

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. 18. TORONTO, SEPT. 9th, 1926. Whole No. 228

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHAT IS THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST?

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, September 5th, 1926.
 (Stenographically Reported.)

"Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his!"—Romans 8: 9.



IN these days of much contention for the faith we have heard this text very frequently quoted against those who contend for the faith; and on the authority of this verse we have been exhorted to exhibit the "spirit of Christ". I read an article not long since in which the writer quoted this text, and referred to it as the "acid test" of orthodoxy. Those who thus make use of this passage seem to suppose that the word Spirit is spelled with a small s, that the Spirit of Christ referred to, designates His disposition, His temperament, His temper; and the "Spirit of Christ" is supposed to stand for mere inoffensiveness, for amiability, for leniency, for a kind of tolerance toward everything—it is assumed that the "Spirit" of the text is a spirit of pacifism.

There is no more dangerous practice than the practice of utterly wresting the Scripture by taking a text entirely out of its context. I want, therefore, in a very few words, first of all, to expound the principle of the text.

I.

What is the apostle speaking of here? We read it this morning, and you will have observed that he describes two natures. We are, first of all, born after the flesh, we have a fleshly nature: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh"; and until we are born again, while in our natural state, we are dominated by the carnal mind—which does not mean that men of carnal minds are grossly sensual: it simply means the natural mind, the mind of the flesh which minds the things of time and sense, but has no view nor recognition of the spiritual: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh", the Scripture says; and we are told that "to be carnally minded is death", to be minding the things of the flesh, the things of time and sense, without having any correspondence whatever with the spiritual realm, separated from Him Who is a Spirit—thus to be carnally minded is to die, the minding of the things of the flesh leads inevitably to death.

But there is another nature, there is a spiritual nature. Those who are in the flesh, we are told here, "cannot please God". However educated one may be, however amiable his disposition, however good a neighbour or faithful a

father, however excellent as a citizen, whatever his human relationships may be—he may be a professor, he may be president of a university, he may be a leader in some department of human knowledge, he may be a man of high ethical ideals, he may be a man of unblemished character so far as his outward record is concerned, but however fine he may be in all these respects, if he has never been born again he is still in the flesh, for “that which is born of the flesh is flesh”, and “they that are in the flesh cannot please God”. But, I say, there is another nature, a spiritual nature: we are born from above, we are born of the Spirit, we are begotten by the word of truth through the gospel; and “that which is born of the Spirit”, saith our Lord, “is spirit”. He differentiates between the two. Let me quote the whole text again: “That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” And it was in that connection He said, “Ye must be born again”; “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.”

Here the Apostle Paul is speaking of such as have been born of the Spirit, and who are no longer in the flesh, they have another nature, they have a spiritual nature: “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you”—you have been born again, and you have been born again by the Spirit, by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Therefore, Paul says, we are no longer in the flesh but in the Spirit, if the Spirit of Christ dwell in us.

Then we have this tremendous utterance: “Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” The argument is that every believer who believes on Christ, having been born of the Spirit, must, of necessity, have the Spirit. Everybody who has ever been born from above has the Holy Ghost in some measure; for “if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his”. If you have not the Holy Ghost, then you are not a Christian: to say that one may be a Christian without having the Holy Spirit is absolutely to deny the teaching of God’s Word. Everybody who has been born again has the Spirit; and if he has not the Spirit, he has not been born again, and he is none of Christ’s. But the believer—do not make any mistake—may, alas, grieve the Spirit, he may oppose the Spirit, he may live at a poor dying rate, crowding the Spirit out of much of his life; but if the very life of God is in him, it was implanted there by the regenerating grace of the Spirit, and that life is the life that beats from God, it is eternal life, and will always remain. We may grieve the Spirit, but, on the other hand, it is our privilege so to yield to the Spirit that every avenue of our nature will be open to Him; and we may “be filled with the Spirit.”

Let me put you young Christians on guard against a grievous error here. Every true believer has the Holy Spirit, and it is our privilege now to surrender to Him absolutely, day by day, hour by hour, and all through life, yielding ourselves to His domination, that our lives may be flooded by the divine Energy, that we may be under His control; and that the fruits of the Spirit may appear in our lives. If you have not the Spirit you are none of His. What a terrible fate that would be, to have no part whatever in Jesus Christ, to be none of His! What a terrible thing if His cross had no relation to me; if His grave were not my grave; His resurrection not my resurrection; His ascension and intercession at the Father’s right hand of no profit whatever to me; if I had no part in the inheritance of the saints; if the blessed hope of His return were no joy at all to me! If I have not the Spirit, if I have not been born again—I may be a professor in theology, I may be conspicuous in religious leadership of some sort; but if I have not the Spirit, then I do not belong to Christ. Do not beg the question, that is the plain matter of fact: if you have not been born of the Holy Ghost, quickened by divine power, whatever you are or are not, whatever you have or have not, you are none of Christ’s. Oh, that we may be sure of our interest in Him!

That is just to set the text in its context.

I shall deal particularly this morning with the assumption that to have the “Spirit of Christ” is to be so amiable, and so pacific, and so tolerant of everything, that a man will not quarrel even with the Devil—but he will be just “hail fellow, well met”, so gentle, so loving, so kind, that he will have no rebuke for sin anywhere.

II.

Well, let us see. I must ask a few questions: IS IT POSSIBLE THAT A MAN WHO DENIES THE AUTHORITY OF THESE SCRIPTURES, BREATHED BY THE SPIRIT,

INSPIRED BY THE HOLY GHOST—IS IT POSSIBLE THAT A MAN WHO DENIES THE GOD-BREATHED SCRIPTURES, HAS THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST? or, in such denial, is speaking by the Spirit of Christ? God cannot deny Himself; and the Holy Spirit will never deny His Own signature, nor repudiate the authority of that Word which He has inspired. I do not care how amiable a man may be, how engaging his personality, how excellent his character, how winsome and attractive in his relationships with men—I affirm that the man who denies the supreme authority of the Bible as the Word of God is not speaking by the Spirit of Christ, whatever he has. The Holy Ghost will not deny that which He has written.

