

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. 6

TORONTO, JUNE 17th, 1926

Whole No. 216

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHY BAPTISTS SHOULD PREFER ROMAN CATHOLICISM TO MODERNISM.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, June 13th, 1926.
 (Stenographically Reported.)

"Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else."—Isaiah 45: 22.

Let us bow together in prayer: O Lord our God, we remember that it is written in Thy Word that Thou hast hidden the things of God from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes. Thou hast told us that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; therefore we come to Thee to seek Thy enlightenment, and to invoke the ministry of the Spirit of Truth that His promise may be fulfilled to us, and that He may guide us into all the truth. Make us all conscious of our limitations this evening as we come to Thy holy Word. It is Thy Word, and we can understand it only as Thou dost open our understanding that we may understand the Scriptures. We pray that Thou wilt speak this evening to every member of this congregation. It may be there are some here who have been turning a deaf ear to the voice of the Lord, some who have hardened their hearts against the gospel: we beseech Thee, O Lord, to speak in such a way this evening that even the dead may hear, that those who are dead in trespasses and sin may be quickened into newness of life. Take charge of this service, and bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; and make this hour one of blessing to us all. For Jesus' sake, Amen.

It has been announced that I would speak to you this evening on, Why Baptists should prefer Roman Catholicism to Modernism,—I want to add to that, and why the Way of Life as revealed in the gospel should be preferred before either.

What is Modernism? In its ultimate expression it is the substitution of the natural for the supernatural; but there are degrees of Modernism. Modernism is a disease whose symptoms are not always readily recognized. There are some physicians who are expert in the matter of diagnosis; there are some physicians who know what is the matter with the patient after the patient is

dead!—they diagnose disease by post-mortem examinations. There are some people who would disregard the symptoms of this deadly plague of Modernism and say, "Give it full opportunity to do its work, and then we will judge." But that may be too late.

I say in its ultimate expression, Modernism substitutes the natural for the supernatural. It begins with the application of that principle to the Scriptures: it denies the supernatural character of the Book—perhaps, in the beginning, not of the entire Book, just a part of it, here and there. Whenever you find a man who approaches this Book from that point of view you will discover that by and by he will deny the supernaturalism of the Book all the way through.

Thus, also, it approaches the virgin birth of Christ. If I can do away with the authority of the Bible, it is a very simple matter to do away with the doctrine of the virgin birth. Of course, if the record be true, then I shall have to accept that which it teaches; but if one may cut the Book to pieces as Jehudi did the roll with his pen-knife, and delete such parts as his massive intellect is pleased to reject, the things that do not appeal to his reason—if he may do that, then it is a very simple matter to do away with the virgin birth! All he needs to say is that Mark and John do not specially mention it, and that Paul does not deal with it, and since it is only recorded in Matthew and Luke, the birth story really has no proper place in the record!

The same attitude is assumed toward the miraculous works of Christ. If you want to know how Modernism can explain away the miraculous, go and hear Brother Brown Wednesday night. A certain professor gives a clue to the story of the miraculous deliverance of the demoniac of Gadara: there was a man in an asylum in England, who was under the delusion that he had a glass arm. The doctors tried every means to deliver him from that delusion; but no argument could persuade him that his arm was not made of glass. So one day the doctor went out for a walk with him, and he carried under his coat, or concealed somewhere, a big glass bottle, and as they were walking along the doctor knocked him on the arm and dropped the glass bottle. The mono-maniac said, "What is that?" "Why," said the doctor, "that is your glass arm." "Why, yes," he said, "it is all right, is it not?"—and so he became perfectly sane from that moment; he got rid of that one delusion. So the demoniac of Gadara was under the delusion that he was possessed with a legion of devils, and Christ drove the devils down the steep place into the sea, and said to the demoniac, "There they go"—and he thought the devils had left him and entered into the swine. So he was delivered from that moment "That," said our professor, "is not an explanation, necessarily; but perhaps it may be a clue."

And so all the way through. The resurrection of Christ is explained away. Of course, that reduces the religion of Christ to the natural plane; and it leaves it to men to determine the soul's relationship to God; that salvation is obtained by human effort, and is no longer the gift of divine grace. The authority of the Bible being denied, a man finds that authority within himself, in his religious consciousness; and so he becomes a law unto himself, and God is elbowed out of his life; the voice of God is no longer heard.

Now Roman Catholicism is not an anti-supernatural religion: Roman Catholicism does not deny the divine inspiration of the Bible, it recognizes that the Bible is the Word of God; it does not deny the Deity of Christ, it accepts at their face value the records of His virgin birth,—indeed, it exalts Mary to a position of equality with God, and sets her forth as an object of worship; Roman Catholicism does not deny the fact of human sin, it does not teach that in the moral realm sin is a vestige of a lower stage of development: it recognizes sin as sin, and it recognizes and acknowledges its deadly character. Roman Catholicism does not deny the atoning work of our Lord, it makes much of the cross, and of His death upon the cross; it does not deny the resurrection of Christ; nor the necessity of our having dealings with God somehow,—indeed Roman Catholicism accepts the great verities of evangelical faith: the Deity of Christ, the virgin birth, His blood atonement, His miraculous ministry. His literal bodily resurrection, His ascension to the right hand of God the Father, the fact of sin, the necessity of repentance—all that, Roman Catholicism admits. And on that ground it is to be preferred before Modernism.

"Well", you say, "let's be Roman Catholics; then we shall really have some religious authority in our lives!" But remember that while Roman Catholicism acknowledges the divine inspiration of this Book, it says you cannot interpret it, the church must interpret it for you; and therefore it stands between you and the Word of God; the Bible is authoritative only as it is interpreted by an authoritative and infallible church. Roman Catholicism believes in the Deity of Christ; but between Christ and the sinner it puts Mary and the saints, and you can get at Christ only through the intercession of the Virgin Mary and the saints. It recognizes the value of the atoning work of Christ; but it stands between Christ and the sinner as a middle-man, and makes merchandise of every element of gospel truth. In other words, it takes the free gift of God and sells it at a price; its whole sacramentarian system stands between the divine Saviour and the poor bankrupt sinner, and it says that there is salvation in Him—but you can get it only through the church and her sacraments as administered by her priests.

