

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST) POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY. TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS DURING 1926 \$1.00 FOR ONE YEAR. RENEWALS \$2.00.

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. 16. TORONTO, AUGUST 26th, 1926 Whole No. 226

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE FAITH OF MOSES.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, May 20th, 1923.
(Stenographically Reported.)

"By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.

"Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;

"Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.

"By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible."—Hebrews 11: 24-27.



THE BIBLE is given to us to be a guide-book. The divine purpose in its writing is indicated in John's Gospel: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." The Bible was never given to be used as a text-book in science or philosophy; it was never designed to be a text-book in history: it is given to us to point the way from sin to holiness, from darkness to light, from death to life, from hell to heaven, from the prince of the power of the air to Him Who is Lord of all. And the Bible, after all, is a very simple Book. It is the profoundest of all volumes. We can never hope to exhaust its fulness of wisdom. And yet, for those who will be instructed in its precepts, and be guided by its principles, and comforted by its promises, it speaks in the language of a little child. Nothing could possibly be simpler than the Word of God. Indeed, we are never able to understand it until we become as little children. Our Lord Jesus said, "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight." "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." So the Bible proposes to make the way of salvation so plain and so simple that we may all understand it and find the way of life.

One of the great words of the Bible is that which we find in our text this evening—Faith. The chapter I read to you tells us that "without faith it is

impossible to please him." That is the *sine qua non*, that is the irreducible minimum, that is the thing without which we cannot be saved—whatever else we may have or have not, we must have faith or we cannot please God. And if we do not please Him, then we cannot be saved.

This chapter is written especially to tell us how we may have faith, and what faith is. The writer does not deal in philosophical abstractions. He does not weary you with intellectual subtleties. He states as simply and plainly as possible that "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." And lest that should not be sufficiently clear, the whole chapter is taken up with illustrations of what it means to believe God. The roll is called of those who have trusted God in the past, and their life-story is brought before us one after the other. And the outstanding characteristic of their life-story is illustrative of some aspect of this essential grace of faith. That principle is followed in the plan of redemption. God does not tell us what it is to be righteous, what it is to be a sinner, in any abstract way. He sets forth His Son as an example of righteousness, as an incarnation of the principle of righteousness; and He says, "If you would know what it is to be righteous, measure yourself by Jesus Christ." Nothing is simpler than that. One comes along and says, "I am just as good as your church members. My life will bear inspection. I think my character will compare favourably with most of the religious professors I know." Well, the Bible does not argue with you on that point. The Bible simply says, "There is only one measure, there is only one standard: measure yourself by Jesus Christ. And if you are not equal to His stature, then you will never get to glory: Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Thus the principle of the incarnation is carried through the Old and the New Testaments; and these profound principles of truth are wrapped up in human life so that we may study that principle in operation and learn what it is to believe God.

Here before us we have the life-story of Moses. We are told that the explanation of his wonderful career, and of his unending influence upon the world of the past and of the present, and that his place in history, in time and in eternity, is explained by the fact that he believed God. "By faith"—that is the explanation, that is what differentiated Moses from other men of his time.

Now let us look at this old-fashioned and familiar text that we may receive some spiritual profit from it ourselves.

I.

First of all, just look at WHAT FAITH REFUSES. There is the negative side of it: "By faith Moses . . . refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." And you would say, perhaps, that he was a very foolish man for making such a choice. But I remind you that this choice was made "when he was come to years". Faith is here described as the exercise of a mature man. Moses was not a child; he was a full-grown man. It was "when he was come to years" he made this choice. And further, we are told that he "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." He was a man of trained and disciplined intellect. He was a man of vast learning. His natural intellectual capacity and power had been developed to the utmost. And when Moses, the mighty man, the man of massive intellect, the man who even on the natural plane stood head and shoulders above all his contemporaries, this giant among the sons of men, his powers trained and developed to the highest point—when he surveyed the possibilities of life, "when he was come to years", there were some things he refused.

Let no one say that Faith belongs to our intellectual nonage, that only the immature mind, only the uninstructed, only the uninformed, only the undisciplined, only those who are intellectually inferior, believe God. That is the devil's lie. He has been saying that from the beginning. But a man is never so truly a man, never so worthy of his high destiny, never so nearly approximates the divine plan and purpose, as when, with the consent of all the powers of his intellect, he bows before God and believes God. Turn your back upon that sophistry at once. If you would learn to think, if you would learn to push back the boundaries of time and trace all things that are back of the beginning, and be wise with the wisdom of the Eternal, then learn to believe God. Moses "when he was come to years" exercised faith in God.

Now, what did his faith do for him? *It led him to refuse to be called something he was not*; it implanted within him a passion for reality, a love of the truth; it led him to a rejection, a repudiation of the seeming and the unreal and the artificial. Legally, he might have been called a son of the royal house, he might have passed among his fellows as an Egyptian prince with all the privileges and preferments involved in that exalted position. But because he believed God, he "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter". He wanted to live his life openly; he wanted to walk in the light of truth; he confessed a love for the realities of life; he wanted to be called what he was, and he wanted to be what he was called. He hated the sham, the mere trappings, the externals of life, and desired to live before Him to whose eyes all things are naked and opened. Oh, what men will do in order to be called something. The notorious Dr. Cook fabricated a most interesting story. Why? In order that he might be called the discoverer of the North Pole. It mattered nothing to him that he had not discovered it, if only the world might regard him as the man who had succeeded where all others had failed. He was quite content to be called the great discoverer. When God took His Spirit from Saul, and when Samuel had pronounced the divine sentence upon him, when he had been informed that the kingdom should pass from him into the hands of another, you remember how Saul said, "Honour me before the people. Let me hear them still say, God save the King. Let them call me what God knows I am not." There never was a day when men and women were so anxious to be called by honourable titles. I know we have done away with it in this country, but we shall be manufacturing some new ones to take its place after a while. Universities fling around their honorary degrees, and in this democratic country everybody is a doctor or a professor or wears some title of distinction. We must have some kind of a title. We want to be called something, it does not make any difference whether we are entitled to it or not. I remember a friend whom I knew some years ago who had a passion for academic degrees. I said to him one day, "My dear fellow, if you had diplomas enough to paper the walls of your study, it would not take you anywhere. It is not what universities say you are, it is what the people discover you to be that will in the end determine your place in life." But we are naturally artificial. You ask a man if he is saved, and he says, "Certainly, sir, I am a Christian. I am a member of the church." He joined the church in order to be called a Christian. He may not be a Christian, but if he is only called a Christian, if he can only get the name and title of somebody's son, then he is satisfied. Another man who really believes God will brush aside all these outer decorations, these artificialities, and will go to the heart of things, and say, "Let me be true to the core, and let me be called by what I am." Moses refused everything that was artificial. He had a passion for the truth.

