

NEXT WEEK'S CONVENTION ISSUE	Page 11
S. S. LESSON	" 14
ORDERS FOR NEXT WEEK'S ISSUE	" 16

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. 25. TORONTO, OCTOBER 28, 1926. Whole No. 235.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES OF McMASTER.
A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, October 24th, 1926.
(Stenographically Reported.)

"Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

"He bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees."—Matthew 16: 6, 12.



AKE heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees"; "He bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees"—and that doctrine is likened to leaven which when it is put in three measures of meal leavens the whole: "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees."

I shall endeavour this evening to be very simple, very plain, and very direct; because I want you to understand what I have to say. In the days of the beginning of the ministry of the great Spurgeon, an old lady went to hear him, having heard of the fame of the preacher; and when asked what she thought of him she said that she was greatly disappointed. Her enquirer said, "Why were you disappointed?", to which she replied, "I was able to understand every word he said"! Now there are some preachers who are admired by many because they speak in an unknown tongue, and when they have finished the congregation have but little idea what the dear brethren have been talking about! But I propose to use the plainest and simplest speech, so that everybody will understand exactly what I say,—and exactly what I mean. And, you know, it is a theory of mine that the man who cannot make himself understood, while he may be a very good man in other respects and useful in some callings, but the man who cannot make himself understood so clearly as to make his hearers understand what he means, has no right to be either a teacher or preacher—for what in the world is he there for if it is not to preach and teach so as to make people understand? I have no poetry to quote, and I shall not refer you to the classics, nor talk about things which you do not understand, and I shall be especially careful not to talk about things which I do not understand myself—and that is a great virtue in a preacher!

As is not unusual in this place, I have a few things to say before I begin. I was re-reading a little while ago some lectures by the great Dr. Joseph Cook, delivered back in the seventies somewhere; and in a footnote the editor said that Dr. Cook's introductions were often as informing and important as the lectures themselves. When I read that I said, I can be in good company after this, because sometimes it is necessary to say much in order to get to the heart of the subject itself. So I must explain why I speak on this subject at all this evening.

I became Pastor of this church the 16th of May, 1910, so that I am in the 17th year of my ministry; and in the course of that time a preacher says a great many things, and he meets a great many people, and affords opportunity to the city in which he lives to have a fairly good idea of where he stands. And I tell you over again that this is not an extraordinary church at all, nor is the Pastor an extraordinary man: we are just ordinary, old-fashioned, Baptists. We are neither preaching nor teaching any new thing: we are teaching the same things which our fathers believed. For example: we hold to the view that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are divinely inspired as no other book was ever inspired, and we believe it to be the Word of God that liveth and abideth for ever. How many Baptists are here this evening, will you put up your hands? (Many hundreds raised their hands). That is a pretty good showing. Now, as I understand the Baptist position, Baptists have always believed that: so far as I know, there is nothing new in the view, that the Bible is the inspired and infallible Word of the living God. Then, in the next place, this Book portrays a unique character, Jesus of Nazareth, the Lord Jesus Christ; and the Bible says that He was begotten of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary; that He had a human mother but no human father; and that God and man were united in Him, that God was manifest in the flesh. That is what the Bible says, and the Baptists who worship in this place are simple enough to believe that that is true. I do not know that there is anything new about that. And because that is true, we hold that Jesus Christ is infallible, that He never made a single mistake: that morally, He was free from sin; and that intellectually, He looked at things from God's point of view; that He said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." We hold that on every subject concerning which our Lord Jesus has spoken, His is absolutely the last word. Is there anything new in that? Once Baptists believed that the infallible Christ had certified to an infallible Bible, and we accepted the Scriptures of the Old Testament because He did; and we found all that He said fulfilled in the Scriptures of the New; even as we found the Person of Christ, and the promises of His redemptive work, filled the entire Bible, so that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is like the City that came down out of heaven which John saw and of which it is said, "The city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." I do not know that there is anything new in that. I was brought up on that theology, and have believed it all my life, and have not changed one whit from my position in the beginning. I trust, through the passage of the years, one comes to see things a little more clearly; but I believe nothing that is contrary to the fundamental things, but rather that Jesus is the Christ of God, the Truth, the Infallible Standard to whom all questions must be brought.

Well then, what did Jesus come for? We have been simple enough to believe that John the Baptist, who came himself in fulfilment of prophecy, and whose birth was, in a sense, miraculous, a man sent from God to bear witness to Christ—we have believed that when John introduced Jesus as the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world", he spoke by the Holy Spirit, and that that is the truth, that Jesus Christ came to die for our sins. There was no other reason for His coming: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Therefore we regard the atoning work of Jesus Christ as the central thing. He was a Teacher, but His teaching only prepared men to understand His great sacrificial work. He is to come by and by as a King; but meanwhile He is our great High Priest, Who has entered into heaven itself, "not with the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood . . . now to appear in the presence of God for us." I say that I do not know that there is anything specially new

in that! It was not new when those hymns which you have been singing this evening were written; it was pretty old theology in the days of Toplady when he wrote, "Rock of Ages"; and that great truth is written, not only into the Bible, but as an expression of universal Christian experience, into all the literature of the Christian Church, that Christ died for our sins, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Now mark: not only did He take our sins upon him, but He "made him to be sin for us"—He was Himself in God's sight the sin of the world, "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

We have long supposed that the resurrection, the literal, physical, resurrection of Christ was a cardinal doctrine of Evangelical Christianity. There is nothing new in that, is there? We did not suppose that we had to await a new psychology to explain the resurrection: we believed that the Apostle Paul spoke by divine inspiration when he made the resurrection of Christ the keystone to the arch of redemption, and when he declared that "if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." So that is not new! And we stand by these old things still as well as we know how, as God helps us; and we keep on preaching them: the eternal priesthood of our Lord Jesus, and the hope of His return, that some day He will come again.