Notwithstanding, Roman Catholicism has a God, and a divine Saviour; and I can well believe that by His infinite mercy, even amid the darkness and superstition of Rome, there are some people who get through it all to God. But Modernism, when it is finished, has no God, it has no divine Saviour, it has no atonement, it has no mercy-seat. Neither of these sets forth the way of life as revealed in the Bible. Here it is: "Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else."

I.

THE FUNCTION OF RELIGION IS TO SAVE MEN; to bring men to God. Do you know that you need to be saved, my brother? Religion, with some people, is a kind of hobby. A certain man, a Welsh lawyer, said to me some years ago, speaking about another, "What is your opinion of Dr. So-and-So?" I said, "I think he is a very good man, a man of God, so far as I know." He replied, "I think very likely he is; but you know, some people collect postage stamps as a hobby, and some people collect butterflies, and it always strikes me that Dr. So-and-So makes Bible-study his hobby." Perhaps it is not a bad hobby, but religion is something more than a hobby, something more than a means of entertainment for Sunday. With some, religion is merely a means of self-culture—There is a great deal of good in man; and I need something to develop it, that I may grow up into a completer likeness to my ideal, the Man Christ Jesus! So some say. No; religion is vastly more than that, my friends: the function of religion is to save men.

But now I want to ask you very plainly and pointedly, Are you saved? "Well but, sir, I am a member of the church"—that is not the point, are you saved? "Well, I am a religious professor, sir. I have just told you I am a member of the church"—quite so, and there are tens of thousands of people who profess religion, and who are members of the church, but who are not saved. Are you saved? Do you know that you have passed from death unto life? That is the great question. "Well, but that is not my view of religion. I belong to the church, and I think religion affords me an avenue for the expression of my social interests. I believe everyone ought to join the church, and do what they can for the uplift of the community."

I remember during the war I was going from Liverpool to London, and I got into conversation with a gentleman in the compartment in which I was travelling, and I asked him very pointedly if he were saved. "Oh", he said, "I joined the church. I was not a religious man; but as soon as the war broke out I felt it was the duty of every loyal British citizen to join the church. That was my first contribution toward winning the war—I joined the church"! I pressed upon him the question, telling him that it was very admirable that he should be interested in the war, and in the beating back of the thing against which we were fighting; but I said, "What about your personal relationship to God? Are you saved?" He knew nothing at all about that, he had joined the church as a national duty! And there are a great many people in Toronto who join the church as a duty to the community, as an expression of social interest; they say, "I believe in public welfare, I joined the church."

But that is not the function of religion, my friends: religion is designed to save you as an individual. What sort of a religion have you? Is it a personal

matter? Has it saved you? "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." Do you know anything about the sovereign power of God in your personal life? "Well, but why do I need to be saved?" You need to be saved from your sin, that is the first thing. "My sin!" Yes, your sin. "How dare you tell me I am a sinner!" I do not tell you—God says so, and He makes no mistake. And every man knows that he has within him that something—he may not call it sin—but that something that has defeated him at every turn, and is dragging him down to the lowest levels of life. You can be saved from all your sin, from the sin within and the sin without. And you need to be saved from the guilt of sin, and from the power of sin; and that is what religion is for. "Do you mean to say, sir, that religion is designed to come to me as an individual, to do something for me individually, and to bring into my life a power that I have not got of myself?" That is exactly what it is for. God bids you look to Him and be saved.

II.

In the next place, RELIGION IS DESIGNED TO BRING MEN TO GOD. Much that is called Christianity to-day is a kind of humanitarianism, there is no God in it. I have in my mind now, it comes to me at the moment, a certain lady whom I met some years ago, who was a great church worker—she was a Presbyterian—and she began to talk to me about her church. It was a wonderful church! And after a while she spoke about her pastor—and I should judge he was an extraordinary man! Then she told me about her religious activities—and I should judge she was very active in the church to which she belonged. I listened to it all, and then I said, "Excuse me, Mrs. So-and-So, but are you a Christian?" "A Christian", she said, "I am a member of the church!" "But", I said, "Do you know Christ? Do you know Him personally. Have you sat at His feet and heard His Word? Has He washed your sin away? Do you hear from Him every day? Do you walk with Him, and of His fulness receive 'and grace for grace'?" She said, "I do not quite understand you." I said, "No, I rather think you do not." She was very religious, she was a church member, an active church member, a loyal church member—she was full of religion, but she had no Christ; the divine Saviour was to her an utter stranger, living far, far away. But our text says, "Look unto me—unto me—unto me—not to the church—look unto me, come back to God." We need to remember that we are under some obligation to God. The first and great commandment is to love the Lord our God; the second is to love our neighbour as ourselves. But the second is always second, not in order merely, but in importance: the one is the fruit, the other is the root; and not until we give God His proper place in our lives are we really saved.

That is a very simple word, and I want to make it as simple as A.B.C., as I come to you this evening to ask you not only, Are you saved? but, have you met with God? Have you experienced the power of God? Have you become the subjects of the grace of God? That is the great question.

III.

Then another thing: TRUE RELIGION IS FOR EVERYBODY, FOR ALL CLASSES OF PEOPLE: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." I never can understand where our critical friends get the notion that the God of the Old Testament is represented as a tribal God, shut up to Israel: as I read the Bible, He is the God of the ends of the earth—from Genesis to Malachi, just as truly as from Matthew to Revelation. All the ends of the earth need the salvation of God. This religion of Christ is not only for young men in college, as some people seem to imagine: the religion of Christ is for the common people, for everyone. Do you not need Him? It was a great joy to me to baptize our Chinese brother this evening. The religion of Christ is for all the millions of China, and of India, and of Africa, and of all the Islands of the sea. Ours is the universal religion, for all classes of people. It is for you, then,—“all the ends of the earth”, and all the ends of the city too, no matter who you are, or where you live.

IV.

That brings me to the word which I wish specially to emphasize, "for I am God, and there is none else". I used to read Spurgeon a great deal, and do still. Spurgeon used to glory in the gospel of grace, in a salvation that was all of grace,

and of which God was the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end—God doing it all. Salvation is the gift of His sovereign grace. I remember Spurgeon used to denounce the doctrines of Arminianism; he insisted that a doctrine of works was not the gospel at all, that there was not an infinitesimal element of human merit entering into our acceptance with God; that we are saved wholly and absolutely on the ground of what Christ has done for us.