Or, to be specific for a moment, the spirit that denies the supreme authority, the infallibility, of the book of Genesis is not the Spirit of Christ. "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. . . . He saith"—God the Holy Ghost saith—"Not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ"—the Holy Ghost said that, He said it in the book of Genesis. It is useless to say that the man who will say, respecting the inspired record of creation, that where that disagrees with science, he will submit to the authority of science first—I say, that the man who takes that position does despite to the Spirit of God. It is contradicting the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Spirit never contradicts Himself.

Are we necessarily lacking in the Spirit of Christ because we oppose, for instance, Canon Driver's view of the Scriptures? Read the one hundred and tenth Psalm, that marvellous prophecy about Melchizedek, and the prophecy which our Lord Himself quoted when He said, "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?" Peter takes that Psalm also into his sermon on the day of Pentecost, and, according to the record, "being full of the Holy Ghost", he makes application of that Psalm to Christ saying, "The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore"—listen!—"therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." That was the climax of his sermon, that was his master argument; and under the power of it three thousand were convicted of their sin. I say, that the men who say that the one hundred and tenth Psalm is not a Messianic psalm, as Dr. Driver and those of his school say, however scholarly they may be, they cannot possibly have the spirit; for the Holy Ghost will not say one thing in this Book and contradict it in modern writing.

So I may go on and cite the familiar case of the book of Jonah. Beyond peradventure, the evangelists, writing by inspiration, record the very words of our Lord; and our Lord says that Jonah was an historical character, and that which is recorded of him did actually, literally, take place. It is, if language means anything, indisputable that Jesus Christ subscribed to the historicity of the book of Jonah; and I say that the man who denies the historicity of the book of Jonah, as our Professor Marshall does, whatever he may have, in that denial, he has not the Holy Spirit: it is impossible that the Spirit of God should say one thing here and then absolutely contradict it elsewhere.

Take another instance: a brother came to me the other day and said, "You ought to love Dr. Fosdick." I said, "I do love him as a poor benighted sinner; but as a Christian teacher I absolutely repudiate him, and regard him as an enemy of the gospel." Someone will say, "You ought to have the Spirit of Christ." Well, I ask you this: Can a man have the Holy Spirit who repudiates the virgin birth and the essential Deity of Jesus Christ? How came Christ into the world? He was begotten of the Holy Ghost, He had but one human parent: "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." The promise of Scripture was that the "seed of the woman" should bruise the serpent's head. Jesus Christ was the son of Mary, but He was not the son of Joseph. The Scripture says that He was divinely begotten. Will any man tell me that the man who intrudes upon that holy Mystery and dares to deny—as Fosdick and many of his school do—the truth of that Scripture which says, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and

the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God"—the Holy Ghost will never deny that; and the man who denies it, who says that it involves a "biological miracle that is incredible to the modern mind", simply exemplifies the truth that the carnal mind is enmity against God—but I say that the man who denies that is of the flesh, and cannot please God. The Holy Spirit will never deny that Jesus Christ is, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, one God.

III.

Once again: CAN IT BE SAID THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT IS SPEAKING THROUGH THE MAN WHO DENIES THE EFFICACY OF THE PRECIOUS BLOOD, OR THE VICARIOUSNESS OF THE ATONEMENT OF JESUS CHRIST? It is very wonderful, dear friends, to observe that the whole work of redemption was participated in, and is participated in, by the whole Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. When Jesus began His public ministry He was buried beneath Jordan's wave, and the heaven's opened and the Spirit of God, in the form of a dove, descended and lighted upon Him, and a voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased"—when, by His baptism, our Lord prophesied and predicted His death in our behalf, going into the grave and coming out of the grave, the Father and the Holy Ghost approved of His act.

And what saith the Scriptures about that atonement? Let me read a few verses from the epistle to the Hebrews. What is the significance of the blood of Christ? Listen: "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh"—mark this, will you?—"how much more shall the blood of Christ"—the blood of Christ! How was it shed?—"how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" The "eternal Spirit" was in that great Sacrifice; it was through the "eternal Spirit" that Jesus Christ offered Himself without spot for us: God the Holy Ghost was at Calvary, and by His power Jesus offered Himself; and the Holy Spirit will never repudiate the atonement which was there accomplished. And I say openly and frankly and without apology, that the man who denies that salvation is through the blood of Christ, and the blood of Christ alone; whoever he may be, has not the Spirit of Christ—the Holy Ghost will never deny that.

IV.

But there is another simple observation: NO MAN SPEAKING BY THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL EVER BOAST OF HUMAN GOODNESS. "They that are in the flesh", I repeat, "cannot please God"; we must be born again in order to please God. The special function of the Holy Ghost is to convict of sin and righteousness and judgment. There is nothing in Scripture to support the theory that there are elements of indestructible goodness in the natural man: "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God"; we are "dead in trespasses and in sins"; "For in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." You remember the gross, inexcusable comment which Professor Marshall made on that verse when I challenged him on that point: "Did I say that the spiritual instinct was in the liver? Did I say it was in the lights? Did I say it was in the blood? I said nothing of the sort." What is the meaning of that scripture? Paul is speaking of the fleshly nature, the carnal mind; and that which is born of the flesh is flesh until it is quickened by the Spirit, and he said, "In me, in that natural state, dwelleth no good thing." And men who are speaking by the Holy Ghost do not speak like that in contradiction of the teaching of the Word of God.

And so of the whole category of revealed truth. Who is the Holy Spirit? Who or what is the Spirit of Christ? The Spirit of Christ is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth; and the Spirit of Truth has no concord with untruth, the Spirit of Light has no agreement with darkness. "He will guide you into all truth." Pilate asked, "What is truth?" and went away without an answer. Can you answer it—what is truth? I can answer it—not on my own account, but from the Book. This is the answer: "Sanctify them"—Jesus said in His high priestly prayer in the seventeenth chapter of John—"Sanctify them through

thy truth: thy word is truth." God's Word is truth without any admixture of error, for it is inspired by the Spirit of Truth; and no man denies that Word by the Holy Ghost—it is some other spirit, not the Spirit of Christ that leads men to a denial of the Word of God.

V.

Are we then to be charged with not having the Spirit because we warn men of the dangers of the day? Has the Holy Spirit anything to say about that? Listen: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly"—and the idea is that He dictates the words, that He speaks with express words—"the Spirit speaketh expressly"—what has the Spirit to say?—"that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron." The Word of God says that it is the Holy Spirit that expressly warns us that in the latter times some will depart from the faith. Are we running counter to the Spirit when we call attention to the very things that the Spirit teaches, when we warn men to be on their guard?

