

# 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. 21. TORONTO, SEPT. 30th, 1926 Whole No. 231

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

AARON AND HUR.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, September 19th, 1926  
 (Stenographically reported)

"Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim.

"And Moses said unto Joshua, Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: tomorrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand.

"So Joshua did as Moses had said to him, and fought with Amalek: and Moses, Aaron, and Hur went up to the top of the hill.

"And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed.

"But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun.

"And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven.

"And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi;

"For he said, 'Because the Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation.'—Ex. 17:8-16.



HIS passage which I have read to you relates to Israel's experience as they journeyed from Egypt toward the land of Canaan. They were in the way of the divine purpose; they were being definitely led; and in that divinely appointed path they encountered opposition.

I.

Now let us take that as our first principle this morning: that while we are being led of the Spirit of God, finding our duty in the path of divine appointment, seeking from the heart to do the will of God, WE SHALL BE SURE TO ENCOUNTER OPPOSITION.

The contrary of that is generally believed; it is too often supposed that if our lives are in tune with God, if we have received Jesus as Saviour, and endeavoured, by the grace of His Spirit, to walk in obedience to His commandments, that then we shall find a paved road for our feet; that all obstacles will be removed, and that we shall have a comparatively easy time. I do not know how often I have heard men say that the way to be successful in this world is to follow the Lord. But it does not always follow that those who obey God find success in this life: there have been those who have laid down their lives

for Christ. The career of Stephen was a very short one; he was permitted, in the providence of God, to preach only one sermon, and he died because of that sermon; he was stoned to death by those who had been cut to the heart by the word he proclaimed. It is written in the Word of God that they who live godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution. We read from His Book this morning that we may expect hatred and strenuous opposition of the world about us. Our Lord predicted, "In the world ye shall have tribulation". So I would remind you once again of this principle, that those of us who are Christians will not find things easy in this life: we are on the way from Egypt to Canaan; we are on a divinely appointed pilgrimage; we are leaving some things behind, and pressing toward the mark. And in that path from Egypt to Canaan, believers will always find many obstacles and multiplied enemies. Our Lord introduced Himself to Saul of Tarsus; He sent a messenger in the person of Ananias to communicate His will to him, and He said, "I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake." Therefore at the outset I remind you of that great principle, that there is opposition always to the man or woman who is determined to do the will of God, and who has been made a new creature in Christ Jesus.

As long as Israel remained in Egypt there was no fighting; they had burdens to bear; they were made to smart under the whips of the taskmasters; they were limited in their freedom; they were in fact a nation of slaves, and to whom they yielded themselves servants to obey, his servants they were whom they obeyed. As long as a man will stay in Egypt, the place of his birth, as long as he is content to live on the natural plane, and to satisfy himself with the leeks and garlick of Egypt, and the fleshpots thereof,—even then he will not escape the burdens of life, even then he will have to make bricks, even then he may shed many tears; he will not be a free man in any sense—but there will be no real fighting. He will not encounter the opposition with which he will meet when he has cut clean from Egypt. You remember how reluctant Pharaoh was to let Israel go, how he endeavoured at last, under divine pressure, when he felt that he was being compelled to let Israel go, to effect a compromise. He said to Moses first of all, "Go now ye that are men". And Moses said, "No, we will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go". Pharaoh said at first, of course, "You shall not go at all." Then Pharaoh said, "I will not let you go, you will stay here; I will let the men go, but we will keep your wives and children, and property here." This is what the Devil does to-day. Some one says, "I don't mind your being a Christian if you won't be fanatical about it; leave your family alone; never mind your family religion." But when a man says, "I am going to have my household for God, all there is of me, and all there is of my family; I will get clean out of Egypt", then Pharaoh will be sure to oppose him still more. And then at last under still further pressure he said, "Go ye, serve the Lord; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed: let your little ones also go with you." And Moses said, and he put it very strongly, he said, "Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not an hoof be left behind; we will all go, all that we have will go." And Pharaoh said, in effect, "You will do nothing of the kind." And then when the Lord visited him again, he said, "Well, I suppose I shall have to let you go, but don't go very far away; just go outside and stay there." And Moses said: "We will go just as far as the Lord wants us to go; we will go clean through to Canaan, and we will not stay near you at all."

And then you know how God interposed and delivered Israel with a great salvation, and brought them out into a large place. Notwithstanding, when they had seen the Egyptians dead upon the seashore, and they set out on their pilgrim journey, they discovered there were still difficulties; they lacked bread, they lacked water, they lacked everything; but God supplied all their need. To make matters still worse, at a certain point in their journey "then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim." And I have no doubt some of you here this morning who have put your trust in the Lord, have been a little bit disappointed in your experience, for you said, "I did not understand; I thought everything was going to be easy, but I declare to you that from the time that I put my trust in the Lord difficulties have multiplied. It is true I have had my bread and water thus far; He has made ends meet for me; He has helped me; but I am afraid of to-morrow, for I can see the hosts of Amalek gathering across my path, and how I am to cut my way through them I don't

know." My dear friends, that is the common lot of the disciple of Christ, for, this vain world is not a friend to grace, to help us on to God.

## II.

In the path in which Moses and his people trod, they met A VERY PARTICULAR ENEMY, Amalek. And it is said of Amalek that he had lifted up his hand against the throne of Jehovah. He was an Old Testament antichrist; he was not so much opposed to Moses and the people of Israel as such, as he was opposed to Jehovah; He hated Jehovah; he had lifted up his hand against the throne of Jehovah. He hated the religion of Jehovah, and he was determined to make war upon all the people who tried to follow Jehovah. Now, my friends, that is the root of the opposition with which Christians meet. You remember how John said there are even now many antichrists. Some day there will come the Antichrist, a spiritual Amalek, a great towering personality who will combine in himself all the powers of the Pit, he will exhibit superhuman power. I believe the Antichrist will be an incarnation of the Devil himself; just as God was incarnate in Christ, and is now incarnate, for He took His glorified body with Him, and forever united deity with humanity. And some day the Incarnate God will come back again, and when He comes He will find Antichrist in full power. And it is said that He will consume him with "the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." But there will be a great final battle some day between incarnate Goodness and incarnate evil; Heaven and Hell will meet in the shock of battle under the command of Jesus Himself, and the hosts of God will go forth to the fight, and until that final battle, until that climax of the war, until that victory is won, all who follow Jehovah, all who are disciples of Christ will meet somewhere with antichrist, with the spirit of antichrist, with that, which is opposed to Jesus Christ.