Some of you have heard that Jarvis Street Church is the home of a lot of fanatics! Our friends the opposition have diligently circulated all over the Convention—I could name minister after minister, including the Dean in Theology—who has spread abroad the report that the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church is really insane! Well, "it is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord." When I hear these things, they do not hurt me. Why, they said of the Master Himself, "He is mad"; and one great authority said of Paul the Apostle, "Much learning doth make thee mad." I suppose I could claim to be apostolic in all but one particular—I don't suppose they would credit me with "much learning", but with much "ignorance"! You members of Jarvis Street Church who are here to-night, have I stated in simple language the things that we believe and preach and rejoice in here? ("Yes!") Is it anything new? Is there anything fanatical about it?

A Strange Combination.

Now let us look at this text: "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." That is a very strange combination, and we need to examine it. Who and what were the Pharisees? They were a very orthodox Jewish sect. They believed, or, at least they professed to believe, in the Old Testament Scriptures. The great name to which they bowed was the name of Moses: he had given them the law, and they professed to believe the Old Testament Scriptures.

The Pharisees Were Supernaturalists.

We have it on record that they were supernaturalists,—as everybody must be who believes the Old Testament, for the Old Testament is just as truly a book of miracles as the New. The Old Testament is designed to reveal God as above His work, as having sovereign power to do what He likes: "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" And, specifically, *the Pharisees believed in the resurrection from the dead.* Our Lord Jesus Himself quoted the Old Testament Scriptures in support of the doctrine of immortality. The Pharisees believed in a literal, physical, resurrection: and, indeed, when the Apostle Paul on one occasion saw that his audience was made up partly of Pharisees and partly of Sadducees, he said, "Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day." The Pharisees were a New Testament type of orthodox people: they believed in the Word of God, they were supernaturalists; but they had added to the Word of God certain interpretations of their own, and in some instances had made the Word of God of none effect by their tradition. Into that I need not go for the moment; it is enough to call your attention to the fact that the Pharisees were theoretically supernaturalists, they believed in a supernatural religion.

The Sadducees Were Rationalists and Naturalists.

What were the Sadducees? The Sadducees were rationalists and naturalists. That is to say, they did not believe in the supernatural: they said there was no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; they were secularists, they believed that this life was all, and that the soul perished with the body. As a matter of theory, they had absolutely nothing in common with the Pharisees: the Pharisees were supernaturalists, the Sadducees were naturalists; the Pharisees were revelationists, and believed God had spoken from heaven, while the Sadducees were essentially rationalists. In their theories they were as wide apart as the poles. And yet the Lord Jesus classes them together, and in one breath He said to His disciples, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees", as though they were one in identity. And the extraordinary thing is that *where the Incarnate Word of God was concerned, where the Person of Christ was concerned, when men were obliged to take up an attitude toward Jesus Christ, Pharisees and Sadducees sunk their personal differences, and united in opposition to the Word of God, notwithstanding their avowed theories!*

Why Did Pharisees and Sadducees Unite?

That is a psychological puzzle. One must needs examine that, and find out how it was that Pharisees and Sadducees could thus unite. Who were the Pharisees? What did the Lord Jesus say of the Pharisees? There was no class against which He spoke so strongly, there was no class of people He so roundly denounced as the Pharisees; and invariably He used one word to describe them, He said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" He charged them with being insincere. He knew their theories, He knew that, intellectually, they subscribed to the very prophecies which were finding fulfilment in Himself, He knew that in the intellectual realm they were perfectly orthodox; but He said, "You are hypocrites, for the thing you believe in your head has absolutely no relation to your life. You believe it, but it does not determine your character and conduct; you believe one thing, and yet you can join hands with men who deny everything that you profess to believe." Why, Because their deep-seated opposition to a spiritual interpretation of the law, such as Jesus gave, their deep-seated opposition to that spiritual interpretation of the Word of God which required that it should have application, not only for the outer life but to the inner man, and that every thought should be brought into captivity to the obedience of that Higher Authority—so did they hate that spiritual interpretation that they joined hands with the Sadducees in seeking to effect the crucifixion of Him in Whom their own theories were literally fulfilled. In other words, *when a mere intellectual orthodoxy has to make choice between a vital, spiritual, religion and a mere naturalistic religion, when a mere intellectual orthodoxy has to make choice between a spiritual interpretation of the law which humbles men absolutely in the dust, and leaves them undone, lost, bankrupt, utterly, absolutely, dependent upon the grace of God—between that and the naturalistic interpretation of the Bible which magnifies human reason, and exalts man, and makes him into an authority for himself, THAT INTELLECTUAL ORTHODOXY WILL CHOOSE THE NATURALISTIC RELIGION, AND WILL JOIN HANDS IN OPPOSITION TO THE GLORIOUS GOSPEL OF THE BLESSED GOD.*

Prof. Marshall a Modern Sadducee.

Let me prove my point. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." Our new Professor is a modern Sadducee; he is a rationalist; he has gone much farther on the road to Unitarianism than at first appeared. Let me go back, first of all, to his sermon on, "What Baptists Stand For", preached in England, in which he said: "Some of our people (Baptists) are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship." He sets what he calls the "Hebrew tradition" in antithetical relation to the "teaching of modern science", and says that you can take either; you can be the "broadest of the broad"—I suppose

that would include our friend Fosdick, it would include Dr. Shailer Mathews who preached in Convocation Hall this morning, it would include Wellhausen himself! I should suppose the "broadest of the broad" means that you can include anyone, does it not? And the "narrowest of the narrow"!—I suppose he might, if they behaved themselves, include a few Plymouth Brethren! There is Prof. Marshall's conception of what Baptists stand for, "the narrowest of the narrow", or the "broadest of the broad"; and they can accept the "Hebrew tradition or the teaching of modern science."