I want to appeal to you this evening on that score. The question I ask of you is not, are you called a Christian? are you called a good man by your neighbour? are you called rich? are you called influential? It is not what people say about you. The thing I ask you to face in the name of the Lord is, what are you before Him? have you that beginning of faith which will lead you to refuse to accept half-way measures, which will lead you to say I will not join the ranks of mere nominal professors of religion, I want the real thing, I will not be called what I am not. Do you remember what John said? "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." When God calls a man His son, he is a son indeed. Moses' faith then led him to refuse the artificial, the unreal.

II.

NOW, WHAT DID HIS FAITH LEAD HIM TO CHOOSE? "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God." Moses desired to be enrolled among the people of God. Actually, he desired to be numbered among those upon whom God's favour rested, who belonged to Him. Surely that was a more honourable title—to be classed among the people of God—than to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. What is it we desire this evening? Is it to be numbered among the people of God? Not primarily a church member, not primarily a Baptist or a Methodist or a Presbyterian or

an Anglican—not to be called by some religious name primarily. The first and essential thing in the view of the man who really believes God is that we shall be one with the people who are God's people. It may be that some of you here may feel that that is not a particularly attractive sort of life. And therein lies the wonder of the text.

Who were the people of God? They were a nation of slaves; they were not their own masters; they were hewers of wood and drawers of water. Their special work as a nation seemed to be the making of bricks; the most menial sort of labour was assigned to them, and they wrought under the whips of the taskmakers. They were a down-trodden, despised, persecuted people. Yet this man who might have been a prince said, "I would rather be reckoned with those people who are outcasts from society if only I may be numbered with the people of God, than I would share all the glory and honour of the Egyptian court."

Now, my friend, the first question for us in this connection is this, How can I become God's man, God's woman? I want Him to be my Saviour, to be my Lord. I want to be rightly related to him, no matter what my human relationships may be, no matter what it may cost me. I want, first of all, to have this soul of mine related happily, savingly to Him, Who is my Lord and my God. No other kind of religion is worth having, my friend. The religion of the formalist, of the ceremonialist, of the worldling who wants to find some religious sanction for a self-indulgent, self-willed, worldly life—as God helps me, my voice shall never be raised to increase the number of people of that sort. But to belong to God, to know that wherever we are, at home or abroad, we are still in touch with Him—the supreme value of life consists in that relationship. And because of that, he was quite willing to endure the affliction as an incident. The man who went yonder, in the days of the Klondike rage, enduring all kinds of hardships, did not go because he loved the hardships. He was determined to have gold. And if the long and lonely path with all the rigours of life in that northern country were necessary to the possession of gold, then he would brave it all, but he would have gold. That is what it means. I will be right with God, no matter what it costs. I will suffer anything, but I will be right with Him. That is what Moses meant. He chose to suffer affliction with the people of God rather than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.

There are pleasures in sin. There were delights in the Egyptian court. It is folly to say that people do not enjoy themselves until they become Christians. They enjoy themselves as long as they themselves are enjoyable. But the "old man" soon wears out, you know. There is a kind of pleasure in the worldling's life. There is a joy of achievement in business. I can understand the man who comes home from his office feeling that he has really accomplished something to-day. Not merely that he has obtained wealth—that is but incidental to him. But he has set before him a certain goal, and he has made several steps in the direction of the realization of his ambition. And I can understand how he comes home with elastic step and in joyous mood, saying, "This has been a day well spent." I sympathize with the man of science who with microscope or telescope wrests from nature some secret which hitherto has alluded all human investigators, until at last he cries, "I have found it." He is a happy man. Then, too, even the ordinary superficial enjoyments of life have their place. You cannot live on ice cream, but it is rather nice on a hot day. There are a lot of little things that minister a kind of pleasure while they last. I frankly confess when I have seen a company of people, cultured, polite in their manner, amid pleasant surroundings, exchanging the fruit of their thinking in conversation, enjoying perhaps a musical evening, and pursuits in which people may engage who are not Christians—I can understand they have a certain kind of pleasure. And I should be denying the facts of human experience if I should say there are no pleasures in Egypt. I fancy that Moses found temptation in Pharaoh's court, among the wise men of that great empire, able to take his place with the greatest of them—I fancy it was a temptation to him, and his withdrawal was a real act of sacrifice and self-denial. But he said, "I will have none of it." But, my friend, the pleasures of sin; the pleasures of a life divorced from God are evanescent, are fleeting. The pleasures of sin are for a season, and a very

short season at that. A man has made his money, and has invested his whole life in it, and he has amassed a great fortune. But suddenly the crepe is on the door, for a higher voice has said, "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?" But Moses had a faith which led him out into the future, and he said, "The day is coming when all the glory of Egypt will fail, when all its pleasures will wither as an autumn leaf, they will pass, the winter will come. But I am going to set my heart upon a life that will endure, and upon riches that will not pass away; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season."