Now you will find that, my dear friends, in your own hearts in the first place. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever," you have a new nature, and that new nature is a divine nature, for we are "made partakers of the divine nature." But side by side with that divine nature there is what the Bible calls the "old man", and "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit", but, blessed be God, "the Spirit lusteth against the flesh." "These are contrary, the one to the other," so that the fight, the conflict between Israel and Amalek will be fought out in your own hearts. I heard a man say the other day he had had a battle over the matter of smoking. The Lord had taught him that he ought to give it up, and he had given it up. But he said to me, "I have to confess that He has not taken the appetite away; it is there, but it is kept under." Now in some cases He does take it away; in some cases He does not. But there is that in all of us that is opposed to the progress of the divine life, and "the old man" must be kept under. We are to put off the old man, and put on the new. The battle between these two will always go on. I have known some people say, "The Devil did so and so, the Devil did so and so." But, my friends, the Devil could not do anything with you if he had not something to work with, could he? You say, "The Devil made me do something—" I knew a man once who said that he had no old man, the old man was entirely gone. He was through with fighting, you see, the final victory had been won; he was entirely through with the old man, he had no old man left. "Well," I said, "supposing the Devil comes knocking at your door, is there anything in you, that can respond, is it possible for you to yield to temptation?" "Oh, yes, it is possible for me to yield to temptation." "Now," I said, "the Devil comes from without, he does not dwell within; he knocks at the door and demands admission. Who lets him in? Is it the new man that opens the door to the evil. 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.' Is it the new man who commits sin?" "No," he said, "it is not the new man, it is the old man." "Well," I said, "I thought you had no old man." He said, "I thought so too, but I am afraid I have." Of course!

"Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim." You must expect continuous opposition to your development in the Christian life, because there is still the old nature, the old man, the love of the flesh with its ambitions. I am not speaking about life on the lower plane, but of the man who is ambitious to succeed, to get on, to receive what this world can give. What is it? It is the old man, the carnal mind, the life, the passions, the covetings, the desires, the ambitions of the flesh, it is of Amalek; it is the thing that opposes us all the time. Oh, people used to talk about drink and all the rest of it. It does not make much difference where the opposition comes from, or what

form it takes; it all comes from that spiritual power that has lifted up its hand against the throne of God's Anointed. That is what this conflict, in which we are now engaged, is about. "Oh," you say, "that is a scholastic matter, about the authorship of the books of the Bible." It is nothing of the kind. Or some student says, "The question of Jonah is a matter of biblical criticism,"—I am going to talk about that to-night. It is nothing of the kind. The opposition to the Word of God in its last analysis is opposition to the God of the Word. It is opposition to Jesus Christ Who dwelleth within. And wherever you begin,—Genesis or Revelation, or anywhere between, this whole controversy is simply a modern manifestation of the spirit of Amalek that has lifted up its hand against the throne of Jehovah. And the great question we have to face in these days, first for ourselves and in our own individual lives, then in our churches, and in the world at large, the great question we have to face is this: whether Jesus Christ shall in all things have the pre-eminence. I don't care where you go, to McMaster or anywhere else, the thing that discounts God's Word, and that would discredit Christ, and question His infallibility, take the sceptre from His hand, and the crown from His brow, it is evermore the ancient spirit of antichrist, and it will cross the path of every simple believer who will dare to take God at His word. So much for that.

### III.

Then next, Moses said to Joshua, "Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek." So Moses said, this thing, this principle, representative of the principalities and powers, and of the prince of all princes in the world of darkness, Satan himself, he said, "This thing must be fought, go and fight it". Choose us out men. What else can you do? Why, my dear friends, there is no neutral ground. You cannot be neutral toward evil in your own life. There is only one attitude to take toward evil. Listen: the Scripture does not say that you must not love evil—that is negative,—it says, "Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good,"; take up a positive attitude toward it, a fighting attitude, declare war upon it. That is the only thing we can do: "Cleave to that which is good"; love the good, hate the evil; fight for the good, fight against the evil. There is no middle course. I was at a place recently where a company of ministers had come together, not all of them, thank God, but some of them, and what do you suppose they did? They passed a resolution regarding the present controversy, saying, "We declare we are determined to remain neutral". That is an impossibility. You cannot be neutral, as a Christian, on the question as to whether this Bible is the Word of God or not, either you know it to be so, or you believe it not to be so. There is no middle course. You cannot possibly be neutral in respect to the claims of Jesus Christ. "He that is not with me is against me." There is no neutral ground. In other words, for the soul that is born of God, there is no possibility of justifying an attitude of neutrality toward error, toward untruth, toward evil; we cannot be neutral. And let me tell you that the man who tries to be neutral is always on the side of evil, and not on the side of good. "In the day that thou standest"—you remember Brother Robertson's text—"on the other side . . . even thou wast as one of them." You cannot be neutral; the only thing to do is fight. And we are commanded so to do. Jesus Himself in the days of His flesh was aggressive in this matter; He was not passive, He took the offensive against evil always. The Apostles in Jerusalem took the offensive. To-day we have men going about and saying, "Don't let us have any controversy; don't let us have any fighting, let us get down to evangelistic work, let us preach the gospel to sinners, let us not fight." All right; there is a sinner down there, and I am going to preach the gospel to Him, so I begin by telling him what sin is, and I cut pretty close, and he says, "Look here, sir, don't talk to me like that." And I have a fight on my hands at once. You cannot preach the gospel of repentance, and tell men to turn away from their sins, without controversy. God has a controversy with rebellious men: this whole world is in rebellion against its rightful King, and there is no way out of it; you have got to take sides on this matter.

I don't fear to speak after this fashion in the presence of unconverted people. Let me address you a minute if there are any unconverted people here. I do not say we should fight men; we fight the things they stand for. When the Lord Jesus Christ passes condemnation upon your sin He yearns over you, and would forgive you. It is because we know how serious a thing sin is, as revealed in God's Word; and because we know the absolute necessity of the cleansing blood of Christ, and the divine power in human lives, that we speak

after this fashion. Why, my unconverted friends, as I speak to you you say, "Sometimes I have tried to do better, but I am afraid, although I have little acquaintance with this Amalek myself, I have found him too much for me. I pass as a respectable man; I have not been an outrageous sinner, but there has been an inward fight all the time, and I have been getting the worst of it; and sometimes I have been half tempted to give up the struggle, because I have not had any help." Do you know why we are fighting? We are fighting that you may have the truth that there is a mighty Saviour to come into your heart and life, and give you the victory where you fail; it is just because we cannot endure this teaching that Jesus Christ is only a man, that Jesus Christ is merely an ideal, merely an Example, it is because we are sure from God's Word, and from our own experience, that He is God: That is why we contend for the faith.