The Sadducees and Miracles.

Take this one shocking thing: it is the Professor's endeavour to explain away every miracle. He says he accepts the miracles where he cannot explain them, but take for instance—I want you Baptists to remember this, that Professor Marshall is teaching not merely theological students, but he is teaching young men and women in the Arts Department, some of whom are not even professing Christians, and this is what he taught in the Arts Department to a class, some of whom were not even Christians, about the Bible. Everything is involved in it: the miraculous, the inspiration of Scripture, and the Person and authority of Christ—it is all involved. You remember the story of the Gadarene demoniac, how the devils were cast out of the man whose name was Legion, and had entered into the swine, and the swine ran down a steep place into the sea. Now Professor Marshall says, in effect, "I will give you a clue to that; it is not exactly an explanation, but it is a clue." Possibly we are on the track now of a scientific explanation of the casting out of demons, and he told the following story. There was a man in an asylum in England who was under the delusion that he had a glass arm. The doctors tried every means to deliver him from that delusion; but no argument could persuade him that his arm was not made of glass. So one day the doctor went out for a walk with him, and he carried under his coat, or concealed somewhere, a big glass bottle, and as they were walking along the doctor knocked him on the arm and dropped the glass bottle. The mono-maniac said, "What is that?" "Why", said the doctor, "that is your glass arm." "Why, yes", he said, "it is all right now, is it not?"—and he became perfectly sane from that moment; he got rid of that one delusion,—the implication being that this man of Gadara supposed he was possessed of demons, and when Jesus, by some means or other, sent the swine down a steep place into the sea, He said to the man, "There go your demons"; and when the man saw the swine running into the sea he was delivered from his delusion! Is that the Jesus you worship? (Chorus of Noes). Is there any place in any Christian school in the world for a man who teaches that to unconverted men and women?

This Would Make Jesus a Trickster.

I have not time to go into the details of it, but I am positive that that, is where we have arrived in respect to the Scripture: it is to be explained away when you can explain it away. And as to the Person of Christ: you reduce Him not merely to the level of a man, but to the level of a man who is not a very good man, a mere trickster. Well, my friends, if we have nothing better to teach than that, let us put out the lights, and close our doors, and admit that we have no religion whatever; for I say to you, in my judgment, that is absolute blasphemy, and I will have no part with it, if I have to stand alone for ever. That is not the Jesus Whom I worship.

I come now to one other point. There are many, but I will speak of this one particularly to-night. Next week I hope to publish in *The Gospel Witness*, if we get the transcription in time, a verbatim report of the proceedings of Educational Day at the Convention. I had two reports taken by two court stenographers, independently of each other, that they might compare notes and check one against the other, in order to ensure absolute accuracy; and that long discussion will take a long time to prepare, but as soon as it is prepared it will be printed. I cannot promise it this week, but I am hoping we may possibly get it this week; if not, we will print it the week following. And when you get that, you will be able to read Professor Marshall's own speech—exactly what he said.

Prof. Marshall on the Atonement.

But I call your attention to this one point. Right from the beginning it was abundantly evident to me that Professor Marshall did not believe in the atoning work of our Lord Jesus Christ—and I will tell you why: because Dr. Farmer said that he accepted the Driver view. I am not going to weary you with a discussion of technicalities this evening, but merely to say to you that Professor Marshall, dealing with that last Tuesday, said that when it was said that he accepted the Driver position, it did not necessarily mean that he accepted all Dr. Driver's conclusions, but that he accepted the "historical method" as the proper way to approach the Bible. What is the "historical method"? You know that Dr. Driver takes the whole Priestly Code out of the Pentateuch and dates it about a thousand years after Moses was dead. The record of the Passover, the building of the tabernacle, the Aaronic priesthood, all the offerings of blood—they did not belong back there at all, but they were invented a thousand years after Moses died! Now Driver puts the date of that portion of the Pentateuch some time during the Babylonian captivity: Professor Marshall, I have been informed by his students, puts an even later date than that, and makes the Priestly Code post-exilic, that is to say, after the exile; and so the Passover, and the ritual of blood, and all the offerings that pointed forward to the coming of Christ, are sheer forgery! Now, will you tell me that a man who adopts that method, though he calls it the "historical method", is a proper man to teach in our University? And the other night when he said he adopted the historical method, a lot of people clapped as though that settled the matter—and they did not know what they were clapping about. The historical method, I say, makes the first six books of the Bible, or a large part of them, sheer forgery; utterly unreliable; and brings you into the New Testament without any foundation for the plan of redemption and salvation through the blood.

Destroys the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Then, of course, it absolutely destroys the epistle to the Hebrews, the man who wrote the epistle to the Hebrews did not know what he was talking about, for he said Moses was told to "make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount"—and Dr. Driver's position implies that he never was in the mount, that the tabernacle was not built in Moses' day, that the whole thing is a fabrication! I say that the man who takes that position does not believe in the inspiration and authority either of the Old or the New Testament Scriptures. The "historical method" absolutely destroys the Bible—I mean the so-called historical method.

Prof. Marshall Objects to Word "Punishment."

At the Convention Professor Marshall made a statement about the atonement, and I asked him a few questions—and he will be sorry he answered even one of them. When he saw where he was being led, he sat down and said, "I refuse to be catechized." He interrupted me every few moments, although I had listened patiently to his abuse without a word. I asked if Professor Marshall believed that Jesus Christ endured the punishment of our sins, and he said, "I don't like the word 'punishment', I don't use the word 'punishment'; I prefer the word 'suffering.'" Now mark: when the mask is altogether torn off, you will find behind that denial of the substitutionary work of Jesus Christ, a veiled Unitarianism; for there is never a denial of the one that does not lead, ultimately, to the denial of the divine character of our Lord. I do not say that Professor Marshall is there now, but he is hard on the road that leads inevitably to that position.