VI.

I wish I could go into it at length, but I shall just read a word or two before I close of the example we have in Jesus Christ. He returned from His temptation in the power of the Spirit, and wrought in the power of the Spirit, for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one; and listen for a moment to what the Spirit of Christ says through the lips of Christ about false teaching: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte"—and let me remind you that this thing against which we do battle does compass sea and land literally to make proselytes; it is the most aggressive thing in the world, a pestilential rodent, gnawing its way into every religious house. What does He say of that ancient time—"and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves"—it was the Spirit of Christ that said that! I have only time to pick out a few passages—"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." Then He concludes His terrible indictment with these words: "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers"—the Spirit of Christ is speaking when He says—"ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" To whom were they spoken? To false teachers, to people who were blind guides, leading people to destruction, in opposition to the Word and will of God.

My brethren, let us speak the truth in love always; but as we have the Spirit of Christ I am persuaded that we shall stand uncompromisingly by this Book, and for the eternal verities of the faith.

Are there any unconverted here this morning? Are there any that are none of Christ's? It is not important that you should be a member of the church—although all Christians ought to belong to the body of Christ's people. It is not so serious if you have but little money and few friends, or if, indeed, you have poor health; but to be "none of His", to be without Him, to be on the outside of the gate, to be in danger of hearing Him say, "Depart from me. I never knew you"—that is a terrible thing. How may you become His? By believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, by taking this old Book for what it is, the "word of God that liveth and abideth for ever", by believing that He died, and was buried, and rose again, and ascended, and is interceding, and is coming back again—that is the whole gospel. Just leave your sins with Christ and sing,

"Jesus paid it all,
All to Him I owe;
Sin had left a crimson stain,
He washed it white as snow."

May we be all His to-day and for ever.

Shall we bow in prayer: O Lord, we rejoice that when Thou dost save

us, Thou dost abide with us, as we heard in song this morning, "Our Lord abideth." We would not think of Thee as an absent Saviour. We know Thou didst die for us, and in the Person of the Holy Spirit Thou art here to dwell in us, and that we may have Thee all the time, and every day. We pray that this morning some may be led to decision by these simple words. May those of us who are Thy children so yield ourselves to the Spirit of God that we may be witnesses, that we may be able to say, "We are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him." Hear us in Jesus' name, Amen.

THE CROSS AND THE CRITICS.

An Address by the Editor.

Delivered at the Pre-Convention Fundamentalist Conference (Dr. J. C. Masee, President), Des Moines, Iowa, June 21, 1921.

"When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it." But the Incarnate Word was crucified, and His voice was temporarily silenced, notwithstanding Pilate's assumed neutrality. And still the cause of evangelical truth suffers more from Pilate's washbowl, than from all the open assaults launched from the palace of the high priests of the Higher Criticism. The church has more to fear from the hand-washing of politic Pilate, than from all the hand-writing of Professor Calaphas and President Annas. The spirit of compromise which, while acknowledging the baselessness of the charges against God's Word, proposes first, to "chastise Him and let Him go"; and then, failing thus to placate the enemy, washes the hand which signs the death-warrant, is one of the deadliest foes of the truth. There are men who once boldly avowed their allegiance to the Word of God and the gospel of our salvation, who warm themselves by the critic's fire, and have no courage to withstand even the taunt of the critics' fashion-following maid-servant. In professors' chairs, in denominational offices, in pulpits, and in pews, there are men who, having examined the Bible for themselves "have found no fault" in it, but who yet have no word of protest to offer when they see the Holy Book given over to the mockers, the nails, and the spear of the critics, because it makes itself the Word of God.

In the hope of stirring to action, and to courageous defense of the gospel some who are essaying the impossible role of the innocent neutral in relation to the battle for revealed truth, I venture to attempt to show how Modernism crucifies the Son of God afresh, and puts Him to an open shame. And when I employ the term "Modernism" I use it merely as a convenient name for that dogmatic assumption and assertion of critical certitude which denies the plenary divine inspiration and consequent unity of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

I.

And I begin with the observation that *Modernism finds its chief opponent in the Lord Jesus Christ*. Of those who have boasted "the assured results" of modern Biblical Criticism, as of those who gloried in the works of the law, it may be said, "They stumbled at that stumbling stone."

There are no defenders of the Old Testament Scriptures, like the writers of the New Testament. The New Testament attests the historicity of the record of Creation, of the Fall of Man, of Cain and Abel, of Enoch and Noah, of Abraham and all the patriarchs, of Melchisedec, of Moses, and of those who followed after.

The only record we have of Jesus Christ represents Him, implicitly or explicitly, as accepting the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and the authenticity of the stories of Creation and the Deluge, of Abraham and Jonah; it represents Him as fulfilling the Scriptures by His birth of a virgin; as deliberately reading a passage from Isaiah's prophecy at the beginning of His public ministry and declaring it to be fulfilled in Himself; as fulfilling to the minutest detail prophecies relating to His death; and as assuming always in all His teaching the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures;

and, while finding His whole ministry predicted therein, as being so sure of its trustworthiness as to quote it as His final answer to the devil himself.

It would seem, indeed, that every possible point of attack upon the Bible has been anticipated by the inspiring and directing Spirit of God, to the extent of recording our Lord's approval of practically every part of the Old Testament which has been subject to the critics' assaults. For it is impossible for the critic to escape the necessity of arguing his case at last before Christ as the supreme Judge. However petty the critics' complaint respecting this Word, he finds his case carried, whether he will or no, to the Supreme Court where Jesus Christ presides; so that it would appear that God has said of this City of Truth, as of ancient Zion, "Behold, I lay therein a stumbling stone and a rock of offence." Jesus Christ is the Rock upon which Modernism splits: "A stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the Word, being disobedient."

II.