I come to you this morning preaching an Almighty Saviour; I tell you that you're in a fight, my brother. Let me assure you that you are in a winning fight if you are on God's side, for listen: "Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven. And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi: for he said, Because the Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation." Now He said, "Get on my side, and fight with Me, will you?" There would be no use fighting if God were not on our side, or if we are not on His side. But the Antichrist is doomed to failure, and utter ruin at last, and victory is on the side of those who fight with God. God has sworn to have war with error, and with every spirit that denieth that Jesus Christ is His Son. God is against all that, and we are taking the winning side when we stand with Him. "Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek", and as we fight the victory is sure.

#### IV.

Now a word or two as to THE VARIETY OF SERVICE RENDERED IN THE WAR. Joshua and his men went down into the plains and Moses and Aaron and Hur went up on to the hills, and Moses said, "To-morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand", the rod with which he had wrought the miracles, the rod which was symbolic of the presence and power of God, the rod indeed which was the physical representation of the promise of God, for God had told Moses to take that rod and cast it down before Pharaoh, to use it to show Pharaoh His power; and it was with that rod he had parted the sea asunder; it was with that rod he had turned the water into blood; he had brought plague after plague upon Egypt, it was with that rod he smote the rock; that rod was representative of the promise of God, and Moses said in effect, "I will go up to the hill top to-morrow and I will hold up to God His promise while you fight".

Ah, but where is Moses? Long since they laid him away, buried by the hand of God in a secret grave. But Moses said, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." And in due course Moses' Antitype came, the Lord Jesus Himself; and ere He went to glory He said to His disciples, "Go, fight Amalek", or being interpreted, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; carry the good news to sinners; pronounce my judgment upon sin; go and fight." And what is He going to do. He says, "I will go up to the mountain; I will return to the Father; All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore." And so Jesus, like Moses, went up the mountain to pray; He ascended to the Father. And you remember how Peter explained the first great victory at Pentecost, He said, "You do not see Him, He is up yonder, but He has received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost and He has shed forth this which ye now see and hear, and all this blessing that we have down here is due to the fact that He prays up yonder." "He ever liveth to make intercession" for us. And my dear friends, the fight, the prosperity of the war, depends upon the intercession of Jesus Christ. Someone quoted in the prayer meeting last night, "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation." But it would do you no good to watch or to pray if it were not for the fact that our Jesus is praying for us; He is up on the mount with the rod of God in His hand; He is pleading the covenant promise: He is standing as your representative and mine in the presence of God.

But you know the story, the parallel is not absolutely complete yet. Moses'

hands grew heavy, and as they grew heavy he let down the rod, and when he lowered the rod Amalek prevailed. But as long as he held that rod toward heaven Israel prevailed. Aaron and Hur standing beside him saw what happened, and so they got a stone and they said to Moses, "Sit there, sit there". Oh, I am glad he sat down, "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." They got a stone for Moses, and they said "Sit down". I don't know who was the leader, perhaps it was Aaron, and he said, "Hur, you get on that side, I will get on this side". And so they stayed up Moses' hands until the going down of the sun: "And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword" until victory was won by Joshua fighting in the plains, and by Moses praying in the mount. That is how we are going to have victory. Oh, but you say, "Who are Aaron and Hur? What place do they have?" They were called into co-operation with Moses in his ministry of intercession, and they held up the hands of the intercessor, and the victory came. Not because His hands are heavy, for He is the Infinite God, does He call us to pray. He has gone into heaven itself to appear in the presence of God for us, and He calls us into co-operation with Himself. And it is our privilege—oh may I reverently say so, wonder of wonders,—it is our high and holy privilege by means of intercessory prayer to uphold the hands of our Great High Priest! There is a special blessing promised to those who agree together as touching anything that they shall ask. Do you know to whom God's special promise is made? Not to a great multitude. Of course there are promises to all, but when He made a promise to those who were praying in concert, collectively, do you remember to how many the promise was made? Can anyone tell me how many? "Two or three." Well it could not be more than one, and less than two, could it? The smallest possible number, Aaron and Hur. Just two! Just two!—a man and his wife, a mother and her daughter, a husband and somebody else praying for a wife. A promise to two! Do you know there is a mysterious passage,—I don't attempt to expound it,—which says we are privileged to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church".

Now, my friends, it may be that some are being called down into the plains to do the fighting; it may be that our Joshua has to choose out men to go and fight, and it may be there are some who cannot fight with the sword, but they can fight on the mountain top. And when that battle was won, it was won, not by Joshua's sword alone, but it was won by the intercession of Aaron and Hur. Five years ago we were face to face with impossibilities, we were face to face with an opposition that was overmastering, and you remember, some of you, those days? There was only one thing we could do, only one thing, and that was to pray. And that is what we did, and our prayer meetings were multiplied. And we prayed and we kept on praying. And do you remember how so often we felt our own utter helplessness that there was no heart for speech? We did not want to talk to each other, we could only talk to God, and we did talk to God, and our Moses in the heavens prayed and God wrought a great victory; and every blessing that has ever come to us as a church has come to us by that principle, in answer to prayer. And so as we face anew the future, the Convention, that work outside of our immediate membership, as we think of our own service in the weeks and months to come, let me remind you that the rod of God in the mount is just as necessary to victory as the sword of Joshua in the plains. Your praying, Sunday School teachers, is just as necessary as your teaching; only as we thus prevail with God can we prevail with men.

And, oh, my unconverted friends, what a gospel that is for you! You say, "Sir, I have got to go back to the plains to-morrow, I have got to fight it out on the plains to-morrow. Oh, I shall meet many enemies to-morrow, and I would love to confess Christ to-day. But what shall I do when I go down to the battle to-morrow". Just remember that your Moses will be in the mount for you to-morrow, and that as you fight down in the plain to-morrow, He will plead your cause before God in the heavenly places, and He Who has sworn to have war with that thing against which you are fighting, whatever it may be,—summed up in one word it is "sin",—He has sworn that He will have war with it, will command His angels, "the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them." The Spirit of God will take possession, and we shall go on from victory to victory. Is it not glorious to

be sure that we are going to win? There is no possibility of failure while God is God, and truth is truth. May the Lord help us valiantly to fight both in the plains and on the mountain, both with the sword and with the rod of God. Let us pray.