Falsely Appropriates Spurgeon's Great Name.

And then, listen: Professor Marshall had the audacity—and I will say it openly, the dishonesty, to affirm, "I stand with Spurgeon on the atonement." Well, I read Spurgeon. I had pages and pages to read, but I read only one or two; and proved beyond all peradventure that what Professor Marshall said was absolutely—and if there are any newspaper men here, please put this in the headlines, that the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church declares that *what Professor Marshall said at the Convention was absolutely—and I use the strongest word I know—untrue*. If he knew anything about theology, he knew it was

untrue; and if he did not—then he ought not to talk about Spurgeon until he knows what he is talking about. He takes that great name, the greatest of the world's evangelicals, one of the greatest preachers the world has ever seen, and dares to say, "I stand where he stood." That kind of deception, dear friends, I frankly say, to me is utterly intolerable. When *The Gospel Witness* comes out you will find that Professor Marshall is a Sadducee.

The McMaster Pharisees.

What about the Pharisees? Dr. Farmer says that he does not believe exactly what Professor Marshall believes: Professor Marshall says, "I don't believe in the historicity of Jonah"; and Dean Farmer says, "I do. But I do not quarrel with Professor Marshall because he does not." What has been the record? I name two men: ex-Chancellor McCrimmon, and the Dean in Theology. These two have always been looked upon as orthodox men, and so far as I know, up to this hour, they have been orthodox in their teaching; I never heard of their teaching that which was not according to Baptist standards—but I know this, that *the Pharisees in McMaster have always protected the Sadducees; you have a kind of intellectual orthodoxy that sponsors, and defends, and, indirectly, propagates, the doctrines of modern Sadduceeism.* "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." You will find to-day that there are brethren in the University, not only on the Faculty but on the Board of Governors, who are orthodox in their statements—I should never charge the Pastor of Walmer Road Church with heterodoxy; so far as I know in his teaching and preaching, he has always been in accord with the great principles of the gospel; but I know that at this moment he is championing Modernism. Of course, they deny that it is Modernism. But they must be very blind! Such an attitude toward the Word of God, such an attitude toward the great central doctrine of the atonement, such an attitude—as I have not time to discuss this evening—as Professor Marshall's attitude toward the resurrection—if that is not Modernism, then everyone is orthodox. But I say that these brethren have joined hands—joined hands—with a modern Sadducee.

I wonder why? I wonder why? We had a contest here a few years ago in this church. What was it all about? Not two per cent. of those who were in opposition to the ministry of this pulpit were, theoretically, Sadducees: they were orthodox people avowedly; and the Sadducees did not have much chance in this church until I preached on worldly amusements. But when I said that the doctrines of the gospel ought to be reduced to practice, and that one who loves the Lord Jesus should really be a spiritual man, and should be separated from the world, not of it, *the Pharisees and Sadducees united—no; not against me personally, do not make that mistake, but against a spiritual interpretation and application of the gospel.* Why, a man could go into a Unitarian church anywhere, and if he holds up orthodoxy as a picture and says, "There it is", people will hold out their hands to him and say, "Yes, part of it I believe, and part of it I don't, Good morning, Pastor, how are you"—there won't be any offence at all. But if you take the great principles of this Book and begin to apply them to everyday life, and say to men, "Thou art the man"—well, you will have something on your hands in these modern times; you will find that Pharisees and Sadducees will get together immediately, and that the religion that is merely a religion of the head will join hands with that other type of religion which demands that human nature should be allowed to have its own way without let or hindrance from above—and it is leaven, my friends, it is leaven.

The Leaven of the Sadducees.

If there ever was an example of what leaven will do, we saw it at the Convention. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump"; and we just had one professor, Professor Matthews, but he was there for twelve or fourteen years, and apparently he has leavened a very large part of the lump.

What of Ourselves?

The few words I have to say now are the most important of all—but that is the situation we have to-day in the Denomination. It is very easy to talk about other people's sins, very easy for me to talk about McMaster—and you who don't belong up there, smile back at me and approve. Well, I want to talk

to you; I want to take this verse and apply it to you as well as to myself to-night: "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees"; which, being interpreted, means this, "Take heed of the religion that is a religion of the head and not of the heart; take heed and beware of a mere theoretical orthodoxy." Some man here may say, "I believe, sir, in the divine inspiration of the Scripture." Do you? In what way? "Why, I read it, and find great delight in seeing how the Scriptures fulfil themselves from Genesis to Revelation. And when I close the Book I say, 'That is what I believe.'" Well, that is very good as far as it goes. But, come now, what authority has the Word of God in your life? Do not talk to me about the authority of Scripture if it has no authority over you. By what law is your life regulated?—that is what I want to know. Is there any higher law than, "Thus saith the Lord"? Do you allow God to speak to you out of this Book? And when you have read His Word, do you bow before it and say, "That must be done to-day, that is the rule of conduct to-day. My business, my pleasure, my domestic affairs, all the affairs of life, have got to be brought into harmony with this authoritative Word, because I believe in the inspiration of Scripture"? If that is not true, stop saying that you believe it, because you do not. You do not really believe any word of Scripture that has not a particular bearing on your life, not a word. Therefore, if we believe in the authority of Scripture, we shall submit to its authority.

Some paedo-Baptist brother says, "I am with you, brother, I believe in the authority of Scripture"—but you have never been baptized yet. Come, now!