Look now at Faith's estimates. Do you know that true faith makes a man wonderfully wise? You have been amazed sometimes at the sagacity of a man of business. He seems to see around a half dozen corners and knows how the markets are going to rise and fall. He makes a profitable investment, while all his neighbours round about become poor. Why? Because he had that indefinable something, that business instinct which enabled him to weigh up the values of the business world. And he made his choice on the right side, and he got rich while other people became poor. Now let nobody suppose that faith is a kind of leap into the dark, that the believer is one who does not know anything, that the believer is one who knows less than other folks. Let me tell you a secret. He is one who knows a little bit more; he is one who has got on the inside of things; he is one who sees farther than other people; he is one who has learned to weigh up the possibilities of life in a just balance. Moses did that. "When he was come to years" he saw the Egyptian court with all its splendour, with all its worldly pomp and power. He saw on the other hand this nation of slaves, down-trodden, oppressed, despised by all the people of their day. And when weighed the two together, he said, "The reproach of Christ, the very worst that a servant of God can experience in this life is infinitely to be preferred before the very best this fleeting world can give." He esteemed "the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." Moses was not acting blindly. He was acting wisely. He was a good business man. Isn't that just what Jesus said? "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal." I wonder if any of you have put your money in some stock companies that were guaranteed to make you rich. I think there were a lot of people who did that not long ago. I remember boarding years ago with an old man who had a few thousand dollars—it was not very much. But if anybody would come along and offer him ten per cent. interest he would lend anything. He did not ask for security. He used to lend his money and get six per cent. for six months and then lose his principal. Now that is the devil's trick. He is a great promoter. He is always offering stock in the affairs of Egypt, guaranteed. And when this man measured things up, he said, "No, thank you. I am not going to take any stock in Egypt at all. And the very best that you can offer me is not to be compared with the worst I shall get on the other side." And faith teaches us that no matter how dark you may paint the Christian life—and it has its sombre side;—it does mean affliction for the people of God; it does mean something to stand for Christ in this day as any other day; it does mean self-denial; it does mean the cross with blood on it; it does mean self-crucifixion; it does mean separation from the world; it does mean sometimes making bricks without straw; it does mean the whip of the task-masters of the world; it does mean the scorn and contempt of the men of this generation who think they are very wise. And you young people, people will laugh at you, especially in school. Some little professor who has passed an examination of some sort, who could not even tell you the books of the Bible, or if he could, does not know what they contain, but is quite competent to pronounce judgment, he will laugh at you if you say you believe the Bible—but faith teaches us that no matter how dark you may paint the Christian life, the reproach of Christ is greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt; and the poorest of all my Master's gifts, to those who follow Him, are infinitely to be preferred before the very best that the world, the flesh and the devil have to offer.

What was the "greater riches"? Society? We hear one saying, "If I were to take that stand, I should not receive any more invitations to certain circles. I should no longer be welcome among certain people." No, perhaps not. From the day that Moses chose to suffer affliction with the people of God, I suppose he ceased to be welcomed at the court of Pharaoh. But he had another companion, and I think if you had talked with Moses, he would have said this: "In my judgment, the companionship of a good conscience toward God is better company than all the princes of Egypt. Let me have a good conscience. Let me lay my head upon the pillow at night with a good conscience. Let me be sure that I am right with God, and I will choose that society before any society that earth has to offer." And there is a joy in it. There is a comfort in it. Although you may not feel very comfortable if you look at the man beside you, he may frown at you; and you may not be as happy as you would like to be in the office where you work, there is a solace, a consolation, in feeling that you can always look up into the face of God with a good conscience; that is greater riches than all the society that earth can give—the favour of God is more to be desired than the favour of any earthly court. How simple it all is! It is a great thing that a man has done a task worthily, to be appreciated by his fellows, and to be recognized, too, as well as appreciated, to have his good deeds acknowledged. I do not think we can be wholly careless of human opinion. I do not believe that a rightly constituted man can be indifferent to the opinion of his fellows. He prefers to be well thought of. Don't you? I frankly say I do. I have no pleasure in making enemies, in having people say unkind things about me, whether they are true or untrue. I would rather have people say what Brother Brownlee said this morning. I rather like that. It is well to desire the good opinion of our fellows. But he has not learned to live truly and worthily who has not learned to subordinate even the judgments of good men, the opinions of good people, the estimation of the saints—he has not learned, I say, to live truly and worthily who has not learned to subordinate all these things to the "Well done" of his God. And that was the secret of Moses' life. Greater riches—"I would rather have God say, 'My servant Moses', I would rather have that written", I think Moses would have told you, "than for all the world to say, 'He is the son of Pharaoh's daughter.'" He lived for the approval of his God.

III.

Just this word and I have done. WHAT HE ENDURED: "He endured, as seeing him who is invisible." I can fancy some wise men from among the Egyptians coming to Moses and saying to him, "Moses, have you estimated the wealth of the court?" "Yes, I have seen all that." "Have you been inside?" "O, yes. I have worn the robes of a prince for years. I was called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. I have tasted all the pleasures of the Egyptian court. Yes, I have estimated that side of it." "Well then, Moses, have you thought of what it will mean to identify yourself with those poor people? They have no prestige, they have no nationality, they are not a nation, they are not self-governed—they are merely slaves of the greatest power in the world. And if you identify yourself with them, you will be submerged. Can't you see this, Moses?" I think Moses would have said, "Yes. I see it all. But I see something more than that." "Well, what do you see?" He would have said, "I can see One high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple. And some day He is going to deliver these people out of the hand of Pharaoh and out of the house of bondage. He is going to make them a nation. He is going to carry them through the wilderness and into the promised land. He is going to build in that land a temple, and He is going to fulfil to them the promises He made to their fathers. And then I can see down into the dim and distant future that a Prophet will the Lord their God raise up unto them, a Greater than I, but one whose forerunner I count it the highest honour to be. And some day He will rend the heavens and come down, and He will stand among men and say, He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Like Abraham, Moses rejoiced to see Christ's day: he saw it and was glad. Indeed, I think he looked forward not only to the first coming, but to the second coming of Christ, and anticipated the day when the cross being passed and the crown in prospect, He should come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory to reign as King of Kings and Lord of Lords. And Moses said, "I see Him

Who is invisible, and I put the world under my feet and live for that day." Don't you see it? By faith Moses did it all because he believed that God would do what He said He would do. I am sorry for people who cannot see the Invisible. I asked a friend some years ago about a certain preacher, whom at that time I had never heard. He was one of the world's greatest preachers. I said, "What is the characteristic of his preaching?" "Oh," he said, "I never hear him but he makes me feel what a beautiful thing it is to be a Christian." I wish I could make you feel not only what a beautiful thing it is, but what a profitable thing it is, what a worthy vocation, what a glorious calling, to be God's man, to be God's woman, to be God's boy, to be God's girl, to endure all these passing, transient, evanescent things, "as seeing him who is invisible." "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look now at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." Oh, that God may make us wise unto salvation, that we may be done with sin.