Now look at the argument. Why look to God, my brother? For the simple and sufficient reason that He is God. I read two articles on religion in a certain popular paper published in this city last night, one by a minister of the United Church, and the other by an ex-Methodist minister, now a member of Parliament. The minister of the United Church remarks on the change of attitude in the religious realm, that the old evangelical conceptions have gone utterly. He remarks on the fact that in these articles which he has been writing, views have been set forth which were diametrically opposed to everything that evangelicals believe. And yet, he said, it has called forth no protest, no objection. He cites it as an evidence of the change of mind religiously. I think he is right—there is a change of mind religiously. But the other writer practically eliminates God, he is done with a personal God altogether. These two articles were crammed full of infidelity, yet they were published in a weekly paper that is said to have the largest circulation of any paper in Canada. Why? We have forgotten this note, that salvation is of God and of God alone. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else."

"Why should we look to God for salvation?" Because it is against God we have sinned. David had committed a great sin; he had sinned against his neighbour, he had sinned against society; but when God spoke to him, and he saw his sin in its true light, he said, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." And your sin, and my sin, no matter what its character—the sin of dishonesty, the sin of untruthfulness, whatever it may be—ultimately it is a sin against God. And it is God Who is going to deal with your sin and mine, it is with God we must all deal ultimately; and therefore if we would be saved we must look unto Him Who is to be our Judge, "For I am God, and there is none else."

We are to look to Him because He made us, and He only can re-make us. No one but God can make us over again into His image and likeness, no one but God can give us a new heart and a regenerated mind, a new nature that is responsive to God—no church can do it, no priest can do it, no educational system can do it, no passionate devotion even to the highest ideals can possibly effect this result: God Himself must save, or we cannot be saved at all. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God." No one else has authority to remit our sin: it is against God we have sinned, and only God can forgive. Shall we not push past all these secondary matters this evening, and get to God Himself? Are there not some here this evening who need the help of God, who need the pardoning grace of God, who need the power of God? He bids you receive it all: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God."

How can we be saved? What does it mean to be saved? I said that the function of religion is to save men—as the business of the preacher surely is to tell people how to be saved,—what else is he for? How can I explain to you what it means to look unto God and be saved? If He gave His Son to die for you and me, to pay our debts, to cancel our obligations, to make it possible for Him to "be just, and yet the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus", if He has given His Spirit that He may touch us and make us new creatures by His divine power, how am I to receive the benefits of the death of Christ? Is that not the question? Roman Catholicism says, "Come to the church—come to the church and we will give it to you; obey the church, and you will get salvation: be baptized, come to the sacrament of the mass, do penance; and through all the sacraments of the church you will get salvation, you will be saved by and by—labourously do your duty, and by and by you will be saved."

That is not what the text says: it says, "Look unto me"—not to the church, not to the priest, not to the pope, not to the preacher; do not look to anyone but only unto Me: "Look unto me". I wish I could so speak in a minute or two

that you would forget where you are, that you would forget the preacher, that you would forget everything except that you are a poor sinner to whom God is speaking, and that with the eyes of your heart you are just looking to "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Then you would be saved. There is no reason why you should not be saved sitting right where you are. "Look unto me, and be ye saved."

That is the text that was used of God to bring Spurgeon to the feet of Christ, and he used to preach from that text often. I remember to have read something like this in one of his sermons—he said to his students that sometimes he rammed himself into the gun and fired himself off—I remember once he told of how a poor preacher went one rainy Sunday morning to preach in a certain little church. There was a young man sitting down under the gallery, and he said, "Young man, you look sorrowful." Then he said, "Just look—look." Spurgeon said the preacher did not know anything but to shout his text. (I wish some preachers did not know any more than that nowadays.) But this man said, "Look", and by the blessing of God Spurgeon looked, and was saved. And Spurgeon said, "Look—look—look—only four letters and two of them alike." How simple God has made it, just to look!

Who has not read that old story from the Old Testament, that bit of history from the Old Testament about the fiery serpent? You remember how the people were dying by hundreds, and they said to Moses, "Pray unto the Lord for us." And Moses prayed for the people, and the Lord said, "Make a serpent of brass, a likeness of the thing that is destroying them, and put it on a pole, put it in the midst of the camp, and tell the people to look; and everyone who looks shall live." And Moses did as he was told. You can imagine some man writhing in agony there because the poison of the fiery serpent has run all through his system—possibly he cannot stand up or turn his head—and someone comes to him and tells him, "There is life, my brother, in a look; just look at the serpent." But he says, "What is the use of telling me to look? Cannot you bring me some medicine, cannot you bring me a poultice, cannot you do something for me? Cannot you see that I am on fire, the poison is running through all my veins, and I shall be dead in a short time? What is the use of telling me to look—what good can that do!" "Why", that man would have to say, "I do not know. I only know that God says the moment you get your eyes on that brazen serpent you shall live." Will you do what God tells you? Will you so surrender your intellect to God as to do exactly what He says and trust to God to do what He has promised to do? Will you do that? I can imagine that poor fellow—he perhaps could not turn his head; it may be he could just turn his eyes until he got sight of the serpent—and instantly he was made whole. Did that look save him? The look signified that he surrendered himself absolutely to God, and that He believed in God, and depended upon God to work the miracle. That is all. And the moment he ceased his own thinking, and his own planning, and his own imagining, and just let God have His way, he was a whole man.

What is the application? Just the simple old story that Jesus was lifted up on the cross. He used the figure Himself, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." Will not you Christians pray that someone here may see? I know it is the A.B.C. of the gospel, but that is what we need. Look to Christ—away from yourself, away from your circumstances, away from all your weaknesses, from all your temptations, from your church, from the wretched record of failure of the past; look away from everything to Christ, fix your soul's eyes upon Christ, abandon yourself to Christ, yield your intellect to Christ, yield your heart to Christ, yield all there is of you to Christ—look, man, look! Look! Just look, that is all!

What will happen the moment you do that? You have God's Word for it, that all the powers of Deity are at the command of faith, and the God Who made you will make you over again: "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new", and you shall be a new creature in Christ. "Oh", you say, "is that all I have got to do, sir, just look?" Yes, look with your eyes shut, look with the eyes of your heart, rest upon His promise that "whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life".

Editorial.

DR. J. W. HOYT LEADS BAPTISTS TO VICTORY IN CHICAGO CONVENTION.