Modernism cannot prevail against an infallible Christ. In Canada the opponents of prohibition avow their allegiance to temperance principles. They are opposed to the "tyranny" of prohibition because they believe in "personal liberty". And we have Baptists who object to the "tyranny" of those who are resolved to control their own institutions, and to see that the money they give is used for the propagation of principles in which they believe. And when objection is taken to the use of Baptist money and Baptist institutions for the dissemination of views which would destroy the Baptist denomination, these theological revolutionaries demand exemption from all restriction in the sacred name of Baptist "liberty". The truth is, standards of any kind are irksome to the man who would be a law unto himself. And this seems to be emphatically true of the destructive critic. He finds that Jesus Christ stands in the way of his theories. The great Teacher contradicts him at every turn. The critic's only hope of success is in proving the fallibility of Christ. It seems to me that it is logically impossible to evade the issue. Choice must be made between Christ and the critics. It is unnecessary for me to deal with the attempts which are made to prove the fallibility of Christ, while seeking to escape, or, rather, to avoid acknowledging, the logical implications of the denial of His infallibility. The "assured results" of modern criticism are a Babel tower, which, when an infallible Christ has pronounced upon it, becomes but a heap of confusion.

The true disciple of Jesus Christ will not demand "liberty" to differ from, or contradict his Lord. He will glory in being the bond-slave of Christ whom he delights to honour in all realms of life. He will crown Him Lord of his intellectual life, rejoicing in the use of those weapons of warfare which are not carnal, but which are "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing which exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." No Christian, and no Baptist, has "liberty" to entertain a view of the Scriptures which is contrary to Christ.

III.

The Infallibility of Christ, in the nature of things, is involved in His Deity; you cannot disprove the one without the other. I shall not argue that which is self-evident. It is enough to say that the only record we have of Him never represents Him as expressing a mere opinion, or as uttering a doubtful word. His questions were always the questions of a teacher, put, not to elicit, but to impart information. "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." He said, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" As He claimed to have power in heaven and on earth, so He claimed a full knowledge both of earthly and heavenly things. To surrender to Modernism involves not only the denial, but the betrayal, of the impeccable Man, the infallible Teacher, and the incarnate God.

Respecting the resurrection, Paul said, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ; whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." It is still more

emphatically true, that if Christ Himself be found a false witness of God, our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins.

IV.

Let us now consider *the relation of Modernism to the death of Christ*. What construction does "modern scholarship" put upon the death of Christ? That must depend upon the view it takes of His person. Does it content itself with taking a sandal from His feet, or with cutting a piece from the skirt of His robe, or with roughening His hand, or with plucking but one laurel leaf from His brow? Has it discerned an astigmatism in His spiritual vision, a defect in His intelligence, or a hisping uncertainty in His speech? Is it engaged in the removal of a rank growth of tradition which has grown up about the Castle of Truth, so as to afford the eye of faith an unobstructed view of its perfection? Does it concern itself with cleaning the glasses, or even with putting new lenses in the lighthouse of Revelation that it may more clearly direct the mariner on the pathless sea of life?

Let us see.

The charge against Jesus was that, "He made Himself the Son of God." It was for this He was crucified. It may be said that He died by His own testimony; for when the council had heard Him, they said, "What need we any further witnesses? for we ourselves have heard of His own mouth." And to precisely the same conclusion does the reasoning of Modernism lead us to-day. Only by a logic that is as lame as Mephibosheth, and which cannot limp beyond the boundaries of Lodebar, can the higher critical view of the Scriptures escape the necessity of denying the deity of Christ. And when driven along that road, what find we in the Cross?

In the first place, it loses its redeeming power. If the Sufferer of Golgotha was not God, "manifest in the flesh", the cross can have no atoning value. If God was not in Christ, He cannot through Him have reconciled the world unto Himself. If in Christ we have a mistaken dreamer who, by such knowledge as He then possessed, being ignorant of "the assured results" of modern criticism, could not have qualified for a professorship in divinity in some of our advanced theological seminaries, He must have been without capacity to bear our sins in His own body on the tree. Unless in nature and essence He was one with God, unless "His Godhead gave Him an infinite capacity, and infused a boundless degree of compensation into all the pangs He bore", there can have been no vicariousness in His suffering, and no expiatory value in His death: that being true, there is no

"fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Immanuel's veins,
Where sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains."

The modernist is as blind to the spiritual significance of the death of Christ as was the neutral Pilate who signed the death warrant, or the soldiers who nailed Him to the tree. Indeed, I venture to believe it is no exaggeration to say, that the logic of the critical view of the Person of Jesus puts into the lips of Modernism the sentiments, if not the very words, of the Pharisees of ancient time as they contemplated the death of Christ: "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while He was yet alive, After three days I will rise again: command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night, and steal Him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead. So the last error shall be worse than the first." Modernism has done its best to follow Pilate's suggestion; the logic of its reasoning would make the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.

But to return to the cross. To the "advanced" critic the loss of the "Fountain filled with Blood" is no loss at all; for his reasoning would lead us seriously to question whether we have any "guilty stains" to lose. For this strange and "strong delusion" which seems to have fallen upon so large a part of the professed Church of Christ would not only rob us of a Redeemer, but would rob us also of any trustworthy revelation from God.

If Christ be fallible, and the Scriptures untrustworthy, who shall tell us of our state? or who shall show us the path of life? The doctrines of the fall

of man; of sin and its punishment; of the new birth; of justification by faith; of the ministry of the Holy Spirit; of the resurrection of the dead; of the second advent, of judgment to come; all these doctrines fail, and the whole historic evangelical position crumbles, with the surrender of the infallibility and eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ.

I met one not long since, whom I knew in years gone by as a worshipper of Jesus the incarnate God. But he had turned at the forked roads, and when I met him recently he had travelled far along the road of rationalism; and apparently, his logic gave him a through ticket to the end of the way. When I opposed his rationalism with the word of divine Revelation, he smiled at my simplicity. I said, "I suppose you don't believe in revelation?" He replied, "If you mean by that, any sort of extra-mundane revelation, no."

And it appears to me impossible to stop short of that conclusion if once the fallibility of Christ be postulated. Is it therefore necessary to contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints? Can the ship we know as the Church weather the storm with this Jonah of Modernism on board? Can we lighten the ship or calm the sea by casting our doctrinal wares into the sea? Or must we take the modernist who will neither preach the preaching which God bids him himself, nor let any one else do it, and heave him overboard?