"Through faith he kept the passover and the sprinkling of blood." For Moses learned that this vista that opened to the view of faith was possible only through the blood. And it is only through the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ Who died in the sinner's room and stead, that all our folly and all our sin can be put behind us and buried in the grave of Jesus Christ, and that we can rise to walk in newness of life.

May God help us every one thus to make choice of Jesus Christ to-night. How many will here and now make choice of Him? How many of you who have made this choice have found it just as profitable as I have tried to say it is to-night, just as profitable as the Bible declares it to be? How many of you have found in the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt?

Editorial.

LETTER FROM REV. R. J. SMITHSON.

We very gladly publish below a letter from the Rev. R. J. Smithson, P.Th., of Glasgow. It appears that Mr. Smithson's perfectly natural desire to occupy his Sundays while in Canada was by our informants mistakenly interpreted as a desire to settle in this country. We are glad to know that Bro. Smithson is not in agreement with Prof. I. G. Matthews' position, and only regret that he did not omit Prof. Matthews' name from the list of those to whom he looks up. He may have regarded it as a simple courtesy to include Prof. Matthews with the other members of the Theological Faculty, but in these war days we believe that in loyalty to the truth of the Gospel it is, to say the least, wise to guard against even an indirect endorsement of error and even against what might appear to be such.

Respecting Mr. Smithson's quotation from Dr. Jas. Moffatt, we, of course, assumed that he knew Dr. Moffatt to be no friend of Fundamentalism, and his citation of Dr. Moffatt's remark without objection seemed to imply approval. The "five points" to which Dr. Moffatt objects may be identified by two quotations, one from Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, and the other from Dr. W. H. P. Faunce.

In his sermon "Shall the Fundamentalist Win," Dr. Fosdick said:

"It is interesting to note where the Fundamentalists are driving in their stakes to mark out the deadline of doctrine around the church, across which no one is to pass except on terms of agreement. They insist

that we must all believe in the historicity of certain special miracles, pre-eminently the virgin birth of our Lord; that we must believe in a special theory of inspiration—that the original documents of the Scripture, which of course we no longer possess, were inerrantly dictated to men a good deal as a man might dictate to a stenographer; that we must believe in a special theory of the atonement—that the blood of our Lord, shed in a substitutionary death, placates an alienated Deity and makes possible welcome for the returning sinner; and that we must believe in the second coming of our Lord upon the clouds of heaven to set up a millennium here, as the only way in which God can bring history to a worthy denouement. Such are some of the stakes which are being driven, to mark a deadline of doctrine around the church."

In an article in an American magazine, Dr. Faunce wrote as follows:

"Then to protect Christianity from modern thought and thinkers they have announced a new set of 'fundamentals,' among which they enumerate the Virgin birth, the Deity of Christ and a substitutionary atonement, the inerrancy of the scriptures in science and history as well as in religion, and the imminent physical return of the Lord on the literal clouds in the sky. The question as to the nature of Christ and his death is not directly related to the teaching of science and need not be discussed here. But science and religion do come into touch the moment men affirm that the church must believe in a scientifically inerrant Bible, in the Virgin birth, and in an imminent physical catastrophe which shall wind up all human history. To the first Apostles of the Christian faith such things were never the fundamentals of Christianity. The writers of the New Testament never ascribe inerrancy to the Old Testament but, on the contrary, often pronounce its teaching defective and preparatory to something better. The Virgin birth, which is related with noble reticence and reverence in two New Testament passages and which has for centuries been accepted by the great majority of the church, is not mentioned in any of the New Testament epistles or in any of the apostolic sermons recorded in the Book of Acts. It apparently formed no part of the preaching of the twelve apostles or the seventy disciples. If that miracle was not considered fundamental in the days of the apostles, can it be made so to-day? But the Fundamentalists affirm that belief in a miraculous inerrant Bible, in a physiological miracle in Bethlehem, and a physical miracle soon to occur in the sky, that these beliefs are the fundamental things in Christianity—which is not only a transformation of the early faith, but a palpable inversion of moral values."

If the points to which Doctors Fosdick and Faunce object were included in the five points of Fundamentalism—as, of course, they were—Evangelicals will insist that they are the *sine qua non* of Christian faith. We assume that had Mr. Smithson been fully informed on these matters, and had he known Dr. Fosdick's position, he would at least have warned his people to be careful. However, *The Gospel Witness* would a thousand times rather discover that a man is in full accord with the great essentials of the gospel than that he has turned aside from them, or, that he acquiesces in the course of those who do. We had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Smithson after our article appeared, and *The Gospel Witness* most heartily wishes him well, and prays God's blessing upon him.

Mr. Smithson's Letter.

Dear Dr. Shields,

In the issue of *The Gospel Witness* for August 19th, under the caption "A Visiting Glasgow Preacher" you do me the honour of referring to me and to some of my statements or supposed statements. You say "We are informed that Mr. Smithson would like to settle in Canada." Wherever you got that information it did not originate with me. No one in Canada or in Scotland ever heard me say that I should like to settle in Canada. I was desirous of securing preaching engagements for four Sundays in the course of my visit. Three were arranged for before I left Scotland.

When I reached Canada it was to find that through an oversight the fourth had not been filled. In consequence efforts were made to discover whether any one of a number of churches had the 22nd of August free. If this gave rise to any misapprehension I am not in the slightest degree responsible. It is quite true that in my letter to *The Canadian Baptist* I acknowledged my indebtedness to my professors in McMaster University, but I did not single out, as you appear to suggest I did, Prof. I. G. Matthews for special mention. My exact words were: "Over the fireplace of my study is a framed photograph of some of the professors to whom I owe a debt I can never repay, Farmer, Trotter, McCrimmon, Brown, Matthews, Gilmour, Keirstead are there. They look down upon me but I look up to them—to every one of them". May I add that upon occasion I took issue with Prof. Matthews and did not go behind his back to do it; but that does not invalidate in any degree my indebtedness to him. In my letter, however, the emphasis was laid upon the debt I felt I owed to the teaching staff of McMaster University, not to Prof. Matthews in particular, as your statement would naturally lead one to infer.