Oh, Lord we thank Thee that we go not to warfare at our own charges, and if any have been faint-hearted in the war may we borrow new courage this morning. If any here have in their hearts trusted the Lord Jesus, and have never yet openly in any public way confessed Him, we pray that they may do so, this morning, that they may declare their readiness to go down into the plains to fight, because Jesus has gone into the heavens to pray. Bless us every one for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

### BAPTIST BIBLE UNION MEETINGS.

During the last two weeks seven very successful meetings have been held within the Convention territory, dealing with the educational situation. Three meetings were held in Western Ontario, the speakers being Revs. C. J. Loney, W. E. Atkinson, W. S. Whitcombe, and the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*. The first was held in the Armories in Windsor, September 15th. There was a fine attendance, including many from outside points, and great interest was manifested. The second meeting was held in Chatham, September 16th. The large Oddfellows Hall was filled, and the people listened with great interest to the end. September 17th the meeting was held in Hyman Hall, London. Additional interest was given to the service by the presence of a McMaster student who expressed a desire to speak. This was granted him. A few questions put to him at the close of his remarks showed that he was wholly without knowledge of the situation, but was a blind defender of McMaster, right or wrong. We do not mention this brother's name because he has some qualities we admire: he was at least manly enough to come to the meeting to say what he had to say in a way that could be answered. The London meeting was a very representative one, officers of all the London churches being present. The chair was taken by Rev. T. J. Mitchell, Pastor of Wortley Road Church.

The other four meetings to which we refer were held in the East. The party consisted of Revs. C. J. Loney, W. E. Atkinson, G. W. Allen, W. G. Brown, Jas. McGinlay, and the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*. The first meeting was in Coaticook, Que., September 21st. There was a fine attendance for this small place, and a splendid meeting. From Coaticook we journeyed to Montreal for the evening of September 22nd, where the meeting was held in the building formerly owned and occupied by the First Baptist Church, which has gone out of existence. The building itself was a protest against the destructive work of Modernism: Modernism is the finest thing in the world to kill churches. We sympathize with our Montreal brethren, and recognize that the dominance of Roman Catholicism makes evangelistic testimony very difficult. Notwithstanding, we are convinced that the gospel that won its way in Jerusalem, and Athens, and Corinth, and Rome, can win its way in Montreal; but the Modernism that gives a stone to people who ask for bread, is bound to lead churches to ruin. We are grateful to the present generous owner of the building who gave us the use of the building without charge. We considered the attendance at Montreal most gratifying; it was really a large attendance, and members of many churches, we are sure, will have something to say on the issue presented.

Thursday, September 23rd, we held a large and enthusiastic meeting in Ottawa. The six addresses made every meeting a long one; but the interest never waned to the end. From Ottawa we motored to Peterboro, about two hundred and seventy miles, and there held a large meeting in the Great War Veterans' Hall. Baptists of Peterboro and vicinity were well represented, a number being present from points as far away as Windsor. These, and other meetings held by the Baptist Bible Union, serve to show that all over our Convention territory there are men and women whose love for the Lord and His Book will not permit them to compromise on these important issues. The influence of these services no one can accurately estimate.

Our party left Peterboro at a late hour, arriving in Toronto in the early hours of Saturday morning, having completed a motor trip of eleven hundred miles, with six in a car, without even so much as a puncture—that is in our tires. We hope we were able to puncture some other things!

## Editorial.

### PROF. BROWN OF McMASTER ON DR. JOHN A. BROADUS AND OTHERS.

[The following article is taken from "The Western Recorder" of September 23rd, of which Dr. Victor I. Masters is the Editor. The article speaks for itself, and it proves conclusively that Dr. Brown had absolutely no authority for implying that Dr. Broadus had so modified his views of the Bible in "later years" as to be more sympathetic toward the liberal view. That point Dr. Masters deals with effectively. The question we cannot help asking is, Why should Dr. Brown desire to use the name of the great Dr. John A. Broadus to credential liberalism? Dr. Brown concludes his article in "The Western Recorder" with the words, "Personally I stand strongly for the conservative position." That being so, why should he use the name of dead men to bolster up the pretensions of liberalism?

We have travelled a good deal about the country, and we have found that Dr. Brown has been very industriously writing private letters to pastors, seeking to win them over to the support of the University in its retention of Professor Marshall. We would remind our readers that "The Western Recorder" is a Regular Baptist paper; it is the official organ of the Kentucky Baptists; and is published in Louisville, the city of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Dr. Masters is a Regular Baptist, and justly resents Professor Brown's attempt to enroll Dr. Broadus among the modernists. This incident is only a further evidence of McMaster's apologetic attitude toward Modernism. Dr. Brown says he "stands strongly for the conservative position", but he has a clenched fist and bitter words for those who stand for the faith, and the hand of fraternal greeting for those who seek to destroy it.—Editor of "The Gospel Witness".]

In our issue of August 26 we called attention that Dr. J. G. Brown, professor in Church History in McMaster University, a prominent Baptist institution at Toronto, Canada, in an address this summer definitely implied that Dr. John A. Broadus, along with certain other well known conservative Baptist theologians of the past generation, had in his later years of careful study of all the facts greatly modified his early attitude toward higher criticism and modern materialistic science.

We asked Dr. Brown to use *The Western Recorder* columns to present any facts in his possession tending to show that John A. Broadus ever leaned toward the theories of modern liberalism. We also wrote Dr. Brown twice to the same effect and received from him a courteous letter indicating that he would comply with our request.

Elsewhere we are publishing the communication which we have received from Professor Brown. For the most part the communication, as he sent it, consisted of a lengthy quotation from Dr. A. H. Newman in an article in the *American Journal of Theology* twenty years ago. It will be noted that several of the conservative theologians, including Dr. Broadus, mentioned by Dr. Newman had already passed away before 1906 and that all of the gentlemen mentioned by Dr. Brown had passed on to give an account of their stewardship before the time of the address of Dr. Brown.

#### I.

Dr. Brown must be aware that it is not an infrequent practice of Modernists and theological pacifists to attribute liberal views to conservative scholars whose voices are hushed by death from defending themselves. The apparent purpose is to use the prestige of these fallen leaders in the interest of foisting the New Religion. Not even John Wesley and Spurgeon have been spared from the ghoulish attacks of these desperate and unscrupulous partisans of the "New" Faith. This procedure is unethical and is not calculated to impress people who have learned their moral code from the Bible.

For lack of space we are eliminating most of that portion of the lengthy quotation of Professor Brown from Dr. Newman which has to do with the alleged departure from conservative views of Doctors Northrup, Strong, Hovey, and others. Besides the reference to Broadus we are only quoting a single



reference to certain other scholars because it is coupled up with the name of Dr. Broadus.

It will be seen that Dr. Brown places his entire dependence upon the utterance of Dr. Newman, who himself became a liberal in theology. Apparently Dr. Brown has no other authority concerning Dr. Broadus' alleged change toward Radical Criticism in his "later years".