In our issue of April 22nd we expressed surprise to find the names of Drs. John Roach Straton of New York, and J. W. Hoyt of Chicago, in the list of those who were alleged to have supported the resolution on the open membership question adopted at the Chicago Conference on April 13th. In our issue of April 29th, among other things, we said, "We know Dr. Straton too well to believe that he would ever compromise on matters of principle. The same is true of Dr. J. W. Hoyt. We have never known two truer men." In our issue of May 6th we published an article by Dr. Straton entitled, "Have the Fundamentalists been Tricked Again?" together with a covering letter which had been sent to *The Baptist* of Chicago, in which Dr. Straton speaks of the "unfair and even dishonest treatment by *The Baptist* of those from whom it differs". We learned from Dr. Straton in Washington that *The Baptist* report of the Chicago Conference involved a gross misrepresentation. He also informed us that the resolution was brought in when men had on their overcoats and were wearied of the day's discussion. At Washington Dr. Straton made one of the most effective of all the speeches delivered in opposition to Dr. Brougher's resolution.

And now we learn that under the leadership of Dr. J. W. Hoyt, the Chicago Association has also repudiated the action of the Northern Convention. The story of the action of the Chicago Association is one of thrilling interest, and sets an example which we hope will be followed throughout the continent. Following is the story:

DR. HOYT'S RESOLUTION.

At the meeting of the Chicago Association held May 12th, the following resolution was introduced by Dr. J. W. Hoyt, Pastor of the Belden Ave. Baptist Church:

Whereas there is a strong agitation now going on in our Northern Baptist Convention regarding inclusive or open membership; and

Whereas some of our churches have already adopted or are practising the inclusive or open membership policy; and

Whereas this is one of the great questions that is to be discussed at our Northern Convention to be held at Washington, D.C., May 25-30, 1926; and

Whereas this inclusive membership policy if continued to be practised will destroy our Baptist fellowship and ultimately will destroy our Denomination;

Therefore, be it resolved, that we the delegates representing the churches of the Chicago Association now assembled in Englewood Baptist Church, May 12, 1926, do reaffirm our historic belief; (1) in the New Testament as the sole guide of faith and practice; (2) in immersion as the scriptural mode of Baptism; (3) in immersion as pre-requisite to membership in a Baptist church.

Be it also resolved that a committee of five (5) be now appointed to confer with the churches in the Association who have adopted or are now practising this policy of receiving members into their churches who have not been immersed upon a confession of faith in Christ, to request these churches to reconsider the advisability of continuing this policy of inclusive membership in view of the fact that it will destroy the Baptist fellowship and ultimately destroy the Baptist Denomination. This committee to report at our next Associational gathering.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to *The Baptist*, the *Watchman Examiner*, and to all Baptist churches now composing this Association.

We do not know whether the matter was discussed at the Association Meeting in May, the matter was considered, but action was deferred until

June 14th, when a special meeting of the Association was to be called for its consideration.

This meeting was held, as arranged, in the Immanuel Baptist Church, Chicago, Monday evening, June 14th, at 8.00 o'clock. There was a large attendance, the total number of delegates voting being three hundred and sixty. In moving his resolution Dr. Hoyt remarked on the large attendance, and said, "I have been attending this Association for a long time; this is the first time the delegates have been asked to walk up to the front to say they have been duly appointed and able to vote. Usually we are glad to have the crowd come whether they vote or not. If the programme committee this year will take a friendly suggestion, in the course of two or three years we shall all be wearing badges."

This seems to be the rule everywhere. For many years in our Ontario and Quebec Convention we were accustomed to hearing the Secretary of the Convention pleading with delegates to bring in their railway certificates, because it was feared there would not be enough present to meet the requirements of the railway for special return rates. We have heard nothing of this in our Ontario and Quebec Convention for the last six or seven years, and it is becoming an increasingly difficult matter to find a building large enough to hold the people who desire to hear these most interesting discussions. The same has been true of both the Southern and Northern Conventions. Some people seem to think that religious discussions injure the cause of Christ. We believe nothing could be farther from the truth. From the Acts of the Apostles we learn that Christianity made its amazing advances during the apostolic period by means of discussion and disputation. And there is hope for any religious body while it maintains sufficient vitality to discuss these vital problems.

Continuing, Dr. Hoyt said:

"I am glad to have this opportunity of presenting this resolution to-night, first because of the fact that it has something to do with bringing together a large number of Baptist people from the various Associations to discuss a matter which is of vital importance to our Baptist churches; and secondly, because I believe that this resolution fairly defines the position we ought to take at this particular time; and thirdly, because I am not afraid to let my own church know where I stand on this matter, nor am I afraid to let the Baptists of Chicago know where I stand, and where I belong in relation to the subject we have under discussion. I am somewhat surprised that a resolution such as we are now considering should even be mentioned in a Baptist Association. It shocks me beyond measure to reflect that the time has come when it should be necessary in a Baptist Association to discuss that which hitherto Baptists have always taken for granted. At the Convention in Washington this year we spent nearly three hours talking on this very question, a question which a few years ago would not be considered a debatable matter in any Baptist assembly. I draw your attention to this fact to-night to let you know how far we have drifted from our moorings and from our historic Baptist position. I want to let you know how far we have gone, how far we have been led, and the direction in which we are in danger of being led in the future. I would have you see also what this resolution involves, in order that you may observe it is not a revolutionary thing: we are not proposing to introduce any sort of revolutionary movement into this Baptist Association. This resolution involves simply a reaffirmation of our faith: it represents what we have always stood for, and what in my opinion, we should stand for at this time."

Dr. Hoyt's resolution was seconded by the Rev. Wilfred Noble, Pastor of Logan Square Baptist Church. Mr. Noble said in part:

"I do not think there is anyone here to-night who would question that the New Testament teaches that only believers are to be baptized, and that baptism is always, in the New Testament, immersion. I attended Baptist schools before I became pastor of a Baptist church, and I learned in those Baptist institutions that practically all the great scholars of the world have agreed with us on this point, namely, that immersion

was the apostolic form of baptism; and that it was the only form of baptism practised in the early church. Now this resolution says that we will recognize as Baptist churches, churches that practise only immersion; but at the same time it grants the privilege to that particular church of receiving into its fellowship people who have not been immersed. Now I say to you to-night that that weakens the whole Baptist position. If we really believe in immersion let us stand for immersion. Personally, I do not care what the secular newspapers have to say. This is a matter of our loyalty to Jesus Christ. I have attended every meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention for nine years. Over and over again I have heard it said that the Northern Baptist Convention is not the High Court of our Baptist churches: that the Northern Baptist Convention cannot settle such a question as this, that this matter must be referred back to the Associations, and that the Associations themselves must deal with the question. Now we are not legislating for any Baptist church, we are not telling any Baptist church what it must do; but I think the time has come when Baptists should let the world know exactly what they believe, whatever sacrifice it may involve."