Once in the ancient time Ben-hadad the King of Syria gathered all his host together, and went up and besieged Samaria. And he sent messengers to Ahab king of Israel saying, "Thus saith Ben-hadad, thy silver and thy gold is mine; thy wives also and thy children, even the goodliest are mine. And the king of Israel answered and said, My lord, O king, according to thy saying I am thine, and all that I have. And messengers came again and said, Thus speaketh Ben-hadad, saying, Although I have sent unto thee, saying, Thou shalt deliver me thy silver, and thy gold, and thy wives and thy children; yet I will send my servants unto thee to-morrow about this time, and they shall search thine house, and the houses of thy servants; and it shall be that whatsoever is pleasant in thine eyes, they shall put it in their hand and take it away."

"Then the King of Israel called all the elders of the land, and said, Mark, I pray you, and see how this man seeketh mischief: for he sent unto me for my wives, and for my children, and for my silver, and for my gold, and I denied him not."

"And all the elders and all the people said unto him, Hearken not unto him, nor consent."

And this Ben-hadad of Modernism is equally insatiable. Trembling Israelites have surrendered the early chapters of Genesis, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the historicity of Jonah, and many of "the goodliest" of the treasures of Holy Writ; but this Ben-hadad will not be appeased. He will send his servants to search the whole house of revelation, and whatsoever is desirable in our eyes "they shall put it in their hands, and take it away". What will all the elders and all the people say to this demand? What limits shall be put to the predatory "liberty" which this Modernism claims for itself? The wise man said, "There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things say not, It is enough; the grave and the barren womb; the earth that is not filled with water; and the fire that saith not, It is enough." To-day there is a fifth. The insatiable mania of "modern scholarship" would devour the whole Bible.

I believe that if once the issue can be fairly faced, and the people can be made to see the implications of this deadly movement, the great multitude who have a personal experience of the saving grace of God, and of the sovereign Saviourhood of Jesus Christ, will thunderously reply, "Hearken not unto him nor consent."

V.

And now let me speak this heartening word in conclusion. The cross was no accident. Dark as was the day, fearful as was the agony, wicked as were the hands which nailed to a cross of wood the Son of God, His absolute sovereignty never shone more clearly than at the place called Golgotha. By wicked hands they crucified and slew the One who was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. By their denial of His every claim, they only proved the truth of that which they denied: "Because they knew Him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning Him. And though they found no

cause of death in Him, yet desired they Pilate that He should be slain. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of Him, they took Him down from the tree, and laid Him in a sepulchre. But God raised Him from the dead."

And the critics are fulfilling the Scriptures in condemning them; for "the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." To the believer in the Scriptures the "perilous times" when so many are "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth", are no surprise. For they who are "mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of the apostles of the Lord and Saviour, know this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."

My brethren, let us take courage! As there was no sepulchre which could hold the Incarnate Word, so there are no means by which this Bible can be destroyed. The original is kept where the alleged "assured results" of the critics have no weight: forever God's word is settled in heaven! And when heaven shall be opened, and the Rider of the White Horse shall come down the skies, He shall be clothed in a vesture dipped in blood: and His name is called the Word of God. And He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords".

Editorial.

LET US PRAY.

We would again remind our readers of the approaching Convention. We are constrained to believe that all who desire the spiritual welfare of the denomination, whatever their opinions respecting the present controversy may be, must feel some concern for the issue of that great gathering. On one point all who really know the Lord must be agreed, and that is, that the Convention should be with us all a subject of special prayer. Baptists have always believed that Christ is the true Head of the Church, and that the Holy Spirit in this dispensation is the Administrator of its affairs. In our conversations or in our public speeches we may make mistakes, and by so doing influence those who hear us in the wrong direction, but we can make no such mistakes when we pray. If we ask for wrong things our prayers will not be answered, or at least our desires will not be granted; and if we pray according to the will of God our prayers will prevail. Many of the readers of *The Gospel Witness* will remember the Convention at Ottawa in 1919. At that time the tension was not so great as it is to-day, but much prayer was offered; and the victory gained for the truth at Ottawa was unmistakably wholly the Lord's. The Spirit of God swept through that great assembly like a prairie fire. When the great company repeatedly expressed the deep convictions of its soul no one could doubt that the shout of a king was in the camp. It would be unworthy for anyone of us to approach the coming Convention with a desire for personal victory. Of course, we are aware that no matter what the Editor of this paper may say he will be charged with hypocrisy, for in some quarters he is credited with nothing but evil. Notwithstanding, he is absolutely sincere when he declares that he is entirely indifferent as to his personal relation to the Convention. He loves his brethren but he loves the truth more. For the past five or six years, in his denominational relationships, he has lived in a kind of purgatory: albeit in his own church he has found a paradise; but the one thing we desire above all others is that the things which have happened unto us should fall out to the furtherance of the Gospel. Modernism has spread like a plague through the land. Spiritual effort in many directions

has been paralyzed, and religion, by the mass of the people, is being increasingly held in contempt. We have a great fear that this may come to our beloved Baptist denomination. Could we do so with a clear conscience we would gladly withdraw from the fight. We have plenty to do with preaching and writing without this long contention. As we see it there is but one cure for our present ills, and that is, a great spiritual revival; but we have no hope that such a revival can come if we consent to any course which involves dishonouring God's Word. We humbly and wonderingly confess that our resolve to continue the fight for the faith is strengthened by the blessing which continues to be poured out upon our own church. Whatever may be the experience of others who have been thrust into religious controversy we gladly bear witness that it has not embittered our spirit nor in any way impaired the effectiveness of our ministry. Our stand has made many enemies, but from the beginning of the conflict until now there has never been an hour when we could not with absolute sincerity pray, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us". We find no difficulty in blessing those who curse us or in praying for those who spitefully use us. They injure themselves far more than they injure us. We venture therefore to suggest that whatever else we do we should all earnestly pray that the mighty power of the Holy Ghost may be present at every session of the Convention, and that God may sovereignly overrule all to His glory. We wish we could awake as from a nightmare and discover that we have been entirely mistaken respecting McMaster University. In this matter we would a thousand times rather be wrong than right. It would be the greatest joy of life to discover that McMaster is soundly based upon the Word of God; but with the teaching of Professor Marshall before us; with the apology of Dr. Farmer and Dr. Whidden for modernism written so that all can read; with Professor J. G. Brown's attempt to show that the greatest of men, if they live long enough, outgrow their strict orthodoxy, it is impossible for us to believe other than that McMaster is at present a menace to the spiritual welfare of the denomination; but if God should send us a revival, bringing us all to the feet of Christ anew, and to a more implicit confidence in God's Word, what an unspeakable blessing that would bring! When we came home from the London Convention in 1924, we assumed that Modernism in the Convention had received its quietus, and in our joy we wrote an article in which we expressed our readiness to join with Dr. John McNeill, as we had done in the Forward Movement, in a tour of the Convention, appealing to all our churches for a great education Forward Movement Fund. After dictating the article we had to leave town before it was transcribed. Before it went to press the article was read by another who wired us expressing the fear that modernism might be lurking in its dugouts and it was too soon to throw our guns away. The article therefore was not published, but we are minded to publish it now, as illustrating our good intentions. But we shall see.