In my reference to Dr. James Moffatt I said something besides that which you quoted. Did I not say that Dr. Moffatt "may have meant it quite seriously when he said that he was tempted to throw in his lot with the Fundamentalists, for he had heard one preacher state that the first thing in American life is Education and the second thing is Christianity. But in the opposite camp he found Fundamentalists who had five points—five points that would have shut the Lord Jesus out of His own church"? I do not suppose that Dr. Moffatt thought of suggesting that all Fundamentalists held these five points. In any case, I am quite unaware what these five points were or are, but if it can be shown me that they are Fundamentals of the Faith, then not for a moment could I follow Dr. Moffatt in his judgment: I submit that it is not a fair deduction from what I wrote that I have no love for Fundamentalists. May I be forgiven if I do not love all "who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity and in truth".

It may interest you to know that I am a member of a Theological Club which meets in Glasgow periodically. That club is composed of Glasgow Baptist ministers and Glasgow ministers of another denomination. Fully two years ago I was present at one of the meetings of that club when certain doctrinal statements were made to which I took exception so seriously that I suggested that we Baptists should withdraw from the club. We had a meeting afterwards at which we discussed the situation. It was agreed that we should continue our membership for at least another year. That year has passed and still another, but for two years I have deliberately absented myself from the meetings of the club simply because, I venture to say, I have as much regard for the trustworthiness of the Gospels as you yourself have.

It is quite true that when Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick visited Glasgow about three years ago I urged my people to go to hear him, and furthermore availed myself of the opportunity of hearing the man whom I styled one of the world's greatest preachers. That is the only time in my life that I have heard Dr. Fosdick. I regarded him and still regard him as a noteworthy preacher in the technical sense of the word, although I by no means endorse his teaching on many fundamental subjects. Further, I frankly admit that my knowledge of Dr. Fosdick's teaching has been greatly enlarged within the past three years. I am not defending Dr. Fosdick, nor do I claim even remotely to be one of his disciples. It seems to me grossly unfair for you to suggest that I am. I hope I am teachable enough to take either from Dr. Fosdick or from Dr. T. T. Shields anything that these men can give to help me towards the fulfilment of my ministry. Furthermore, I hope I shall always be capable of rejecting what they or anyone else put forth if such does not appeal to me by its spirit and substance.

Yours very sincerely,

R. J. SMITHSON.

"BY WAY OF REMEMBRANCE"

The following address was published in this paper last January, but we publish it again because we all forget so soon, and need our pure minds stirred up by way of remembrance.

An Address by Rev. John Linton, B.A., Delivered at the Great Protest Meeting in Jarvis St. Church, Jan. 4, 1926.

(Stenographically reported.)

REV. JOHN LINTON: Mr. Chairman and dear Christian friends: before I read this resolution to-night I just wish to make this remark. I think I overheard the Chairman say that there were forty who voted against the previous resolution. I would judge there are some two thousand people here—and forty people out of two thousand voted against the resolution. I want to say this, that I have the profoundest respect for the forty people who voted against that resolution. One of the first principles of our Baptist faith is individual liberty (Applause); and I would desire nothing better than to have a fair hearing by open-minded men and women. I think we ought to recognize that. It was very difficult at a recent Baptist Convention for some of us who had to speak, without any previous preparation, on a momentous subject, to be continually harassed by frequent interruptions, which interfered with a fair consideration being given to a matter of the utmost moment.

The resolution to be moved by the Rev. John Linton, of High Park Baptist Church—at least, I belong to it now—(Applause and laughter). There are not many Scotch people here to-night—and seconded by my big brother, Rev. Clifford Loney, of Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, Hamilton, is this:

On the Responsibility for the Present Situation.

WHEREAS the teaching of Professor L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, as represented by his sermons preached in Canada and by articles published in England, is so at variance with the doctrinal standards of our Canadian Baptist churches as embodied in the doctrinal statement in the Trusts of McMaster University and repeatedly expressed by resolution at our Conventions, as to be intolerable to such Baptists as already understand Professor Marshall's theological position, and as will be found, we believe, equally intolerable to the great majority of Baptists of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec when they shall have become more fully informed of the facts;

AND WHEREAS such a situation is disturbing to the peace of the Denomination, and hence destructive of that unity of spirit and purpose which is indispensable to any general co-operation in the missionary and educational enterprises of the Denomination,—and this at a time when such co-operation is imperatively necessary to enable us, as Canadian Baptists, to take advantage of the opportunities which face us, and to meet the obligations those opportunities involve;

AND WHEREAS it is important that our fellow Canadian Baptists should know where the responsibility for the present condition of denominational disunion and distrust in this Convention may justly be held to lie;

AND WHEREAS for at least more than fifteen years the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University have pursued a policy which has repeatedly offended and defied the evangelical convictions of the members of the churches of this Convention, as evidenced specifically in the action of the said Governors in retaining for years on the Faculty of McMaster University Professor I. G. Matthews, whose teaching was subversive of evangelical faith; and in the further action of the then Chancellor and the two Deans, with certain of the Senate and Board of Governors, in opposing at the Ottawa Convention, 1919, the protest made against the Modernist editorial utterance of *The Canadian Baptist*; which utterance was repudiated by resolution of the Convention; and in the further action of the said Senate in recognizing with an honorary degree as a distinguished Baptist, the theological liberal leader, Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, which action the Convention refused to approve by rejecting the vote of confidence which was proposed at the London Convention, 1924; and now by the Senate's further action in the deliberate appointment

to the Faculty of McMaster, in the person of Professor L. H. Marshall, one whose views we believe are, at many points, directly contrary to the views of our Canadian Baptist people;

AND WHEREAS the aforementioned actions of the said Senate, we believe, have had the effect of repeatedly disturbing the peace of the Convention, and of alienating the sympathy of a large part of our people from the University, and of undermining their confidence in the Governing Bodies;

AND WHEREAS through the incumbencies of four Chancellors the theological attitude of the University has been largely determined by the leadership of the present Dean in Theology, Dr. J. H. Farmer, who, while professing his personal sympathy for theological conservatism, has maintained an unvarying attitude of tolerance and defense of Modernism;

AND WHEREAS we have their own word for it, that the Dean in Theology and the Chancellor were chiefly responsible for recommending Professor Marshall's appointment;