What is the use of saying that we believe in the inspiration and authority of Scripture, and then not doing what the Scripture says? "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" So, you very orthodox people, "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees"; be careful if you say you hold to the authority of Scripture, that you let the Scripture have authority in your life every day you live. Then it will be a matter of the heart as well as the head, and you will avoid the danger, the peril, that lurks in a mere doctrinaire attitude toward the Book.

Do You Trust in the Blood?

When we sang a while ago those hymns about the cross of Christ, many of you said, "I believe that." Do you? Come now, do you? How many of you believe it? I will tell you how many of you really believe it: just as many as have really trusted in the blood of Christ for salvation. Have you? "Oh, but my father was a minister, and preached that,"—that makes no difference. "But I was brought up in the church; I believe all that"—but you have not trusted Christ as your Saviour. It is the leaven of the Pharisees, it is a mere head knowledge of the truth that has no relation to the heart. Oh, that somebody this evening who holds this truth with the head, would, from this moment, believe it with the heart, and put your trust wholly in Jesus Christ! Will you do it, will you do it?—so that you may be orthodox of heart as well as of head. Then you will be able to sing,—

"E'er since by faith I saw the stream
Thy flowing wounds supply,
Redeeming love has been my theme,
And shall be till I die."

I cannot go over all the principles that I touched in the beginning, I have not time; but you can go over them for yourselves one by one, the things which Baptists profess to hold, and as you go over them say, "Now, is that a vital doctrine to me? Is it a living thing? Do I allow the Holy Spirit to take of that truth and apply it to my heart?"

The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Baptists believe in the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. Somebody says, "That is not a doctrine for discussion, that is not something to argue about. It is for us to have a clear apprehension intellectually of the truth"—but have you yielded to the power of the Holy Ghost? Does He throb through you? Does He, through you, communicate the life of God to dead souls? Are you

a fruitful branch of the True Vine? If you are not, stop talking about it until you get the fruit, until you are sure you are in Christ, and Christ in you; and He is expressing Himself through your life and ministry.

Let Us Be Practical.

Let us be practical. I know what our opposition friends have said, that everything is in the "spirit". Well, God forgive us if we have shown the wrong spirit at any time. But I declare to you that the defense of these tremendous truths require energy, and we cannot compromise; and I would have you witness that so far as this pulpit is concerned, it never teaches men that a mere doctrinaire reception of the truth, that a mere intellectual acquiescence with the truth, is religion. I do not believe it: I believe that God the Holy Ghost dwells in our hearts and vitalizes and energizes the truth until it is transmuted into character and conduct, and we are daily being conformed to the image of Jesus Christ. Nothing short of that is the religion of Jesus Christ. So as you take these doctrines of the Lord Jesus make sure that they have some practical effect in everyday life; otherwise, we are in danger of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

Mothers! Be On Guard!

Oh, you mothers, will you be on guard? You will find the leaven of the Pharisees in your children's school books, you will find this naturalistic religion taught in your schools—whether the Bible is in the school or not, text books on evolution will be there. And in your high schools and universities, you will find the leaven of the Sadducees working. How many of you have read Ernest Gordon's book entitled, "The Leaven of the Sadducees", put up your hands? What! Well, you read it. It is the most damning indictment of Modernism that ever has been written. It shows that Modernism produces characters of the same sort as those that occupy the penitentiary, as far as their ethics are concerned: they steal colleges, steal churches, and steal everything; they mean one thing and say another thing, and have no regard for truth or honour—and the proof is given in every instance. You mothers and fathers, get that book, "The Leaven of the Sadducees", and read it, and be afraid for your children, for the leaven of the Sadducees is everywhere.

What of Church and S. S. Offices?

And you church officers, will you be on guard against it? It is in your Sunday School papers. How many parents are there here whose children go to Sunday School, examine the Sunday School papers your children receive, will you put up your hands? I won't ask those who don't! Well, watch them. Why, the other day, issued by the American Baptist Publication Society, there was a proper broadcast through all the schools of the land in which Jesus was spoken of in this way, that His body had long since crumbled to the dust! In a Baptist paper! It is true that when attention was called to it, it was so glaring that they repudiated it, and apologized for it, and said it had slipped in unawares. They had no business to allow it to slip in unawares. Their publications are full of the same kind of thing. "Beware of the leaven of the Sadducees", it is working everywhere, undermining the faith of men—and beware of the combination of the two: beware of the orthodox man who defends the modernist; beware of the organization that endorses Modernism.

I make this announcement before I finish, and make an appeal to you this evening. We have come to a critical hour. Now, dear friends, are there some things that cannot be surrendered? ("Yes!") Is there a sine qua non of Christian faith? Is there something without which we have no faith? Is there something for which we ought to stand fast, if it severs the friendships of years, even if it should part father and mother, and sister and brother? I said some time ago something which has been misrepresented, and which was misrepresented on the floor of the Convention, but I will say it again. I have been quoted in the press as saying that I was willing to split every church in the Denomination, and the gentleman who quoted it said that I ought to be a good church splitter—for I had banged and bashed and ruined this church. It does not look like it, with a packed church on this rainy night, does it? But what I really said was this: I deplore such division, I have continual

sorrow in my heart that there should be occasion for such conflict, I have not desired it, nor have I originated it. But there are some things which are vital to Christian faith: one is the authority of this Book, and another, which is the corollary of that, is the infallibility and consequent authority of Jesus Christ; and another, which is the outcome of that, is the efficacy of His atoning blood. How some of you may compromise on these matters—I cannot; I can have no fellowship with men who deny the authority of the Word; I can have no fellowship or co-operation with men who deny the authority, implicitly, of Jesus Christ; and I can have no part nor lot with men who preach some other gospel than that Jesus Christ died instead of me. And what I said on that occasion was this: If loyalty to these great principles splits the church, then I am willing to split the church, and split the Denomination, yes, and divide families, on that issue, that Jesus Christ is supreme. We cannot compromise on that matter; and, my friends, if I may say it without the semblance of boasting, this church in its history of the last five years proves that if Jesus Christ is put first, other things will take care of themselves. I am not afraid of the future; we will go without the camp if we must; we will go with Him, with the doctrine of the precious blood and the authoritative gospel, and in the power of the Holy Ghost, God helping us, we will preach it, and He will bear witness to the Truth with signs following.

