegroom's appearing will be a surprise to all, His near approach may be known before He actually comes. Are we living in the hour of the midnight cry? Is there not a more general and renewed emphasis upon the truth that Jesus is coming again? 7. The doctrine of the Lord's coming is a searching and revealing truth. It differentiates between the true and the false. It often appears that a man's attitude toward the second coming of Christ reveals his attitude toward the Person of Christ. 8. Grace can be obtained only from Headquarters (vs. 8 and 9). There can be no proxies in religion: grace must come from God only. 9. The Bridegroom's coming will be a time of revelation and separation. The difference between the wise and foolish virgins appeared most distinctly when the bridegroom came. So the coming of Christ (I Thess. 4: 13-18; II Thess. 1: 7-10; II Thess. 2: 1-12). 10. The Bridegroom's coming will be a time of final awards. For some, "the door was shut". We can find no

justification in Scripture for the theory that anybody's probation will be extended beyond the coming of Christ. 11. We are taught the necessity of being always on the watch (v. 13).

## II. THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.

1. The parable suggests a long lapse of time before the Lord's return. The men travelled "into a far country" (v. 14), and returned "after a long time" (v. 19). We believe there is no scriptural support for the theory that the apostolic writers expected Christ to come in their day. 2. Not all the Lord's servants are equally endowed (v. 15). 3. The two who received five and two talents, respectively, made the best use possible of their trust. As we are not all equally endowed, we cannot all be equally profitable, or equally successful; but we may all be equally faithful. 4. The servant who had but one talent was the one who did nothing. It is often the one-talented people who are guilty of neglect, but not always is this the case. What a story could be told of the faithfulness of the one-talented members of the church; who do their utmost with the gifts bestowed upon them! 5. The Lord's return will be a time of rewards. We believe we do not sufficiently emphasize the scriptural doctrine of rewards. Salvation is wholly of grace, eternal life is the gift of God; but over and above the gift of life, the Lord rewards His faithful servants (I Cor. chapter 3). 6. Our standing in the future will depend upon our use of the opportunities of time. This earthly pilgrimage represents our school-days. These faithful servants were rulers in the latter day because they had been diligent during their lord's absence. 7. "The joy of thy lord": What is it—the joy of the shepherd who finds his lost sheep? of the father who receives his lost son? One thing is certain: the felicity of heaven will depend upon our development of heavenly capacities. 8. Here, again, the Lord's return is represented as a time of revelation: the faithless servant was discovered, and his sin consisted in his failure to recognize his obligation to his lord. It was a sin of omission which brought upon him such terrible punishment.

## III. A PROPHECY OF THE FINAL JUDGMENT (vs. 31-46).

1. The judgment here described may be identified as the final judgment, by the fact that it is a judgment of all nations, it is all-inclusive; and also by the character of the sentence, "everlasting punishment", and "life eternal". 2. The judgment will begin with a separation. No witnesses are required, no possibility of mistaken identity is assumed: the judgment depends entirely upon the knowledge of the Judge Himself. How terrible is this truth, that we deal with a Judge from Whom no secrets are hid, and Whose omniscience will enable Him to mete out absolute justice! 3. The reward of the righteous is described: (a) they are blessed of God; (b) their reward is an inheritance and a kingdom; they are given possession of rulership by right of their inheritance; (c) their inheritance was prepared for them from the foundation of the world. What a prize that will be which was so anciently prepared! (v. 34). 4. The rule of judgment. Are men to be judged for their works, or for their faith? It is true that they are here judged for their works; for only their works are mentioned; but we must interpret this parable in the light of the general teaching of Scripture, as for example specifically, the epistle of James, where it insists that faith without works is dead; which is another way of saying that there is no true faith without works. Hence works are but an evidence of faith. This principle is confirmed by the fact that those who were thus rewarded, were unconscious of the merit ascribed to them. 5. The awful sentence pronounced upon the unjust, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (v. 41). If any should insist that this is figurative language, it must be answered that the reality cannot be less than the figure; and therefore a terrible fate awaits those who are thus sentenced. 6. The sentence upon the unjust would imply that a violation of the second commandment to love one's neighbour as himself, involves the violation of the first, to love God supremely; and therefore a transgression of the whole law (vs. 42-45). 7. It should be noted that the words describing the duration of the punishment of the wicked, and the life of the righteous, are the same: if one is eternal, the other must be.