AND WHEREAS the Senate, as a whole, refused to re-examine Professor Marshall's fitness to serve the churches of this Convention as a professor in McMaster, thus compelling those whose conscientious convictions forbade their acquiescence, publicly to appeal to the whole Denomination;

AND WHEREAS the aforementioned considerations prove that Professor Marshall's appointment is only an additional symptom of a deep-seated, persistent, and determined spirit of opposition to the principles in McMaster University which our Baptist people hold dear, and which are written into the instrument upon which the University is founded;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this meeting of Baptists, who are members of churches within the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, declare it to be our conviction that the present condition of distrust and unrest in the Convention has been brought about by repeated acts of defiance of denominational conviction by the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University; and that, in the conviction that nothing short of a radical change in the Governing Bodies of the University can restore peace and confidence to the Convention, we urge all our fellow-Baptists throughout the Convention to whom the faith once for all delivered is precious to join hands in an effort to effect the necessary change;

And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Board of Governors, and to *The Canadian Baptist*.

Mr. Chairman and Christian friends: in speaking to this resolution I would like to say, first of all, that we are not here because of personal animus against any brother-man; we are not met here to-night—either to speak or to listen—because we have not at heart the welfare of our University, and the unity and prosperity of our beloved Denomination: we are met here to-night, my friends, because these things lie on our hearts, and are the things which we most earnestly covet. It is to be deplored that the one real issue before our people to-day is being lost sight of amid personalities. The issue before our Canadian Baptist people is not personalities; the issue, my friends, to-night—this year—is Modernism.

The issue is not Dr. Shields: it was not Dr. Shields who brought Professor Marshall to Canada! (Applause). Dr. Shields did not examine Professor Marshall, and discover that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship! Dr. Shields did not, after making that examination and discovery concerning Mr. Marshall, commend Mr. Marshall to us in the columns of *The Canadian Baptist*! (Applause). Dr. Shields did not refuse to re-open that examination in order that we, as a Denomination, might be saved from the very situation which confronts us to-night! Dr. Shields did not publish that sermon in *The Canadian Baptist*, entitled, "The Insight of Christ"! Dr. Shields did not preach that sermon in James Street Church, Hamilton, entitled, "Coming to Christ"! Dr. Shields did not declare that the man who accepted the literal interpretation of Jonah would be considered in England an "uneducated fool"! Dr. Shields did not say that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship (Applause), which position has rendered the Old Testament a mass of unreliability—Dr. Shields did not do that! It was not Dr. Shields who examined Mr. Marshall, and, with his eyes wide open to what Mr. Marshall believed, and well knowing that Mr. Marshall's views could

not possibly find acceptance with our Canadian people, nevertheless brought Mr. Marshall with his family from England, and placed him in the humiliating position of coming to a strange country to be the storm centre of theological controversy in a Bible-loving Denomination—Dr. Shields did not do Professor Marshall that wrong! (Applause). Someone else did; but I contend, in all fairness, that Dr. Shields was not that man. Let me repeat it: the issue before us to-night, and at the coming Convention, is not Dr. Shields: it is the attitude of our Canadian Baptist Denomination toward Modernism.

Now, there are three attitudes possible toward Modernism: first of all, openly accept it; secondly, mildly tolerate it; thirdly, utterly resist it. ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!")

The history of our Baptist work in England, and in the Northern Baptist Convention, proves conclusively that an attitude of easy-going tolerance toward Modernism, on the part of Bible-loving Baptists, has resulted every time in the downfall of the historic Baptist position. In our own Convention, despite repeated resolutions declaring our repudiation of Modernism in any shape or form, we are yet being compelled by the inexcusable tolerance of our leaders, to spend our time and strength in contending for the faith. It is being borne in upon thoughtful men that only the strongest kind of stand and resistance will ever be effectual in saving the Baptists of Canada from the blight of Modernism. The rank and file of our Baptist people, thank God, are sound in the faith. I read in *The Star* to-night (Applause) that we are facing a split in our Baptist denomination. Now, if *The Star* reporter will call me up to-morrow morning—not before ten o'clock—I will tell him that it is the considered judgment of one minister, at least, who believes he knows our Baptist people, that there is not the shade of a shadow of a chance of a split in this Denomination ("Amen!"). That is my judgment. We are Baptists; we shall remain Baptists,—and in the Baptist ranks; and our people have far too much common sense, and Scriptural knowledge, and loyalty to Jesus Christ, and knowledge of what true Baptist principles mean, ever to fail to rise to the occasion when a clear issue is presented before them of Modernism versus Fundamentalism (Prolonged applause). When a compromiser with Modernism is out of arguments to defend his position, the easiest thing to say is—Dr. Shields!

If we can arouse the Baptist conscience to the meaning and menace of Modernism, we can save the day. This will require the facing of unwelcome facts; it will necessitate a courageous exposure, not only of Modernism in our midst to-day, but of that indefensible policy of compromise which for years defended and supported the modernist professor, Dr. I. G. Matthews, in McMaster University. Dr. Matthews' book proves him to be a modernist of the modernists. Dr. Matthews stands to-night where he always stood. He is in Crozer University, a hot-bed of Modernism and infidelity; and around him he has gathered a little group of our brightest graduates of McMaster. He represents the thing which has blighted every church it has ever touched; and which, if accepted, would paralyze the spiritual power of our Baptist work at home and abroad. What do Canadian Baptists think to-night of the policy of compromise which tolerated, for years, this modernist professor—and defends him to this very day? Is it not evident, my friends, that only the most determined action on the part of our people will ever compel our leaders to recognize that the tolerance of Modernism will eventuate in the disruption of our work, and do grievous harm to the interests of the kingdom of God in our midst?

As for my friend Professor Marshall—and that in sincerity: on two counts I believe it can be proven to an open-minded Baptist that Professor Marshall is a modernist: first of all, on the confession of his own lips, in the denial of the historicity of Jonah; secondly, on the confession of Dr. Farmer, that Professor Marshall accepts Dr. Driver's position on the Old Testament regarding dates and authorship.