Oh, how many are there here this evening, in these days of terrible declension, who will stand together for the faith once for all delivered to the saints? I shall give an invitation to the unconverted. Will anyone say, "Do you expect men to be converted in the midst of contention?" Yes, I do. We always have converts when we have a fighting sermon. And I will tell you why: because the blood of Christ is worth contending for. Certainly it is, and we invite you who are not saved to come; and the reason we contend is that we are jealous for you. We do not want to have this gospel taken away from you, as we cannot surrender it ourselves. We would not have men preach to you another gospel which is not another; we want you to know that the only salvation is in the crucified and risen Christ.

And you who are Baptists, what are you going to do? Are you going to endorse that repudiation of the blood of Christ? for that is what the Convention did. There is no way out of it. After Professor Marshall had plainly said it, the Convention endorsed it, the Dean of Theology endorsed it. What are you going to do—are you going to endorse it? May the Lord help us to a right decision in these matters.

I think we will sing for our invitation hymn one that is not on the sheet, but you all know it,—

"Alas! and did my Saviour bleed?
And did my Saviour die?
Would He devote that sacred head
For such a worm as I?"

Before we sing, let us bow in prayer: O Lord, we pray that Thou wilt lead us to-night. We love Thy Word, we love the Saviour of sinners, and we pray that in this service to-night there may be decisions for Christ. We ask it in His name, Amen.

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

Sunday a drenching rain fell all day. Notwithstanding the continuous downpour, a large congregation assembled at morning service. The Pastor delivered a gospel A. B. C. message on "Come Unto Me," and sixteen responded to the invitation.

In the evening the rain was still falling heavily, but the church was packed to capacity in every part, the Deacons having to occupy seats on the platform. The sermon appearing in this issue was preached, and seven responded to the invitation, five in the open meeting and two followed into the enquiry room. The ordinance of baptism was administered.

Editorial

NEXT WEEK'S CONVENTION ISSUE.

The Gospel Witness had two independent reports of the Educational Session of the Convention taken, that one might be checked against the other so as to secure accuracy. The transcription of this long debate of approximately twelve hours, including verification of quotations and comparison of records, of necessity, takes a long time. Most of the work is now in hand; but it is our purpose in next week's issue not only to publish the report of the Convention, but to answer every point raised by the opposition. Next week's issue may require one hundred pages, but whatever the length, we intend to expose the sheer hypocrisy of McMaster University and the absolute untruthfulness of many statements made by her defenders.

The speeches of Drs. John MacNeill, A. J. Vining, and Bowley Green, were so full of venom that we believe every genuine Christian in the Denomination will condemn them. We shall publish an editorial on this subject from one of the Toronto papers, among other interesting items.

It is enough in this issue to say that Professor Marshall, by his own statement, explicitly repudiated the central doctrine of the Christian religion, namely, the substitutionary and expiatory purpose of the death of Christ. And, with his statement before them, the Convention of Ontario and Quebec in a resolution which very properly put the Chancellor, the Dean in Theology, and Professor Marshall, in one class, endorsed the false teaching of the latter. At present, the Editor of this paper speaks only as an individual, but he is confident that while the Jarvis Street Church has not taken official action, it will unanimously agree to his proposal, namely, that not another dollar shall pass from the treasury of Jarvis Street Church to the fund of any Board which is part of the Convention which has approved Professor Marshall's repudiation of the expiatory work of Christ.

No one in the Convention has been more outspoken in support of McMaster University than the Secretary of Foreign Missions, Rev. H. E. Stillwell. As long as the churches continue to send money to the Boards, they will continue their support of McMaster University. We venture here now to suggest that where the churches are united in opposition to McMaster's Modernism, every member should continue their missionary contributions, and that the church should hold these contributions in their treasuries awaiting further developments; and that all true Regular Baptists who are members of churches where the majority stand with McMaster, should immediately cease to make any further contributions to mission funds, but lay up their contributions at home until such time as channels are open through which their money may go with the assurance that it will be used in preaching the gospel. The Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec is now fully controlled by McMaster sympathizers, and, in our judgment, ought not to be trusted with another dollar of Regular Baptist money. These suggestions involve severe measures, but nothing short of the cutting off of supplies will bring these Boards to their senses.

TWO GREAT MEETINGS.

Two great meetings were held in Jarvis Street Baptist Church Wednesday and Thursday, October 20th and 21st. The first was hurriedly called, and was known to only a limited number of people. Notwithstanding, about nine hundred were present. The second, on Thursday evening, completely filled Jarvis Street Church. Several addresses were made at each meeting. One of the most striking speeches was made by Pastor James McGinlay, in which he said that the vote of censure upon the Editor of this paper was very much like a convention of bootleggers passing a vote of censure upon the Ontario police because they had discovered an illicit still in somebody's cellar. He said that the denominational detective had discovered in the denominational cellar, McMaster University, a still which was turning out heterodox theology;

and that, because the detective had discovered it and exposed it, the theological bootleggers had passed a vote of censure upon the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*. We heartily subscribe to Brother McGinlay's statement, for the present course of McMaster University is just as illegal as the making of bootleg whiskey. And, it may be remarked, its product is just as deadly!