Nor does the statement of Newman concerning Broadus, while apparently it was made with the desire to couple the name of the distinguished Baptist leader with those who look with smiles upon the liberal German theology and its influence in America, justify the use of the name of Dr. Broadus as it was used by Professor Brown.

### II.

The Newman statement amounts to this, that Dr. Broadus promoted the study of German critical works and encouraged his best students to pursue graduate courses of study in German universities. Newman gives Dr. Broadus credit for his absolute faith in the authority of the Scriptures and says that Dr. Broadus regarded with equanimity the thorough testing of the books of the Bible.

This is all there is to the Newman utterance, except the reference to the personal friendship of Dr. Broadus for Dr. Crawford H. Toy, who was once in the Seminary faculty, and who was retired from the faculty because of the radical views which he adopted. Manifestly the personal friendship of Dr. Broadus for Dr. Toy is no proof of sympathy on the part of Dr. Broadus for the liberal views adopted by Dr. Toy. That this should be intimated is a fine example of the poor reasoning of a school of thought that boasts that it has a corner on ability to reason from premises that are adequately broad. It is well known that Dr. Broadus counselled Doctor Toy that he should resign from a position which he could no longer honorably hold, since his departure from the faith of Baptists. What a blessing it would be if the ethics of Modernists and their apologists were like those of Broadus. Broadus did not apologize for Toy, nor work up a party to defend him. He counselled him to retire. Modernists could immediately do away with the whole trouble that shakes Christendom to-day if they would follow the counsel of Broadus to Toy. But they do not intend to do it. They prefer the Unitarian method of fighting to get hold of churches and institutions developed by real Christians to teach the faith they intend to destroy.

We happen to know that Dr. B. H. Carroll, the great Texas theologian, more than once sent some of his brightest and best students for certain post graduate work to Chicago University. He was aware that he was putting these young men into a dominant atmosphere of skepticism and positive unbelief. He did not wish to put them in that atmosphere, but he believed they were strong enough to resist its blighting effect and he desired that they should have certain scholastic advantages which he believed at that time could be best had at Chicago University. It is manifestly absurd to use Broadus' openness to studying the results of scholarly investigation as proof that he changed his attitude toward the Bible or its criticism in his "later years". Assuming that the person who makes this use of the facts knows the force of his words, it is also dishonest.

### III.

It will be seen that the force of Dr. Brown's words as they may apply to Dr. Broadus comes to nothing. They imply that Broadus had friendship for Radical Criticism. The facts show the contrary. If it was necessary, we could call up as witnesses many hundreds of students who sat under Dr. Broadus in his "later years". Hundreds of these are still living, occupying places of usefulness and honour in pulpits and other Christian service all over America and throughout the world. It is not necessary. But it is a privilege at least to offer our own personal testimony. It was our great privilege for three years immediately preceding the year when God called him Home, to sit under the instruction of Dr. Broadus. We never heard one single word from the great teacher which by any fair-minded man could have been twisted into an endorsement of liberal and rationalistic theological views. Nor did we ever hear another student attribute any such thing to him. Nor since his death have we ever heard even a hint of such views on his part until the present insinuation was made.

We think Professor Brown was unfortunate in allowing himself to follow what looks like *ex parte* testimony on the part of Newman in his effort to make out a case of Baptist gravitation toward liberalism. It is generally known that Professor Marshall, recently imported from England, is a member of the theological faculty of McMaster University and that Canada Baptists are being rent asunder over what many Canadian Baptists believe to be evidence that Professor Marshall is himself a Modernist.

We had heard no indications that Professor Brown was either a Modernist or a middle-of-the-roader who is fertile in seizing opportunities to speak with favor of modern theological down grade-ism. We trust that he is neither. If he is neither, we feel sure he will find himself gratified at the witness that we have borne here concerning one of the greatest and most broadly loved and influential Baptists who ever lived on the American continent.

#### IV.

If "scholarship" was not imperviously "agreed" among the Liberals and their sympathizers—who unlike Broadus put the friendship of men and the world above their witness to the Christ—that the counsel of a mere Fundamentalist is beneath consideration, we might venture to counsel our Liberal friends that they are mistaken in supposing that they shall be able to win their fight against an inspired and infallible Bible by mere assumption and by sustained allegations, uttered with assurance and with claims that everybody whose opinion is worth considering agrees with them—even to the distinguished Christian dead. If their cause was even one-tenth so strong as they continually allege, it requires only common sense to enable one to see that they would not need to exploit in their behalf stories even of the dead that have no verification further than that, which grows out of the jaundiced "scientific imagination" of their author.

### BAPTIST ATTITUDE TOWARD FUNDAMENTALISTS AND PACIFISTS.

[This article also is from "The Western Recorder" of September 23rd. It is so good that we cannot resist the temptation to share it with our readers.—Editorial Note.]

Shall Baptists repudiate Fundamentalism because they may happen to dislike some of the men who defend it? Shall Baptists give apparent sanction to Modernism, and religious pacificism because they happen to like some men who defend these positions?

These questions are not far-fetched. Some Modernists and Pacifists, in fact an exceptional percentage of them, hold positions of influence and prominence and have standing before the world. This does not indicate superior character or intellectual ability on the part of these men. It rather indicates that the method of propagating their views which they have deliberately chosen is to work to get into their hands strategic positions of influence and from them covertly to propagate and give standing to their doctrines. Men so circumstanced not unnaturally have an influence stronger than their own characters and the causes for which they stand.

On the other hand, it has been characteristic of quite a few of the voices of Fundamentalism that have made themselves most prominently heard that, like John the Baptist, they have spoken in the wilderness and have had no standing in the councils of established ecclesiasticism. In saying this we do not mean that every free-lance voice of fundamental faith has the spirit of John the Baptist. We do not even mean that every religious pacifist is a parasitic betrayer of the sacred things of our faith. Some of these may suffer more from ignorance as to the fundamental nature of the differences between the two schools of religious thought than they do from snobbishness and toadyism.

At any rate, more than once we have had occasion to regret that good and prominent men among us have seemed unwilling to allow themselves to be rated as Fundamentalists. And when we have sought for the reason we have seemed to find it in the disapproval which these brethren have of the persons of the outspoken advocates in defense of fundamental truth. On the other hand, the rank and file of our Baptist people have felt a sense of regret when

it has appeared to them that these same Baptists, honoured with distinction and responsibility by us all, have been willing to lend their prestige to give countenance to and express sympathetic fellowship for and exchange fraternal courtesies and platform amenities with Baptist men and groups who are very generally believed by our people to be militant "pacifists" as between an inspired, infallible Bible and Modernism.