Dr. M. P. Boynton, Pastor of the Woodlawn Baptist Church, proposed an amendment as follows:

"The Chicago Baptist Association recognizes its constituency as consisting solely of those Baptist churches in which the immersion of believers is recognized and practised as the only Scriptural baptism; and the Association hereby declares that only immersed members will be recognized as delegates to the Association."

The amendment was the resolution adopted by the Northern Baptist Convention, the only change being in the substitution of the word "Association" for the word "Convention". Dr. Boynton's amendment was seconded by Dr. Charles W. Gilkey, Pastor of the Hyde Park Baptist Church. Dr. Boynton in supporting the amendment spoke in part as follows:

"This has been a very delightful address to which we have listened, to which I think we all agree down to the committee. I have discovered that in Baptist fellowship when we talk the thing through we find that in the end we agree with ninety-five percent, and the difference is on the five percent."

Dr. Boynton proceeded then to give the Baptist schools and the Baptist Foreign Mission Board what was practically a clean bill of health. Coming to the question in hand he said:

"When in Seattle we had a great disturbance as to open membership, and in Washington we discovered by a poll of the Denomination that there were about thirty-six churches out of ten thousand seven hundred, speaking in round numbers, which practised anything like open membership. Now how many churches do you think we have in the Chicago Association that practise open membership? Just one; a suburban church out of the city in a country community, adapting itself to the exigencies of its surroundings. That is all there is in this Association that practises open membership. . . . We ought to get the facts before we fight, not get the facts in the fight, and then discover that the facts do not justify the fight. So I bring a resolution adapted to this Association, that was adopted by the Washington Convention, after the splendid debate which represented one of the finest debates we have ever had on the platform of the Northern Convention.

"This is a stroke of genius in Baptist polity, because it does not interfere with the independence of the local church. This resolution insists that the churches which have membership here shall recognize and practise nothing but the immersion of believers. If they recognize anything else as Baptists, if they practise anything else as Baptists other than immersion, they cut themselves off from this Association. Now here is a little church out in the country practising what this resolution of Dr. Hoyt calls open or inclusive membership. Under this resolution we

would not cut that little church off, because it does not recognize or practise anything else than believers' baptism; but it does receive into full voting membership people who have not been immersed, but they do not recognize or practise anything else than immersion as baptism."

Dr. Boynton's amendment was seconded by Dr. Gilkey, but the reporter said it was nothing more than a flow of words, and made no contribution whatever to the debate.

Other speakers participated in the debate. When the vote on Dr. Boynton's amendment was taken, the yeas numbered one hundred and forty-five, and the nays, two hundred and fifteen. Thus Dr. Hoyt's resolution carried by a majority of seventy. And all this happened in the city of Chicago under the shadow of Chicago University where that institution's influence may be supposed to be the strongest! This took place in the city in which the Northern Baptist Convention will meet next year!

Some mention should be made here of the vote by churches. The churches were polled, so that there should be no mistake. From the Woodlawn Church, of which Dr. Boynton is pastor, twelve delegates were present: five voted for Dr. Boynton's amendment, and seven voted against it; so that apparently Dr. Boynton's compromising position does not carry even his own church. At the Northern Convention Dr. H. W. Virgin, Pastor of the North Shore Baptist Church, Chicago, spoke in support of Dr. Brougher's compromise, and we presume voted in the same way. At the Chicago Association, twelve delegates were present from Dr. Virgin's church: three voted for Dr. Boynton's amendment,—that is, for the same resolution which Dr. Virgin supported at Washington, while nine of the twelve voted against the amendment and for Dr. Hoyt's resolution. If the delegates represented Dr. Virgin's church, it would appear that he has seventy-five per cent. of his members in opposition to the position he took at Washington; while Dr. Boynton, by the same reckoning, had a fraction less than forty-two per cent. of his membership with him, and a fraction over fifty-eight per cent. opposed. The delegates from a number of churches voted unanimously in support of Dr. Hoyt's resolution, among them: Belden Avenue, Albany Park, Covenant Church, Bethany, Messiah, Clyde, Marquette Church, First Baptist Church, Wheaton, and South Chicago Baptist Church.

The absence of Dr. Virgin, of the North Shore Church; and of Dr. Taft, President of the Northern Theological Seminary, was freely commented upon. Of course, it is always possible that busy men may be kept away from a meeting by other duties, but when a question which has agitated the whole constituency of the Northern Baptist Convention, and which had been the subject of a resolution at the Convention itself, was under discussion in the Chicago Association, it would be reasonable to expect that men occupying positions like Drs. Virgin and Taft, if they were unable to be present would have sent some explanation of their absence. Dr. Taft, some time before the Convention, read a perfectly orthodox paper on this very question; but at the Washington Convention he did not vote for Dr. Riley's resolution, although it was in accord with the position he had publicly taken.

It was observed that several pastors who voted in support of the Brougher resolution at Washington, voted against the same resolution in the Chicago Association. Had he been present, as Dr. Boynton was, Dr. Virgin would have found seventy-five per cent. of his own delegates voting against him on the issue which he had supported in his speech at Washington.

Thus the decision of the Chicago Association is a mighty argument for carrying all these matters back to the individual church. On this point we shall have more to say later.

AFRAID OF THE SECULAR PRESS.

Some of the speakers supporting Dr. Boynton's amendment expressed great concern as to what the secular newspapers might say, while the supporters of Dr. Hoyt's resolution vociferously declared that they did not care what the secular press said. Dr. Boynton's supporters criticised the reports in the public press at Washington and Seattle, particularly the head-lines. Here are some of the head-lines copied from the Washington papers:

"Fundamentalists Defeated in Vote on Immersion."

"Leader of 'Middle' Delegates may be Backed by Modernists for Presidency."

"Conciliation Body Wins in First Test in Baptist Parley. Fundamentalist resolution demanding immersion is turned down. Open Membership Churches are kept in by result."