THE CHANCELLOR AND DEAN CRITICIZE "THE GOSPEL WITNESS".

The Canadian Baptist of September 9th publishes a communication signed by Chancellor H. P. Whidden and Dean J. H. Farmer, referring to our editorial of last week entitled, "The Ontario and Quebec Convention at the Cross-Roads". Having quoted our appeal to all churches standing for the old faith to see that they are duly represented at the Convention, this communication says:

"It is quite evident that the editor (that is, of *The Gospel Witness*) intends to convey to his readers the idea that McMaster University and some churches of the Convention do not believe in the old faith, etc., and that all the churches who do should register their votes against the University at the coming Convention.

"We desire to assure the churches that the theological faculty of McMaster University would subscribe to the above declaration with as good faith as Dr. Shields. We resent the suggestion that McMaster University stands for any divergence from the historic Baptist position. McMaster University is quite prepared to present its theological position

to the Convention for consideration. We believe that we shall receive a fair hearing and can assure the delegates to the Convention that they will not be called upon to make any such choice as is indicated by the editor of *The Gospel Witness*."

The Chancellor and Dean say, "We resent the suggestion that McMaster University stands for any divergence from the historic Baptist position"; but the Chancellor and the Dean and all the Governing Bodies are supporting Professor Marshall. We have already quoted Professor Marshall many times, but Rev. John Dodds, in the same issue of *The Canadian Baptist*, quotes Professor Marshall as follows:

"I believe the Scriptures to be inspired, but is not this great book inspired? (reference being made to Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*) is not Tennyson and the other poets inspired? Are not your sermons inspired? and could not my mother's letters be inspired?" Further in this connection Prof. Marshall said, "We do not find God in books, but in the heart. Where is the seat of authority for religion? Would you be religious if the church and the Bible were gone? Experience is independent of these two factors. What we want to get home to the people is that real authority for religion is in men's souls. The foundation of my religion is in my soul."

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick himself could not have surpassed that statement. The Chancellor and the Dean say: "McMaster University is quite prepared to present its theological position to the Convention for consideration." We have no doubt whatever of that. The Theological Faculty did that in the Bloor Street Convention in 1910. In our innocence we supposed that when men solemnly set their signatures to a statement of religious belief they meant what they said, and we took the responsibility of seconding Mr. McNeill's amendment, which referred the whole matter back to the Board of Governors and charged them to keep the institution in accord with the theological statement made. We did that to save the Convention from disruption. What followed? Professor I. G. Matthews was retained for nine years, during which time he poisoned the springs of our denominational life; and during all that time Dean Farmer defended him—and so far as we know, defends him to this day.

Dr. Farmer has admitted that he knew Professor Marshall to be of the Driver school. Has the Dean the temerity to declare that Dr. Driver's position involves no "divergence from the historic Baptist position"? Has Dr. Farmer absolutely no respect for ordinary Baptist intelligence? He has accepted responsibility for Professor Marshall's appointment, jointly with the Chancellor; and when the Chancellor and Dean Farmer say, "We resent the suggestion that McMaster University stands for any divergence from the historic Baptist position", they set their signatures to an implication that is absolutely untrue.

In the first of the paragraphs of the University communication referred to, they say: "It is quite evident that the editor (of *The Gospel Witness*) intends to convey to his readers the idea that McMaster University and some churches of the convention do not believe in the old faith." Just before *The Canadian Baptist* came to our hand we received a letter from an Anglican gentleman. He is a lawyer of distinction, a K.C., and one who is not likely to speak without having full knowledge of the facts. His home is in Toronto, but at present he is out of the city, and this is what he says:

"The Baptist minister here ——— is an enemy of the Cross, as no doubt you know. He says that John 3: 3, 'Ye must be born again', is an isolated passage and that the nurses in the hospital and the heroines in the picture shows are all saviours, and so on. You are badly needed here. Is there anything we can do to help besides pray? . . . Our town is in a desperate condition and we feel that if there could be the same effort put forth by Godly men as has been done in Alton that results would be much the same."

This looks as though our ministry and our churches are not quite as free from the taint of Modernism as some people suppose. We, however, still hold to the belief—and we hope we shall never have to change our mind—that the rank and file of our people are still true to the faith. But did not Dr. Farmer

himself say, something to the effect, that Dr. Shields was mistaken in supposing that more than ninety per cent. of our Baptists adhered to the old position? Did he not say that many of the "better educated" among them had adopted the new view? Did he not also say that if there were two colleges, one could afford to be strictly orthodox; but as there was only one, both views should be represented? Why, in this pre-Convention utterance, should the Chancellor and the Dean object to our appeal to the churches who hold to the historic position to see that they are fully represented? Why should they object to the implication that there may be some churches which are sympathetic toward the new view?—we are only saying what Dr. Farmer said before us.

From this communication it would seem probable that once again the University will present its election platform, that it will prepare an absolutely orthodox statement, it will arrange a procession of speakers to gather up and declare that that statement represents the University; it will probably arrange for a testimonial meeting, and call a lot of students to rise and tell how orthodox they are—and when two-thirds of the time has been occupied with a presentation of the University's course, the presiding officer will probably enquire, as the other side rises to speak, whether there is to be any limitations to the speeches.