It is a very unfortunate circumstance for Baptists, for our morale and the integrity of our denominational witness to fundamental truth, if any men honoured by us with leadership and position should in fact allow themselves to be put into the position of seeming to show more fellowship for those who are more or less cool toward the defense of fundamental truth than they do for those who are faithful in its defense. And, so far as the essence of the thing is concerned, it makes very little difference if the pacifist group happens to be in control of the organization, to be "regulars"

We would not be censorious, nor judge the conscience of any brother. But there are ethical principles which apply to the behaviour of every one of us who is trusted by Baptists with a position of responsibility in which he serves in the name of our brethren. It is manifest that there are some things that the writer of these lines might properly do as an individual that he should avoid as Editor of *The Western Recorder*, for instance.

We have no brief to defend any Baptist leader in North America who, as a prominent voice of fundamental truth in connection with the present upheaval, has made mistakes. These gentlemen have their own personal limitations, as the rest of us have. So far as we are now concerned, some of them may have offended seriously in one way or another. It is not our business to defend them. We are personally bound by conscience, long fellowship and intelligent self-interest to serve the organized life of Southern Baptists. If we were moved by nothing higher, personal self-interest would lead us to understand that if we are to receive favour or position, it will be done by the goodwill of men who are themselves regular in our Baptist organization.

But what we all want to do and we all must do is to be so possessed with the spirit of loyalty and entire devotion to our Lord Jesus Christ that we shall live higher than the consideration of our personal and selfish interests and reputation. If it should ever become necessary, it would be a shame on any one of us if he should follow his own supposed self-interest and fail to give full and glad witness to the inspired and inerrant Word of God and to the saving power of the glorious Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We train with no free-lance group, but we stand for the fundamental things of our faith. We have no objection to being classed a Fundamentalist, with a capital "F". We lament mistakes that brethren may have made who have stood for the fundamentals of faith who wrought by themselves outside of the organized life of Baptists, but we greatly rejoice in the stand they have made and we pray God to make strong and wise their witness to His blessed truth. When the Disciples wanted to call down fire from heaven on one who witnessed for Christ but did not follow with them, our Lord said: "Forbid him not, for he that is not against us is for us." It would be a betrayal of Christ, to give more consideration to the group we are in than we do to the nature and strength of the witness which we give to precious saving truth.

**FAR BE IT FROM ANY OF US TO USE ANY REPUTATION WE MAY HAVE, BY THE CONFIDENCE REPOSED IN US BY OUR BRETHREN, TO GIVE COUNTENANCE TO AND BESTOW FAVOUR UPON ANY GROUP OF MEN, WHATSOEVER THEIR PROMINENCE AND "REGULARITY", IF IN SO DOING WE GIVE ENCOURAGEMENT TO MEN WHO SUBVERT THE TRUTH AND GIVE OFFENCE TO CONSCIENCE.**

When it is a question of loyalty, which should come first, full length loyalty to our Lord and to the spiritual body that trusts us with places of responsible service in its name, or the expression of goodwill and the fraternal amenities to other religious groups that stand well in worldly repute but are believed by many faithful Christians to hold and propagate doctrines utterly repugnant to the revealed Scriptures? *We fail to see how any man can think that he merits the fullest confidence and love of our Baptist people who does not in all good faith lay the considerations that we have here presented to his own conscience concerning relations which he sustains with other religious groups in the name of Southern Baptists.*

## PROFESSOR OF McMASTER FACULTY FOR OVER 36 YEARS SPEAKS OF MODERNISM IN THE UNIVERSITY.

[In order to refresh the minds of our readers we publish again the letter by Professor P. S. Campbell. Professor Campbell had nothing to gain, and everything to lose, by publishing this letter. After its publication he was interviewed by a committee of seven appointed by the Senate in an endeavour to persuade him to retract; and when they failed in this endeavour the axe fell.—Editor of "The Gospel Witness".]

Editor, *Canadian Baptist*:

Dear Sir,—

At the Convention held in Bloor Street Baptist Church in 1910, Dr. MacNeill as mover, and Dr. Shields as seconder, of a motion for the rebanation of Dr. I. G. Matthews as professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in McMaster University, in my judgment each did wrong to himself, did wrong to the church, did wrong to the denomination, did wrong to McMaster University, and, above all, did wrong to his Lord, and so also did the writer of this article do wrong, and with him, too, all the members of the Convention who that day supported that motion. Dr. Harris told the truth. Dr. Matthews was then, and is to-day, a pronounced Modernist.

I hold that the sound and helpful lectures of Dr. Farmer were being constantly counteracted by the erroneous instructions of his Biblical coadjutor, Dr. Matthews.

I am convinced, too, that Professor L. H. Marshall, whose attractive personality all recognize, is a supporter of Modernism. His sermons and personal talks, as given to the press and to others, clearly show that he is a Modernist. His appointment must, therefore, be regarded as a decided gain for Modernism.

When a prominent member of the Central Baptist Church, after hearing him preach, made to an old friend of mine a remark to this effect, "The attacks made on Professor Marshall's theological position are justifiable," don't you see that we, as Baptists, should rise up and resist in the power of the Holy Spirit this incoming tide of Modernism. Not many years ago, the students in McMaster of that day were tremendously excited when Dr. Foster, a popular professor, left us and became a professor in Chicago University.

Dr. Rand, the Chancellor at that time, was censured by the students for not doing his utmost to retain Dr. Foster. But you all ought to know that it was fortunate for McMaster that Dr. Foster left us, for he became, as all know, a destructive Higher Critic. Not many weeks ago, many students and many professors of McMaster heard Prof. Kanamori speak in our chapel. He told us how through Higher Criticism, he lost his Gospel message and walked in spiritual darkness for twenty years. But in answer to the prevailing prayer of two consecrated women he was graciously restored to faith in God and His Word. To-day he is one of the mighty champions of orthodoxy in Japan. Thousands upon thousands have been swept into the Kingdom of God under his powerful ministry. Personally I believe that it was the Living God who permitted Prof. Kanamori to give this timely address in McMaster Hall. I am assured by those who know, that good results have already accompanied that message of this Spirit-filled prophet of God.

At this point may I ask a question: Do you know any Modernist who is being mightily used to-day as a soul-winner? I could name not a few, who, having embraced this heresy, have left the ministry, for they found, as did Kanamori, that they had no longer a message.

Do you know that two or three years ago one of our graduates drank in this poison and became a zealous Modernist? Thank God he did not get it from McMaster, but he hearkened to addresses given by Modernists at Muskoka, and was poisoned.

That young man is to-day a student in Chicago University. Why

did he leave us? Dr. Farmer, Dr. McCrimmon and Dr. MacNeill were too narrow for him.