"Dr. J. W. Brougher Heads Convention of Baptist Church. Modernists and Middle-of-Roaders Group Win Over Fundamentalists."

We have had some opportunity to observe newspaper reports, and we thought the Washington reports were particularly fair: they were certainly right in saying that Dr. Brougher was elected by modernists and middle-of-the roaders! They were certainly correct in representing the adoption of the Brougher resolution as the adoption of the open-membership, or inclusive, policy of the Park Avenue Church! But in any event, we wonder why ministers should be afraid to let their own churches, and the world generally, know exactly what they believe?

OUT OF 10,700 BAPTIST CHURCHES ONLY 36 OPEN MEMBERSHIP.

It will have been observed that Dr. Boynton stated that out of ten thousand seven hundred churches in the Northern Baptist Convention, there were only about thirty-six churches which practised anything like open-membership. Yet it will be remembered that before the Convention many letters were written to the Baptist papers objecting to the proposed amendment to the Constitution, on the alleged ground that it would be an injustice to the free Baptists. We are more than ever convinced that these letters were not printed for these thirty-six churches to which Dr. Boynton referred, but for one church, the Park Avenue Church—the Fosdick-Rockefeller church. Dr. Boynton also said that in the Chicago Association, there was only one church in a country community which practised open-membership. Was Dr. Boynton thinking of that one church when he proposed his amendment? or was he endeavouring to get the Association to accept the Convention's position on the subject?

THE PRACTICAL EFFECT OF OPEN-MEMBERSHIP.

The open-membership church in the Chicago Association to which Dr. Boynton refers is the Barrington Church. A former pastor of that church is authority for the statement that when he was pastor the baptistery was in the basement, and that when he became pastor he insisted on having the baptistery brought upstairs; but even then it was stipulated that when baptism was administered, it should never be on Sunday—but always on week-days when there would be few witnesses. What else could be expected? This is largely true of many of the open-membership churches in England. Open-membership means a divided membership; and this, of course, means that if the pastor should speak on the subject of baptism, his message has direct application to the unbaptized members of the church. If these are influential people, it is likely to create a very unpleasant situation. This has the effect of tying the tongue of the pastor, and, in many instances, the pulpit is silent on the subject.

PREPARATION FOR THE CHICAGO VOTE.

The result of the vote on this subject at the Chicago Association certainly suggests that it would be a good thing if all the Associations throughout the Northern Baptist Convention were to take this matter under consideration. In every Association there would be found many still true to the faith; and if some one brother would take the responsibility of bringing the matter up as Dr. Hoyt did, a great victory might yet be won. For the information and encouragement of any who may contemplate doing such a thing, it should be known that in preparation for this Chicago meeting on June 14th a circular letter was sent to all the churches of the Association stating the business of the Association, and closing with these words:

"If your church has not already appointed its delegates, appoint them on Sunday, and have them instructed. If you have already appointed them, but have not instructed them, have your church instruct them on Sunday.

We ask you to pray that the Lord will keep guard over His Church and His people, and that on Monday night His spirit and Power will prevail.

We are your brethren in Christ,

(Signed)

WILFRED L. NOBLE
JOSEPH CROFT DENT
J. W. HOYT

FRED S. DONNELSON
W. H. COSSUM
JOHN H. HUGHES."

Our hearty congratulations to Dr. Hoyt and those who voted with him! He stands as we have always found him, like a rock.

THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION SUGGESTS A MEANS OF SETTLEMENT FOR ONTARIO AND QUEBEC BAPTISTS.

The article on the Chicago Association shows that the decision there obtained was the result of the question at issue having been considered by the individual churches. We respectfully suggest a means of settlement of the matters in dispute in the Ontario and Quebec Convention.

Let the Executive Committee of the Convention appoint two committees representing the two sides of the controversy. Let each committee present a statement of its case. Let these two statements be published together by the Executive Committee, and sent to the churches in sufficient quantities to enable every member of every church in the Convention to have a copy. Give them a month to carefully study the question. Let it be understood that every pastor and every member of the church is to have perfect freedom to discuss the question; and then let the churches come together and express their decision, and let delegates be appointed to the Convention instructed to vote in accord with the decision of the church. A form of resolution could be prepared by each committee hereinbefore referred to, endorsing their position; and a form of amendment in opposition. These could be printed with the committees' statements, and voted upon by the individual churches. The instructed delegates could then come to the Convention to register their church's decision. This done, an arrangement could be made, either that both sides of the controversy should be free to present their side of the question to the churches, or, otherwise, if thought best, that the official statement alone should go to the churches and an agreement entered into that each church should be left to consider the question without any other outside information than that contained in the official statement.

If such a course were accepted it would be impossible, of course, to bind either side to accept the decision of the majority whether great or small. For ourselves, we could never consent to hold fellowship, or work with, an organization or institution that tolerates that which denies the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible as the Word of God. The plan we have suggested would merely have the effect of taking a plebiscite of the churches on this great issue, and would lead us more quickly to a final decision. If it should be found that an actual majority of the Baptists of this Convention—which means, of the individual Baptists of this Convention—with all the facts before them, do actually approve of the present course of the Board of Governors of McMaster in appointing and maintaining in his position a man who holds and teaches what Professor Marshall undoubtedly holds and teaches, we have no hesitation whatever in saying that we should take steps, so far as we are concerned, to leave the Convention in peace. It is because we are of the opinion that the rank and file of the members of our churches still stand for the old faith that we are determined to stay in the Convention and contend for better things. But we think the foregoing suggestion is worthy of sincere consideration as a short cut to a settlement of our present distresses.

A RISING BAPTIST EDITOR.

We hail Mr. W. G. Brown, B.A., Pastor of Orangeville Baptist Church, as a young man with a true journalistic gift; and predict that ere many years he will be recognized as one of the foremost Baptists of this country.

We have before us a copy of *The Prophet*, edited by Mr. Brown, dated

June 12th. It is published in tabloid form, and this issue has eight pages. The entire paper is devoted to a discussion of the McMaster controversy. We do not quote what Mr. Brown says, because we want all our readers to read it in *The Prophet* for themselves, but we give the headings of some of the articles:

On the front page there are three articles as follows:

- 1. Professor Marshall's Weak Teaching on Miracles.
- 2. McMaster Teaching on Meaning of the Cross.
- 3. Jonah In the Light of God, by Prof. E. M. Keirstead, D.D.