Brother McGinlay also referred to what Dr. Graham, Pastor of First Avenue Baptist Church, had said on Friday night in reply to the proposal to move the Convention to a larger building: Dr. Graham said that it would be impossible to move "all the machinery". Brother McGinlay said the "machinery" was so well oiled that a little child could move it, and that he (McGinlay) stood on the Jarvis Street platform on that occasion in opposition to McMaster University, because he refused to be one of the "nuts" in the machine! We shall have more to say about the "machine" and the "nuts" later.

AN ASSOCIATION OF REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCHES.

At the Thursday night meeting the great congregation, which numbered twice the seating capacity of the Convention church, without a dissenting voice, passed the following resolution:

In view of the present situation in the Convention, and the necessity of establishing a fellowship of brethren who hold and practise the doctrines, principles, and polity of the Regular Baptists, as individuals and churches, it is resolved that a committee hereinafter named be appointed to take steps toward the organization of an association of Regular Baptists within the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, to make possible the co-operation of such Regular Baptists in missionary and educational work; and with authority to call a meeting for the formation of such an association at such time and place as the committee shall determine; it being understood that it is intended that such organization is to be without prejudice to the churches' status as parts of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

This resolution looks to the formation, within the Convention, of an Association of Regular Baptist Churches which will undertake evangelistic, missionary, and educational work. Such churches as are united on the basis of Regular Baptist principles will be able, as churches, to do their missionary work through that organization; and such individual Regular Baptists as may still be members of churches which are divided in respect to Regular Baptist principles, will be able to make their contributions to Regular Baptist work through the funds of this Regular Baptist Association. We have information which enables us to say that the Committee appointed at the Thursday night meeting to give effect to the above-mentioned resolution, will take immediate steps to prepare for the calling of the meeting for the formation of such Association, so that no time will be lost in opening channels through which Regular Baptist missionary benevolences may flow. *The Gospel Witness* will keep its readers informed respecting this matter.

THE NEW COLLEGE.

Some time ago we proposed the establishment of a Pastors' College that would train men to do such work as Regular Baptists should do. We have postponed the beginning of that work in the hope that such changes could be effected in McMaster University as to render such an institution unnecessary. But now the die is cast, and we are determined the college shall open at an early date. It will begin on a modest scale; and from its opening until the spring, the course will be mainly on the Bible itself, and will be designed to fit the students for evangelistic and Bible-teaching work. In Jarvis Street alone a great army of young people are waiting for the college doors to open. In due time the institution will be properly organized and incorporated, and surrounded with such legal safeguards as will make it impossible for any anti-Christian, or unscriptural teacher, to speak the second time within its walls. It will aim to produce able ministers of the New Testament.

This is only an advance notice; fuller particulars will be made later. But this is an appeal to all our friends in the United States and Canada to come to our help financially. Here is an opening to contribute to "Christian Education".

We have just received a letter from the West, from one of the Lord's saints who has little money to give, and this is what she says: "I feel sure you will have a college, and am praying that many of the congregation will give you all the money you need. They could, if they would take time to think how they could do it. To my mind, it is easy. A great number could do without new dresses, and all that they imagine has to go with a new dress. What if they wear the same winter coat and hat as last year, or even the year before? They would be just as nice in the sight of the Lord, for what is all this dress in His sight? So much money is foolishly wasted on dress, just to adorn the body and make outward show, when it could do so much for Jesus."

Some will smile at this suggestion, for when they think of contributions for education, they often think in terms of thousands, or tens of thousands, or hundreds of thousands, of dollars; but a careful study of the history of the Christian church will show that God has invariably got His work done through poor people. There is a spiritual accompaniment with gifts that involve sacrifice. God does not really need our money, nor does He really need service from us of any kind; but it is His will that we should be sharers in the sufferings and sacrifice of Christ, and in the measure in which any one of us approaches the self-abnegation of the Cross, the blessing of the Lord rests upon us. We hope to make a full announcement respecting the college within a few weeks. In the meantime we invite our friends to send in their contributions to the College Fund.

WHAT MAY BE DONE.

Many a pastor has broken his heart, and almost sacrificed his life, in an endeavour to re-vivify certain churches which have lost all spiritual influence in the communities in which they minister, because of the unspiritual character of their members. We believe there are hundreds of towns and villages throughout Ontario and Quebec in which no Baptist church is found, and where no Baptist testimony has been given, where young men, knowing the gospel and full of the Spirit of God, may go and repeat the marvellous record of the revival in Alton. Let us pray that God will raise up a great army of young men who will lay their own foundations and build up New Testament churches all over this province. This will be real "Home Mission" work which will appeal to the hearts of our people.

A long experience on the Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec has convinced us that much of our Home Mission money has been wasted in supporting churches which, but for the niggardliness of some of their members, might have supported themselves. Of course, this has been true of only comparatively few churches, for in time past we believe God has signally blessed our Home Mission enterprise, and many of the truest and most fruitful churches of the Denomination owe their existence to the support they received from Home Mission funds. But even the Chairman of the Home Mission Board has not been altogether enthusiastic about entering new places. His summer home is in Oakville, and the little Bronte Mission Church is only four or five miles away; but instead of attending the little Baptist church while living in Oakville, he has always attended the Presbyterian church. We need real Baptists to head our Baptist enterprises, who have a profound conviction of the scripturalness of Baptist principles, and who will determine, in the power of the Holy Spirit, to propagate them. But we shall have much more to say about these matters later.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION ANNOUNCEMENT.