Did the representatives of our Home Mission Board, Brethren Schutt and Cameron and others, do wrong in refusing, as they did, to give a Home Mission field to this young man, when they knew that he held doctrinal views diametrically opposed to those held by us as Canadian Baptists?

Do we want McMaster to turn out men to fill our pulpits, to go forth as our Home Missionaries and our Foreign Missionaries who, when asked their doctrinal views, would reply in the words of Dr. Shailer Mathews, Dean of the Baptist Theological Seminary of Chicago University, "They stand for what are called Fundamentals, an inerrant Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the physical resurrection, ascension, and return of Christ? It will be observed that none of these is in the field of morals." And yet, I am informed, that two honour graduates of McMaster University can even surpass Prof. Shailer Mathews in unbelieving heterodoxy and yet everyone has heard that Prof. Shailer Mathews when addressing a country congregation, can be as orthodox as Paul. But he is not the only Modernist who can accomplish that feat.

Are you aware that Rochester Theological Seminary, an institution once as orthodox as McMaster professes to be to-day, has on its staff professors, graduates of McMaster, who support Modernism?

Does it give you pleasure to know that Crozer has on its staff professors or lecturers, graduates of McMaster, who are ardent Modernists? Is it encouraging for us as Canadian Baptists, to learn that in Chicago University, that stronghold of Liberal theology, several members of the staff are graduates of McMaster and that they uphold Modernism?

I make bold to say that the greatest scourge that has visited our day and generation is Modernism. It paralyzes the pulpit, it paralyzes the pew, it paralyzes Home Missions, it paralyzes Foreign Missions. The Modernist is an enemy to himself, an enemy to his home, an enemy to his church, an enemy to his denomination, an enemy to the University, and an enemy to his Lord.

He who is disloyal to the standards of faith which we as Baptists hold vital, is disloyal to McMaster University.

#### BE WARNED!

Modernism has captured Brown University; Modernism has captured Newton, and Crozer, and Rochester. Modernism reigns in Chicago University. Are you willing, through an easy tolerance, to permit McMaster to fall into the hands of this enemy, both of man and God?

I am deeply concerned for McMaster and for all our educational work—this you all must know. I spent three years in the old Canadian Literary Institute when Dr. Fyfe, that great champion of Baptist principles, was at its head. It was from that Institute that I matriculated into Toronto University. I sent my only son to Woodstock College. My two daughters took full courses at Moulton College. My son and one daughter are honour graduates of McMaster University. My son was a professor of Latin in his own Alma Mater. I have laboured as Professor of Greek in McMaster for more than thirty-six years. It may not be inopportune to state that in addition to my work as professor, I joyfully toiled as a Christian workman in eight centres between Hamilton and Toronto, and six of them have become Baptist Churches.

I have humbly asked my God to forgive me the wrong I did in 1910 in supporting a motion for the retention of a Modernist. These words are written to let my fellow-Baptists know that I dare not repeat that wrong.

Baptists of our Convention, again I say—take warning!

Suffer not Modernism to capture McMaster. For if you do, Ichabod will inevitably mark its future history.

P. S. CAMPBELL,  
McMaster University.

(From *The Canadian Baptist* of March 18th, 1926).

## A CLEAR NOTE SOUNDED BY DR. JAMES A. FRANCIS.

We print below with great pleasure two letters received from Dr. James A. Francis, of Los Angeles. In the copy of the letter he has sent to *The Canadian Baptist*, Dr. Francis says that what he really said was that Jesus was the child of humble parentage, and adds: "I firmly believe that Jesus was born of a human mother and a divine father." We are delighted to have this statement from Dr. Francis. We travelled thousands of miles with Dr. Francis some years ago, and came into most intimate fellowship with him. A more unselfish companion we have never known. Throughout the period of our intimacy we regarded him as an ideal Christian gentleman.

Dr. Francis' address at Milwaukee, upon which we commented in our issue of June 5th, 1924, which comments we reprinted in our issue of September 2nd, 1926, caused us profound sorrow. We regard Dr. Francis as one of the ablest preachers of the American pulpit, and one of the most winsome personalities to be found anywhere. We love him with all our heart. We are sorry for the misprint in *The Canadian Baptist*, for we are sure *The Canadian Baptist* did not deliberately misrepresent Dr. Francis. But how easy it would be for Dr. Francis on all other matters to speak as positively as he has done on this question of the Virgin Birth! His letter to *The Canadian Baptist* makes it absolutely certain that in regard to the virgin birth of Christ, Dr. Francis still holds fast the faith. If he would be as explicit in all other matters he would bring joy to thousands of hearts. The pages of *The Gospel Witness* are open to Dr. Francis always for this purpose. Following are the letters:

"Rev. T. T. Shields, September 15th, 1926.  
Jarvis Street Baptist Church,  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

"My dear Dr. Shields:

I am enclosing for your eye a copy of a note which I dispatched this morning to *The Canadian Baptist*, in order that you may have the opportunity, if you are so minded, to give the correction the same publicity that you gave the quotation and comment.

Yours with sincerest regards,

(Signed) JAMES A. FRANCIS."

September 15th, 1926.

"*The Canadian Baptist*,  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

"Gentlemen:

I believe that your issue of August 19th reports me as saying, in an address before the B.Y.P.U. Convention in Los Angeles, concerning the Lord Jesus, that he was the child of obscure parents.

I believe that what I said was, 'He was the child of obscure parentage', which is quite another matter, in view of the fact that I firmly believe that Jesus was born of a human mother and a divine father.

Since this is simply a matter of accuracy, I am giving you an opportunity, if you so desire, to make the correction in the columns of your esteemed sheet. Perhaps I would hardly do so were it not that one of your editor-pastors has commented on it with criticism in the columns of his own publication.

Yours with very best regards,

(Signed) JAMES A. FRANCIS."

### PARLIAMENT STREET BRANCH.

Under the leadership of our brother Mr. Wilfred Charlton the work at Parliament Street is being greatly blessed of God. Two services are held every Sunday night, one for children in the schoolroom, and the other for adults in the main auditorium. The work among the children has been especially fruitful, an average attendance of three hundred has been maintained and a number of young people have professed salvation. The prayers of God's people are coveted for these young converts, many of whom have been won from Roman Catholicism.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 4.

Lesson 4.

Fourth Quarter.

October 24th, 1926.

### THE ANOINTING OF JESUS.

Lesson Text: John, chapter 12. To be studied in harmony with lesson text: Matt. 21: 1-17; 26: 6-13; Mark 11: 1-11; 14: 3-9; Luke 19: 29-44.