I am happy to think that not only are there some two thousand people here to-night, but there will be twenty thousand people who will read the words which are uttered to-night (Dr. Shields: "More than that.") Oh, how I would like to say this word to the Canadian Baptist men and women who shall read these messages: I believe in five minutes any Baptist can see what his duty is regarding our friend Mr. Marshall! If you will spend five minutes doing this

with me: first of all, look at Galatians 3: 8. "And the scripture, foreseeing"—certain things. There is a predictive principle in the Word of God which "foresees". That is the first fact.

Fact number two of five facts which I want to present: I Corinthians 15: 3, 4. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how 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." The remarkable thing about that statement is that the Scriptures referred to are not the New Testament Scriptures—for they were not then written—but the Old Testament Scriptures; and the Apostle Paul said that it was prophesied in the Old Testament that Jesus would die for our sin, be buried, and rise again from the dead—when?—"on the third day according to the scriptures" ("Amen!" "That's the boy!") I do not want any praise, I did not write that.

Fact number three (I am speaking particularly to my forty friends and to my invisible hearers): Jesus Christ knew that there was an Old Testament scripture which prophesied, not only that He would be buried and rise again from the dead, but that He would rise on the third day. After His resurrection, in the twenty-fourth of Luke, He appeared to His disciples, and He read to them the Word of God. He said, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled"—now listen—"which were written in the law of Moses"—Did you hear that, Brother Fieldus, the law was written by Moses, the Driver school says it was not—"which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." And Jesus said unto them, "Thus it is written"—now listen—"and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." It behoved Him to rise—and to rise on the third day. Why on the third day? Because He knew that in the Old Testament there was a prophecy which declared that He would be buried; that He would be entombed for three days; and on the third day rise from the dead "according to the scriptures".

Which Scriptures? Look at fact number four where our Lord tells us which scripture. "Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth"—and I challenge you to produce any other scripture in the Old Testament which plainly tells us Christ would rise on the third day, than the Scripture concerning the resurrection of the prophet Jonah ("Amen!" and applause).

Fact number five: The book of Jonah begins with this verse: "Now the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the son of Amittai, saying"—Who was Jonah of the book of Jonah? He was the son of Amittai. Was he an allegorical character? Certainly not! Listen to this statement God has given us on the subject. In second Kings, an historical book, it is said Jeroboam "restored the coast of Israel from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain, according to the word of the Lord God of Israel, which he spake by the hand of his servant Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet, which was of Gath-hepher." There the Word of God declares that there was a prophet of God named Jonah; his father's name, Amittai; that he was born in the village of Gath-hepher, about half an hour's walk north of Nazareth; and that he prophesied the victories of king Jeroboam!

And so, on the authority of the historical book of second Kings, and on the verification of the Son of God Himself, we believe to-night the historicity of Jonah ("Hallelujah!" "Praise the Lord!") And, brethren, in all kindness, let me say this: that our Baptist people will never accept a man who denies that Jonah, as the Saviour declares, was in the belly of the fish—and Professor Marshall denies that. There is no doubt about that. He will deny having said some things with which he will be charged, but he will never deny that he disbelieves in a real Jonah who was in a real fish and who experienced a real resurrection. He does not believe that, he has said so repeatedly, and when our Canadian Baptist people know that, I believe their duty will be clear.

Now the second count is this: Dr. Farmer declared in the Baptist Convention in Hamilton that Professor Marshall accepted Dr. Driver's views on

the Old Testament, regarding "dates and authorship." Now, if that is true, Mr. Marshall is an out-and-out modernist. I tried to make clear at the Hamilton Convention that there was a world of meaning wrapped up in that phrase, "dates and authorship". My friends, every well-informed person who has read the writings of the critical school knows that the whole question of Modernism rests upon the matter of dates and authorship. One of the greatest conservative scholars of England on that subject says this:

"The critics knew from the first that all depended upon late authorship. Late authorship means dependence upon tradition, or upon legend, instead of upon observation. Instead of testimony at first hand, (as that of Moses or of Joshua would have been), we have now, according to the critics, nothing at all that any sane man can regard as worthy of the name of testimony. Between the time of Moses and the reign of Josiah, about nine centuries elapsed"—may I say, in passing, that the higher critical school denies that the books of Moses were written by him, or written in his day. The critical school—Dr. Driver among them—declares that these books were written in their present form in the time of Josiah, nine hundred years afterward—"Nine centuries from our own time will take us back to the year one thousand of our era, to the time of Canute of England and Malcolm the second of Scotland. Let us suppose that someone was now to write the story of these ancient monarchs for the first time, and to do his utmost to gather everything that floating traditions and local legends could supply, who would dream of regarding the result as history? And who would ever think of quoting it as a record of facts? The late date is the critical mine dug under the citadel of truth. Let it once be fired, and the whole structure subsides into irretrievable ruin.

Of course it does; dates and authorship are the pick and shovel with which Modernism undermines the authority of the Word of God! If Professor Marshall, as Dr. Farmer tells us, accepts Dr. Driver's position on "dates and authorship," then Professor Marshall denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, despite the fact that the five books of the Pentateuch declare themselves to have been written by Moses—and Jesus accepted that fact! It is on the ground of "dates and authorship" that Dr. Driver denies that Hannah said what the Scriptures declare she did say in her inspired song of rejoicing in the first book of Samuel. Dr. Driver says, regarding that beautiful, inspired, song, "The song of Hannah is not early in style, and seems unsuited to Hannah's position"! It was an exalted song; and he could not understand how a poor woman could rise to such heights of worship and praise; he did not know that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God has perfected praise—so he denies that Hannah uttered this song, despite the fact that the song begins with these solemn words: "And Hannah prayed, and said, My heart rejoiceth in the Lord." It is on the ground of "dates and authorship" that Dr. Driver denies that Isaiah wrote the prophecy which bears his name—despite the fact that Jesus Christ, in the twelfth chapter of John, three times declared that Isaiah wrote the book. Well does Dr. John Urquhart say, "If this rag-basket is all that stands for the Old and New Testaments, will Dr. Driver and his fellow-critics tell us where we shall find the oracles of God?" It is on the ground of "dates and authorship" that Dr. Driver denies the authority and the truth of the Old Testament Scriptures, and makes them a mass of unreliability. Dr. Farmer tells us that Mr. Marshall accepts Dr. Driver on "dates and authorship". Therefore Professor Marshall, by a hundred arguments from Dr. Driver's writings, is abundantly proven to be a Modernist.