Nothing that the Chancellor and Dean Farmer can say will relieve them of the responsibility for bringing Professor Marshall here with a full knowledge of his position. No statement the University can make can neutralize the false teaching of Professor Marshall, in class room and pulpit. That which we have quoted above is only a sample of Professor Marshall's general position. We do not believe the Baptists of this Convention, when once they know the facts, will consent to the use of McMaster University for the propagation of such views.

"THE CANADIAN BAPTIST'S" FUNNY COLUMN.

One of the most amusing letters we have read for some time appears in *The Canadian Baptist* this week entitled, "A Suggestion", and is signed, "A Member of Arts, '27, McMaster". This student complains that he is having a very hard time. He says that in the particular field where he serves, though they have had "four McMaster students within the last four or five years, and no person will say that any one of them did not preach the real Gospel. And yet, in spite of this, there is still doubt in the people's minds as to whether McMaster turns out sound preachers or not." They have had four samples—they ought to know! One would conclude from this letter that in the particular district where this student is labouring the sentiment is pretty strong in opposition to McMaster.

The writer concludes his letter by suggesting that the educational session should be omitted this year altogether! We have sometimes criticized Editor Kipp, but this time we must most heartily commend him for admitting to his columns one really funny thing. That letter is cheerful enough to cheer any preacher on the bluest Monday that ever dawned. It is almost good enough for a place in *Punch*!

And then to cap the climax, in the concluding paragraph of his letter, he says, "Could it not be moved that only those churches which help support the University shall have any say in guiding its affairs?" To this we reply, "Yes". A man can move anything if he is idiot enough to do it! Whether the Convention would pass it would be another matter. It is not so very long ago since the churches were asked for the first time to contribute to McMaster: until then the endowment had been regarded as sufficient for its maintenance. The fact is, every Baptist church member in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec is a shareholder in McMaster. Those who regularly contribute are buying a little extra stock; but every Baptist church member has a vested interest in McMaster University.

But we need not argue with the writer of this letter. We only hope, as a train running behind its schedule may make up its lost time, that between now and the time of graduation he will be able so to overtake his arrears as to be in a position to justify his stay in McMaster. Of course, if his letter was intended to be a piece of deliberate humour, we withdraw the implication of our last remark, and say we stand ready to nominate him to an important position on the staff of *Punch*!

A TORONTO PASTOR GOES WEST.

We learned from *The Toronto Globe* of September 6th that the Rev. E. O. Ford, Pastor of Beverley Street Baptist Church, Toronto, after an incumbency of about six years, has resigned to accept the pastorate of the First Baptist Church, Lethbridge, Alta. We have absolutely no knowledge of Mr. Ford's religious views, for in the six years of his residence in Toronto we have never heard anyone refer to him. Our knowledge of him is limited to what we have seen and heard of him at Conventions and Associations. His vociferous support of the anti-fundamentalist party in our Convention will, we presume, be missed; and we have no doubt that in the West he may be equally depended upon to take the same course. This is written for the information of our Western readers.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1 T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., Editor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. No. 4

Lesson 1

FOURTH QUARTER

October 3rd, 1926

THE SAVING OF THE BLIND.

Lesson Text: John, chapter 9.

I. A BLIND MAN RECEIVES HIS SIGHT.

1. Christ Jesus comes to correct the defects of nature. He saw a man who was blind from his birth. Spiritually we are all born blind. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." 2. Physical infirmity is not always the result of personal sin, nor is it always of immediate transmission; but all the defects of human nature are the result of original sin, of the long entail of man's original transgression. 3. Yet our Lord declares that He finds His chiefest glory in His redemptive work. The Saviour of sinners loves a hard case, and no matter how evil we are by nature, the works of God may be manifest in us. 4. It is the special mission of Christ to give light. He is indeed the Light of the world. It is impossible that anyone should see life in its true significance and perspective, who does not see it in His light. 5. In this instance Christ made use of means to effect His miracle, anointing the eyes of the blind man with the clay. It is His usual, but not His invariable rule. How many of us are willing to be the clay, unnamed, unnoticed, unimportant, except to Him? When we are, He will use us to open blind eyes. 6. He called the human will into co-operation with His own by bidding the blind man "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam". Had He willed to do so, He could have opened the blind eyes without bidding him wash. It is not, however, what the Lord might have done that should concern us, but what He explicitly commands. Thus we are required to believe on Him, to confess Him before men; and as surely as we obey His Word, we shall receive spiritual sight.

II. MEN'S NATURAL INTEREST IN THE MIRACULOUS.

1. It was natural for the neighbours to make enquiry concerning this man who had been blind, but who was now able to see (v. 8). A life that is touched by Divine power always challenges investigation. When a human soul has become the subject of the operation of the Spirit of God, the neighbours will be sure to observe such a radical change as will compel them to ask questions. Therefore, everyone whom the healing power of Christ touches, becomes, in a certain sense, an object of public interest. 2. Various opinions are expressed concerning this man. It were folly to expect unanimity in matters of this sort (v. 9). Some there were who accepted the miracle at its face value and declared that but for the change, he was the same man. They said, "This is he". Others discerned a resemblance, but could not credit the miracle, and said "He is like him". But the man's own personal confession settled the question. He said, "I am he." (v. 9). We may not be wholly indifferent to the opinions of others, but it is our own personal confession which will bear witness for Christ. 3. The witness can only relate facts (vs. 10-11). There is a useful lesson here for young converts. Too often a young believer misses the blessings that ought to be his by allowing himself to be persuaded that he must remain silent concerning the great miracle of salvation, until he

has acquired a fuller knowledge of spiritual things. We are not required to tell what we don't know, but only what we do know; and we ought always to be able to give an answer respecting the hope that is in us to everyone who shall enquire. It is not necessary to take a college course to do this, but out of our experience of Divine grace we may, like this blind man, relate the simple facts.