Article titles on page 2:

- 1. Giving The Carty Blow.
- 2. Some McMaster Teaching on Inspiration.
- 3. Thinking It Through.

Article titles on page 3:

- 1. "Only Valid Authority Is That Of Experience."
- 2. Concerning the Bible, Jonah, and Science.
- 3. Loose Views on Christian Experience.
- 4. Grievous Effect of Teaching on Students.

Article on page 4: The Cause of the Trouble.

Article on page 5: Professor Marshall a Liberal Evangelical.

Article on page 6: Tells What to Teach Catachumens' Classes on Christian Beliefs.

Article titles on page 7:

- 1. "Sentences Jotted Down in the Ordinary Way."
- 2. Our Estimate of Man's Natural Capacity.

Article on page 8: McMaster's Position on The Fundamentals.

On Wednesday evening, June 16th, Mr. Brown spoke in his father's church, Annette Street Baptist, to a congregation that crowded the building to capacity, an, "Modernism, the greatest enemy of the church."

We print below subscription form for *The Prophet*, and we hope every reader of this paper will at least send for a copy of this issue; and, if possible, subscribe for the paper.

SUBSCRIBE FOR "THE PROPHET"

Quantities of this edition, devoted to an exposition of the Modernistic teachings in McMaster University, over which the present controversy among Canadian Baptists is raging, may be obtained from the Secretary at the following rates:—

Single copies5c. each
In quantities of 10 or more3c. each

Circulate the information far and wide.

The next edition of *The Prophet* will contain an exposure of McMaster's position on Evolution. Don't miss it.

Send in your year's subscription to-day.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Miss G. M. Peplatt, Secretary, *The Prophet*,
32 Willard St. S., Toronto 3, Ont.

Please send *The Prophet* for one year to the following address. For this I enclose the sum of 50c.

Yours sincerely,

(Name).....

(Address).....

A SELF-EXPLAINING LETTER.

Vancouver, B.C., June 2, 1926

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
Toronto.

Dear Brother:

In the *Canadian Baptist* for May 27th just to hand, there appears an unequivocal assertion of the soundness of doctrine at McMaster College, closing with the words, "We assure our readers that at McMaster

there is no compromise in their fundamentals of the faith."

"The Charges which disturb the confidence of the people are uncalled for and without foundation."

"The University is prepared today as in the past to give safe and sane leadership to the denomination and can be trusted to be true to the past and faithful to the future."

I read the above with some astonishment in view of an episode which occurred last year while the Northern Convention was meeting at Seattle and the fight over the seating of the Fosdick delegates was on. At that time I was walking along the streets of Vancouver when a man approached me and greeted me, reminding me that we had met some years previously on a train journey. I recollected the meeting and also having found in conversation on that occasion that he held modernist views and had presented him with a little book containing a very fine argument for the historic faith. This recollection and the fact that he now greeted me cordially led me to seek in conversation, to discover whether his views had undergone any change, and not knowing that my friend had any interest in the Baptist denomination, I referred to the fact that modernists and fundamentalists were locked in controversy, caused by Dr. Fosdick's views, but he quickly assured me that he considered Dr. Fosdick to be the greatest leader of religious thought of today!

This remark led me to question him more closely when he stated frankly that he was a Baptist and considered himself on the solid ground of truth and liberty; that he had been educated for the ministry at McMaster College and that it was there, under the teaching of Professor Cross, he was led, as he expressed it, out of the narrowness of old-fashioned orthodoxy into the broad clear sunlight of an enlightened religious understanding.

He explained that his crisis came when Professor Cross declared that the old view of Atonement was no longer tenable and that Jesus died merely as an expression of his devotion to an ideal and that unless the students themselves were prepared to die as Jesus did, for their ideals, they would never accomplish anything worth while in the world.

My friend admitted that he passed through a period of terrible darkness as a consequence of the necessity of forsaking the faith of his youth for the teachings of Dr. Cross, but emerged at last into the liberty and freedom of which he had already spoken.

I cannot at this distance give the exact words of our conversation, but in every detail my relation of what passed is true to the tenor of the expressions used, and in view of the above sad facts I, for one, cannot take the statements published over the name of C. R. Duncan, Educational Secretary, with any confidence that what happened a few years ago under the teaching of Dr. Cross may not be repeated again, unless the faculty of McMaster are prepared to put their signatures to a clear statement of the historic faith and re-sign such a document annually.

You are at liberty to make whatever use you think fit of this letter which is not intended to suggest that Mr. Duncan is deliberately seeking to camouflage the situation; but is an evident proof that good and worthy men, as I judge him by his article to be, need to wake up to facts before they make general statements.

I remain,
Yours sincerely,
(Signed) H. F. Brown.

P.S. I ought to have also stated that my friend explained that his changed views had led him to relinquish the objective of the Christian ministry.

THE EDITOR AT WHEATON COLLEGE.

This week, June 16th, the Editor delivered the Commencement address at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill. The address will be published next week.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON

Lesson 2.

THIRD QUARTER.

July 11, 1926

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST JESUS.

Lesson Text: Matt., ch. 26. Parallel passages: Mark 14:1-72; Luke 22:1-62.

I. THE DIVINE PURPOSE AND THE SATANIC WILL (vs. 1-5).

1. Our Lord announces the fact, the time, and the manner of His death. This is a further revelation of His foreknowledge, and of His resolution in carrying out the divine purposes of the incarnation: He came "to give his life a ransom for many". 2. Inspired of the Devil, the enemy conspired to kill Him: "Then assembled", etc. (vs. 3-4). How comforting to reflect that the Devil has his limitations, e.g., the case of Job (Job. chapters 1 and 2)! 3. The enemy sought to effect their purpose in secret, fearing the people. Thus evil-doers always love darkness rather than light. It is by "subtily" men seek to destroy the written Word as they endeavoured to kill the Word Incarnate.

II. A REVELATION OF THE BETRAYER'S MOTIVE.

The account of Christ's anointing in Bethany is here given somewhat out of its chronological order—see parallel passages cited at the beginning of this lesson—but it would appear that it is inserted here as revealing the reason for the attitude of Judas. The connection between this and his betrayal of the Lord is unmistakable. We will not, in this lesson, go into this story in detail, as we shall study it again when we come to John, chapter 12.