At the Hamilton Convention when our people voted for Professor Marshall's appointment, they did not know the position of Dr. Driver regarding dates and authorship,—but some of our leaders did; and in spite of that, they supported and defended Professor Marshall. What does it all mean? It means that the voice of the Governing Body of McMaster is not the voice of the people, it means that some of our leaders do not share the attitude of the people of our Denomination toward Modernism; it means that if the conviction of our people on this tremendous question is to find expression, there must be placed upon the Governing Body of the University men who will truly

represent the attitude of our people, and who will see to it that their will shall be faithfully carried out.

Brethren, this is the only wise solution of the problem that confronts us. It is the fair thing to do—and it can be done. Place a sufficient number of men on the Governing Body as will ensure the expressed will of the Denomination being made effective. Let our people join hands and work together prayerfully and courageously towards this end.

I move the adoption of this resolution. (Applause.)

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

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

Lesson 12. THIRD QUARTER Sept. 19.

THE LIGHT OF LIFE.

LESSON TEXT: John, chapter 8.

GOLDEN TEXT.—“Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love Me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of Myself, but He sent me” (John 8:42).

I. JESUS AND THE WOMAN WHO WAS A SINNER—Vss. 1-11.

1. Here we have the spectacle of religious people, manifestly caring nothing about the Law or about sin or the sinner, invoking the Law in opposition to Christ “This they said, tempting Him, that they might have to accuse Him”. It is thus still: many would invoke the thunders of the Law against the transgressor in an attempt at self-justification. 2. Jesus was slow to hear the accusations of the scribes and Pharisees: “Jesus stooped down, and with His finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not”. We have thought it would be interesting to know what Jesus wrote on the ground; we know at least that it is written in His Word that He “willeth not the death of the sinner, but rather that all should come to repentance”. Certain we are of this that He is readier to hear the cry of penitence and the prayer for forgiveness, than to listen to words of accusation. 3. With a wisdom far transcending Solomon’s, He bade such of them as were without sin to execute the sentence they had demanded: “And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last”. By that rule, who of us would dare to be another’s judge? 4. In the presence of Jesus the sinner finds forgiveness instead of condemnation (vss. 10, 11). What a true revelation of God we have here! “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon”.

II. THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD—Vss. 12-32.

1. We must keep always in mind the aim of the writer of this Gospel: he never turns from his course, he is establishing his claim that Jesus is God. Here Christ rests His claim on the joint testimony of Himself and His Father (vss. 12-20). It is most significant that again He rules out the testimony of men. He insists upon His own competence to bear witness to the truth, and then says, “It is also written in your Law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of Myself, and the Father that sent Me beareth witness of Me”. Thus God is His own witness to the truth. Of this David was profoundly conscious when, in his penitential Psalm, he cried, “Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that Thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest, and be clear when Thou judgest”. 2. Christ speaks of His approaching death (vss. 21-28). John, with the other three evangelists, represents Him as moving always toward the Cross. John the Baptist introduced Him as the Lamb of God, as He was about to enter upon His public ministry. He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world: He was born to die. And here He promises that He will

be known and understood in the light of the Cross: "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am He, and that I do nothing of Myself; but as My Father hath taught Me, I speak these things". What a great principle is here—the Cross is the centre of the Christian revelation and only in the light of the Cross can the Incarnation be understood. 3. While many professed to believe on Him as He spake these words, Jesus said, "If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed". The proof of discipleship always is in continuance: "He that continueth to the end, the same shall be saved".

III. A GENERATION OF SLAVES.

When our Lord promised that believers should be free, His hearers answered, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest Thou, Ye shall be made free"? Thus men in chains hug their chains and call them ornaments; whereas Jesus said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin"; "To whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey". 1. Thus men still boast of their freedom who were born in bondage. 2. The Jews were Abraham's seed according to the flesh, but Abraham's true children are such as are born of promise. And Jesus taught them that they bore no resemblance to Abraham because they sought to kill Him, a Man who had told them the truth. 3. Jesus told them they were really the children of the devil (vss. 41-44). All men are not by nature the children of God: indeed they only are His children who have been born again. There is a "spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience". 4. Incidental to this discussion, and yet in agreement with the purpose of this Gospel, Jesus declares that He was before Abraham, and that Abraham rejoiced to see His day and was glad. This, therefore, is Christ's own witness as to His pre-existence: the life of the days of His flesh was but a parenthesis in His eternal existence.

BLESSING AT ORANGEVILLE AND ALTON.

We find it necessary to postpone the printing of the cuts of the corner-stone laying of the Alton Baptist Church until next week; but on Sunday last, August 22nd, the Editor of this paper preached in Alton in the afternoon in the open air to about five hundred people, and baptized fifteen believers. In the evening he preached to a crowded church at Orangeville, and baptized thirteen more. A very gracious revival has visited Orangeville under the ministry of Pastor W. G. Brown, assisted by Pastor James McGinlay. About eighty professed conversion, and we expect that both in Orangeville and in Alton many more will be baptized in the near future. Altogether it was a most happy day.

We were glad to learn that villages round about Orangeville and Alton are inviting these young pastors to visit them with the gospel. In one small place with a population of about eighty, forty were present; and in another little village, with a population of about one hundred, seventy came through a terrific deluge of rain on Saturday night to hear the gospel. Brethren Brown and McGinlay are truly apostolic in their determination to go into all the villages round about preaching.

REV. W. M. ROBERTSON.

Sunday there were showers of blessing in Jarvis Street. A large congregation assembled in the morning when Mr. Robertson delivered a great message. In the evening the church was packed to capacity, and some ten or twelve professed Christ. About two thousand people heard the gospel out-of-doors at the conclusion of the regular evening service. Thus Mr. Robertson must have reached not far short of five thousand people by his ministry on Sunday last. He goes from us for a brief visit to Winnipeg next Sunday, August 29th, returning to Toronto Thursday, September 2nd, when he will deliver his closing address, sailing from Montreal for home, Friday, by S.S. Montclair. We shall have more to say about Mr. Robertson's visit next week.