#### I. THE SUPPER AT BETHANY.

1. Our Lord likes to go where the trophies of His grace are found. He came to Bethany, "where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead". It is marvellous to relate, but it is still true that, like the Shunammite, our Lord dwells among His own people. 2. The supper was made for Christ: "There they made him a supper." So ought every supper to be, every breakfast, too, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God". 3. Martha served. It was not a particularly dignified form of service perhaps. She did not take a college course to render herself capable of giving such service, but it was a service that was rendered to Christ. Thus still it is possible to sublime the common tasks of life to the level of a holy service rendered to the Lord, and all for His glory. By the observance of this principle the kitchen and the office and the shop and the school may all be made holy places. 4. "Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with him", apparently in silence; for all that is recorded of his utterances, Lazarus might have been a dumb man. No single word that he ever spoke is preserved for us; and yet he occupies a considerable space in this gospel. He had been raised from the dead by Christ; he was a living witness to the Saviour's power, and by sitting at the table with Christ he put himself on exhibition showing to all around what a dear Saviour he had found. He showed where a loosed man chose to be. In the preceding chapter we find the Lord saying, "Loose him, and let him go." No word of direction was given; but here we find him sitting at the table with Christ. People who are genuinely saved love to be with the Saviour. Thus, by his silent witness, Lazarus proved the genuineness of the miracle. 5. Mary's part. As a love offering for Christ alone she brought her alabaster box of ointment. Its value was equal to a labourer's earnings for a whole year. No gift is too costly to present to Christ; no sacrifice too great to show how much we love Him. (a) Judas objected to Mary's expensive gift, and suggested it might have been sold and given to the poor. And we are told he said this because he was a thief and had the bag. Behind a professed interest in the poor, there are still many who seek to feather their own nest, while objecting to a religion that magnifies Christ. (b) The Lord Jesus approved of Mary's act, and indicated that she had found her inspiration in the knowledge of the cross. The cross not only makes atonement for our sins, but it supplies the noblest inspirations of life. 6. There was a double attraction at this Bethany supper. Christ was the first, and many people when they knew that He was there came for his sake. But Lazarus also was a powerful magnet, second only to the Lord Himself. And the people came "that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead". And there is no attraction the carnal mind can invent even in our day comparable to the presence of Christ, and with Him one who has manifestly been sharer in the power of His resurrection. If churches would turn aside from their carnal methods, from their endeavours to attract people by music and movies, and what not, and go back to the old-fashioned way of praying for the presence of Christ, and the power of His resurrection in individual lives, churches would again be thronged with worshippers. 7. Relationship to Christ incurs the hatred of His enemies (vs. 10, 11). Lazarus was no preacher, but his silent testimony caused so many people to believe on Christ that the chief priests consulted to put Lazarus also to death. It will ever be so.

#### II. CHRIST'S ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

1. It was a fulfilment of prophecy (Ps. 118: 19-26; Zech. 9: 9). This is another instance of how Christ honoured and magnified the Scripture by

fulfilling it. They cannot be of His Spirit, who dishonour God's words. 2. The people, without any specific word of direction, fulfilled the word of Scripture also. Instinctively we have here a proof of the divine inspiration of Scripture. The fulfilment of prophecy shows that the prophecy is from the Lord (vs. 12, 13). 3. Only in the light of Christ's resurrection did the disciples understand the significance of these events (v. 16). The resurrection of Christ is the Light by which all Scripture may be understood, and the life and death of Christ interpreted. The validity of Scripture and of all the claims which Christ made in His own behalf, are established by the fact of His resurrection. (See I Cor. chap. 15, also John 2:18-22.) 4. Though the people cry, "Hosanna", the Pharisees are moved by these events only to a more bitter envy of His popularity.

### III. CERTAIN GREEKS SEEK TO SEE JESUS.

This request of the Greeks (vs. 20-22) has been the text of many sermons and of a very beautiful hymn by Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, "We would see Jesus". Notwithstanding, it may be doubted whether these Greeks desired to see Jesus for any good purpose; and we are inclined to believe that the text itself suggests that our Lord denied them an interview. 1. Whom did our Lord answer in v. 23? Not the Greeks, but Andrew and Philip. If so, He did not show Himself to the Greeks at all (v. 36). We therefore assume that He discerned the Greeks' purpose to be evil. Perhaps they sought His life. This is not improbable if vs. 19-22 are studied together. 2. Christ sees in His approaching death the path to glory (vs. 23). The glory of God is not His reputation, but His character. He is not glorified by what men or angels say of Him, but by His own self-disclosure. A diamond is glorified when afforded an opportunity to shine. Thus the qualities of Deity: Truth, Righteousness, Justice, Faithfulness, Mercy, Love, Power, Grace, Holiness, Light, all these in infinite degree and in glorious harmony, are revealed in the death of Christ. God is revealed for what He is, and is therefore known through the death and resurrection of Christ as in no other way. Therefore it is through the death of Christ God is supremely glorified. 3. Death is the way to fruitfulness (v. 24). It was true of Christ, and it is true of all of us; there can be no resurrection without crucifixion: only by surrender can we conquer. 4. Christ declares He came to die (v. 27). The New Testament everywhere lays emphasis upon the value of the death of Christ. 5. Heaven spoke but earth did not understand (vs. 28-30). Earth has never understood the speech of heaven, except by special revelation. 6. Our Lord chose the manner of His death: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me"; this He said signifying what death He should die. He was not ready to die by the hand of the assassin, or to suffer any death which man might plan for Him: it was written of Him, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree". And He came that He might be made a curse for us, and thus redeem us from the curse of the law. He therefore chose not merely to die, nor merely when He was to die, but He sovereignly determined also how He would die; He would die by being lifted up from the earth.

### IV. THE PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO THE PROPHECY OF CHRIST (vs. 34-36).

1. They had but a partial knowledge of the Lord. They saw in the Scripture the prophecy of the abiding glory of Messiah, but were utterly blind to the prediction of His suffering and shame. So still it is possible to read the Word of God and appropriate that which pleases us only. 2. They were unconvinced by many miracles (v. 37). The evidence in support of Christ's Messiahship was overwhelming, but their darkened minds could not receive it. 3. And in this the Scripture was fulfilled (vs. 38-41). 4. Many believed, even among the chief rulers, who feared to confess Him (v. 42). They were subject to the fear of man which "bringeth a snare". And it is said they loved the praise of man more than the praise of God. In this connection John 5:44 is informing. A desire for human applause cuts at the root of faith.

### V. CHRIST CALLS MEN TO BELIEVE IN HIM.

1. As a Messenger whom God had sent (v. 45). 2. As a Light from God (v. 46). 3. As the very Word of God (vs. 47-49). 4. As the Life of God.