1. It is enough to say that Judas counted it a waste to make Christ the centre and circumference of one's affections, for that is what Mary did. And this is ever the attitude of the enemy. The carnal mind, under the dominance of Satan, is always jealous of the prominence of Christ. This is the very spirit of Antichrist. This appears in the present conflict between Modernism and Fundamentalism. The spirit of Judas finds many a reincarnation, and vents its spleen ultimately upon the Person of Christ. 2. John tells us (chap. 13: 27) Satan entered into Judas. Thus we are informed of the inspiring cause of Judas' treachery. Does it not suggest that our hearts are made to be the abode of the Holy Spirit, or of Satan; and we have our choice between the two. 3. Judas sought to profit by his treachery: "What will ye give me?" (vs. 15). Thus men still betray Christ and His cause for place, and position, and sometimes literally for money.

III. CHRIST OUR PASSOVER.

1. The physical details of the divine ordering here revealed, while relatively unimportant, constitute a further revelation of the omniscience and sovereignty of Christ. He was Lord of His circumstances (compare Matt. 26: 17-19; Mark 14: 12-16; Luke 22: 7-13). 2. Christ came to fulfil the law; hence He offered Himself at the time of the Passover. 3. His perfect knowledge of the heart of men is here disclosed by His prediction of His own betrayal, and His knowledge of who should betray Him. 4. The disciples evinced an instinctive knowledge of their own depravity, for they said, "Is it I?" John only (chap. 13: 23-25) asked, "Who is it?" And he asked the question while he was "leaning on Jesus' bosom". Anywhere else than that, the best of men may ask, "Is it I?" 5. Jesus gave a new significance to the Passover Feast by the institution of the Supper (vs. 26-30; see also 1 Cor. 11: 23-24).

IV. PETER AS A TYPE OF BELIEVERS GENERALLY (vs. 31-35).

1. He was forewarned of his weakness. The New Testament is full of admonitions to the effect that we must watch and pray lest we enter into temptation. 2. Notwithstanding, Peter was confident of his own integrity: "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall". When the Word of God tells us we are in danger, we had better give heed to the warning. 3. It should be borne in mind that all the disciples said the same thing (v. 35); so that Peter was no more confident than the rest.

V. THE GARDEN OF GETHSEMANE (vs. 36-46).

1. Christ moves from society to solitude; He leaves His disciples that He might go and pray; He takes with Him three, and when He had told them that His soul was exceedingly sorrowful even unto death, "He went a little farther" that He might be alone with God. So must the agonizing soul withdraw not only from the multitude, but even from its most intimate associates to be with

God alone. Thus "Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day". 2. The prayer recorded (v. 39) is a prayer of resignation and revelation. It shows that Christ was (a) absolutely devoted to the divine will; (b) the awfulness of the cup about to be put to His lips. This is implied in the prayer, that if it were possible it might pass from Him; (c) the absolute necessity for the shedding of His blood in order to the salvation of men, for obviously no other way could be found. 3. The disciples' separation from His solitary vigil: He found His disciples asleep. They did not understand the meaning of His infinite sorrow; not yet had they learned that He was to die "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God". And in the presence of His infinite suffering they slept. We must not blame them too severely for that was a grief into which only God Himself could enter. Yet in a measure we may make application of the principle to ourselves. We, too, must have our Gethsemanes; we, too, must bear burdens and experience griefs which no others can share; nor must we complain if while we suffer others sleep. 4. A prayer repeated (vs. 42-44): He "prayed the third time, saying the same words". That was real prayer. There is a repetition which is not "vain repetition." Again and again we need to pray, "Thy will be done".

VI. THE GREAT BETRAYAL (vs. 47-56).

1. Here is the record of the greatest sin ever committed, the supreme treachery, the sin unpardonable, the betrayal of heaven's Best, to hell's worst. Can this sin be repeated? Alas, it may, when men set their affections upon all the interests of time and sense, and choose them rather than heavenly treasures, and reject the salvation affected at the price of blood for mere temporal gain. They, too, turn their back on God, and offer their service to the Devil, and turn from heaven to hell. 2. Love's last appeal (vs. 50). Did ever mortal ears hear such words as these, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" Thus redeeming love leaves man's treachery without excuse; and ere the deed which consigns a soul to perdition is accomplished, gives the traitor an opportunity to repent and calls him, "Friend". 3. The sovereign surrender of Christ: Nowhere did our Lord more conspicuously display His sovereignty than in His surrender of Himself first to those who came to take him, and later at the cross. (a) He refused all human help. How little did He need the sword of Peter! (b) He refused angelic reinforcement; He came to tread the wine-press alone; and all this that the Scripture might be fulfilled. What importance our Lord attached to the Scriptures! He knew them to be the Word of God, which must be fulfilled at all costs. What a contrast between the reverent attitude of the Son of God toward the Scriptures, and the attitude of ignorant and impious religious professors of to-day! 4. The forsaken Christ: Who could imagine the scene! The disciples who had all joined with Peter in their declarations of loyalty now all forsook Him and fled.

VII. CHRIST BEFORE CAIAPHAS.

1. The Son of God is brought to trial and accused by the officers of religion. The Devil has always done his deadliest work under the guise of religion. 2. They sought false witnesses against Him, Who was and is the truth. No other kind of witness can ever be found against the Word of God but false witness. There is a striking parallel between these proceedings and the critical movement of to-day, which would crucify the Son of God afresh. 3. Jesus made no reply to the false witnesses. 4. He did declare His Messiahship in answer to the direct question of the High Priest. Thus the rejectors of Christ had His own Word for it that He was the Son of God. 5. But an unreasoning enmity revealed its own nature in judging Him worthy of death. The carnal mind has murder in it always for the Son of God.

VIII. PETER'S DENIAL.

Peter is frequently spoken of as though he were exceptionally weak. His offence cannot be condoned; but it should be borne in mind that all the other disciples kept too far away even to be asked questions. 1. Peter was in bad company. It is a dangerous thing to consort with the enemies of Christ or to warm one's self at the fires which they have kindled (Ps. 1). Peter denied his Lord three times. The great sin was in the first rather than in the third denial. We cannot take the third wrong step if we do not take the first. We should guard against the beginnings of evil. 3. Christ's prediction was literally fulfilled. 4. The one bright spot in the story is in the fact that Peter wept.