III. NATURAL VERSUS SUPERNATURAL RELIGION.

1. The man whose eyes had been opened was brought to certain religious leaders that they might pronounce an opinion upon his case. It is important that we should distinguish between Christianity and religion. There are many people who are religious who are not Christians. Every miracle wrought by the power of Divine grace will be a subject of interest to natural religionists. Every new convert will be likely to be brought to the Pharisees for inspection. 2. These religious leaders had not learned that true religion is designed for man's benefit, and not man for religion. These men cavilled about the law of the Sabbath, and could not understand that it was lawful to do good on the Sabbath day. Thus natural men, untouched by the Spirit of God, have ever invoked the Law and the Word of God, which were designed for our spiritual profit, to retard the work which Christ would do. 2. Notwithstanding, a naturalistic religion cannot escape the challenge of supernatural facts (v. 15). Whatever men may say of the Christian religion, however they may endeavour to discredit its witnesses, the facts of Christian experience are indisputable and must be faced and weighed. 3. Christ is always a divider (v. 16). In our day we hear a lot about union and unity, and we are exhorted to sacrifice even principles of truth in the interests of unity. Division is assumed to be provoked only by that which is alien to the Spirit of Christ, but Christ will be a divider until and at the Judgment Day, when He will divide as a shepherd the sheep from the goats. And respecting the truth of God as is revealed in Christ, there never will be unity. Not in union with the world, but in separation from it, not in unity but, in division, will the Christian Church find her strength. 4. The testimony of the humblest saved person is of inestimable value (v. 17). There is no one so well qualified to bear witness for Christ as those who have received of His grace. 5. It was natural that the parents of this man should be enquired of. Those who profess to have received help from God must expect that enquiry will be made at home. True religion will show itself at home if it shows itself anywhere (vs. 18-21).

IV. HUMAN NATURE IN RELATION TO THE MANIFESTED GRACE OF GOD.

1. The attitude of the parents of this man who was healed is worthy of note. (1) They were compelled to testify to the fact. It is a great thing when the reality of conversion is so apparent that men should be compelled to recognize it as a fact. (2) Notwithstanding the great blessing which had come to their son, these parents evidently feared men more than they feared God, and therefore referred the Pharisees to the son himself, saying "He is of age; ask him; he shall speak for himself". Verily "The fear of man bringeth a snare". 2. The attitude of the Pharisees should be considered. (1) "They had greed already" respecting their attitude toward Christ. With them it was not a question of evidence. Their minds were closed against the truth because their carnal minds were enmity against God. It is well that we should keep this in mind, that men are agreed already as to their attitude toward Christ, and only the Spirit of God can change them as Christ is revealed to them. (2) The God they knew was not the God Whom Christ revealed. They professed to be worshippers of God, but when the true God was manifested in Christ they refused to recognize Him. Thus there are many who call themselves worshippers who are not worshippers of the true God, for the only God that men can know is the God Whom Christ revealed. 3. The man healed is the next subject of enquiry. (1) He had been the recipient of the grace of Christ, and we shall see that that fact determined his attitude toward Christ. Those whom the Lord has quickened by His Spirit, in the nature of the case, must assume a different attitude toward the Saviour from the men who do not know Him. (2) He did not speak beyond his experience. It was not necessary that he should do so. We need not wait until we grow up. Let us tell now what we have ourselves experienced of Divine grace, and God will bless

it. (3) His contact with Christ has enlightened his mind as well as opened his eyes. His readiness to answer the objections of the trained doctors of the Law, in view of the fact that he had been born blind, is extraordinary. It is, however, but a proof of what the Lord had said, "I am the light of the world", for the entrance of His Word always gives light. (4) Though this man knew but little of Christ, and could not tell whence He came, he knew enough of Him to make it impossible that He should be neutral in respect to his Healer. Thus must it ever be with those who have really met with Christ. They may be only babes, but it will be impossible for them, in silence, to hear the name of Christ ill-spoken of. 4. The Pharisees again. They endorsed Moses and the Scriptures, but they rejected Christ and cast out the man whom He had healed. Thus neither evidence nor argument can convince the carnal mind. 5. Christ and the man whose eyes were opened. (1) Though the man had but little knowledge, he had a heart toward Christ. (2) Christ found him and made Himself known to him. He always does. Even as those who hunger and thirst after righteousness are filled, so those who desire a fuller knowledge of Christ shall be satisfied. (3) Since it is the heart that believeth unto righteousness, the man believed in Christ and worshipped him. **V. CHRIST HERE APPEARS AS A SAVIOUR OF LIFE UNTO LIFE OR OF DEATH UNTO DEATH (vs. 39-41).**

1. He is the Touchstone to Whom all matters must be brought: for judgment He is come into this world. 2. The rejection of Christ is the crowning sin: "This is the condemnation, that light is to come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light."

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION MEETINGS AT COLLINGWOOD AND WOODSTOCK.

By invitation of a number of Baptists, meetings will be held in Collingwood and Woodstock under the auspices of the Baptist Bible Union of Ontario and Quebec, September 10th and 11th respectively. Revs. C. J. Loney, W. E. Atkinson, the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, and others will be among the speakers. Arrangements are being made for meetings in three other Western Ontario centres September 15th to 17th, and in five Eastern centres September 20th to 24th. These meetings are being planned for ten centres from this date to September 24th. We ask our readers to remember these meetings when they pray.

LAST SUNDAY.

Notwithstanding the drenching rain of last Sunday morning, a great congregation gathered. The School was reduced to about seven hundred, but the morning congregation filled the ground floor comfortably, while the gallery was about two-thirds full. There are some fires many waters cannot quench. The morning sermon is published in this issue.

In the evening the church was packed, with not a few standing. Three were baptized, and at both morning and evening services a number confessed Christ. At the Communion Service following the evening service eighteen new members were received.

THE REV. JOSEPH W. KEMP IN JARVIS STREET.

We are happy to announce that the Rev. Joseph W. Kemp, of Auckland, New Zealand, will preach in Jarvis St. Sunday, Sept. 12th, at both services.

GOSPEL WITNESSES WANTED!

A valued reader of *The Gospel Witness*, who is exceedingly anxious to possess a complete file, finds himself without the following numbers:

Volume 1—July 1st, 1922 (unnumbered); August 31st, 1922, No. 16; November 2nd, 1922, No. 25; January 11th, 1923, No. 35.

Volume 2—September 13th, 1923, No. 18; October 18th, 1923, No. 23.

The Gospel Witness would greatly appreciate the help of its readers in this matter. We are unable to supply these numbers. It may be that some of our readers do not bind their volumes, or care particularly to preserve them: if any have one or more of these numbers and will forward them to us, we shall be glad to pay a reasonable amount for them.