Some weeks ago the Executive Committee of the Baptist Bible Union of North America met in Cleveland, Ohio. Among the matters considered was one which has engaged the attention of the Executive Committee almost from the

inception of the Union, namely, the necessity of finding and appointing a Field Secretary. No doubt there are many men endowed with the qualities such a position requires, but whenever the subject was considered, no one could think of a man having such qualities whose services could be secured.

At Cleveland the Field Secretaryship came up as a matter of great urgency. A committee was appointed to investigate the matter, and at a later session, the name of the Rev. W. E. Atkinson, Secretary of the Ontario and Quebec Branch of the Baptist Bible Union was suggested. Mr. Atkinson, during the last six months, has proved himself one of the most effective Bible Union workers on the continent. The committee felt it would be safe in inviting a man who had proved his devotion and ability in the work as an unsalaried official, and accordingly officially invited Mr. Atkinson to become Field Secretary.

Just as we were going to press, Mr. Atkinson informed us that he has decided to accept the Committee's call, and has tendered his resignation as Pastor of Christie St. Baptist Church, Toronto.

Although a Canadian by birth, the new Field Secretary has had a wide contact with Baptist work in the United States, and has the great advantage of having spent about four years as a missionary in Africa, and is therefore profoundly interested in, and peculiarly qualified to deal with, the missionary problems which are so vital a part of the work of the Baptist Bible Union.

Mr. Atkinson is a preacher of ability. He has a fine platform presence, a magnificent voice, and an attractive personality. He is effective as an evangelistic preacher, and Bible teacher, and will be very popular at Bible Conferences. He has an exceptional capacity for details, and will, we believe, prove a master at getting other people to work. Much of his time will be spent in bringing Bible Unionists together in unorganized territories, and in arranging conferences to be addressed by local speakers. We feel sure that Mr. Atkinson will make friends for the B.B. Union wherever he goes. He expects to assume the duties of his office about December first.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Lesson 8.

Fourth Quarter.

November 21st, 1926.

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 4.

THE COMFORTER.

Lesson Text: John, chapter 16.

Golden Text—"Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you" (John 16:7).

I. THE DISCIPLES FOREARMED BY BEING FOREWARNED.

1. He who is the Truth was always frank with those who would follow Him (vss. 1-3). He told them always what was involved in His discipleship, and never lowered His standard to suit the popular demand. In these verses He promised His disciples persecution—and even death; and He does this that they may not later be disillusioned and caused to stumble. It was such a message also He commissioned Ananias to deliver to Saul of Tarsus: "I will shew him how great things he must suffer for My Name's sake" (Acts 9:16). The Gospel of Christ makes an appeal always to the heroic; but, instead of depending upon the power of the Holy Ghost so to magnify Christ before men and fill their hearts with love of Him that they would be willing to endure persecution and even death for His sake, the modern pulpit endeavors to make the Gospel palatable, and to substitute merely psychology for the mighty power of God. This was not the method of the Master, nor was it the method of the preachers of the Apostolic Church. 2. Such persecution must be expected from a world that knows not God (vs. 4); and this must be kept in view. We are in an enemy's country; the language of the world is a foreign language, its habits are equally alien to the tastes and habits of the saints of light. 3. We should be confirmed in our faith as we find Christ's Word

verified in our own experience (vs. 4). If the mind is stored with Scripture, we shall find the Bible saying to us every day, "Did I not tell you so?"

II. THE PROMISE OF THE COMFORTER IS HERE RENEWED—Vss. 7-15.

1. We are here told that we are admitted to greater privileges under the Spirit's ministry than we could have enjoyed under the personal ministry of Christ. Martha and Mary each complained, "Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." While He was in the flesh He moved from place to place and they did not enjoy a sense of His continual presence; but He here tells us that it is expedient that He go away that the Comforter might come and abide with us. Ours are higher privileges than were those who followed Christ in the days of his flesh. 2. The twofold ministry of the Spirit: (1) He is to convince of sin. There are many kinds of sin. It is sometimes possible to reason a man into believing that it is a sin to get drunk, or to be dishonest; but the sin to which reference is made here is the sin of which men, too often, are proud rather than ashamed. The one sin which comprehends all other sins, and is the only sin which can shut the door of Heaven upon a sinner is that of unbelief—"of sin, because they believe not on Me". Only the Holy Spirit can make men see how heinous is the sin of rejecting Christ. (2) Of righteousness. The truth is, no one knows what righteousness is, for, according to human judgments, we should have as many standards of righteousness as we have men and women on earth. We are without any standard of righteousness because the one and only perfect Standard, Jesus Christ Himself, has gone to the Father and men see Him no more. It is therefore the function of the Holy Spirit to set up in the human heart and conscience a Heavenly standard of righteousness, and to make men see that nothing short of the absolute perfection of Jesus Himself can pass with God. (3) Of judgment—not of judgment to come as this text is often misquoted. There is a judgment to come, but this text refers to the judgment that has already fallen,—"Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged". It is the mission of the Holy Spirit to make men see that our sin has been carried to the Cross, and that there God's judgment fell upon it. We are to see in the Cross God's estimate of the deserts of sin: it deserves death, and nothing but death. On the other hand: it is the Spirit's work to show that our sin has already been judged; that our sin has been punished in the Person of our Substitute, it has been atoned for by the precious Blood of Christ; the Law has been magnified and made honorable, and the utmost farthing of our indebtedness has been paid—only the Holy Spirit can make this clear. 3. Christ suggests that there are unrevealed mysteries which must await the light of the resurrection: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." By which He meant that their then state and circumstances would make it impossible for them to understand them. It would, for instance, have been useless to have given to anyone of the disciples on the other side of the cross and the empty grave the abundant revelations which were given to Paul; in the nature of the case such revelation could be understood only in the light of the resurrection. This principle is involved in the great saying in I Peter, 1:10-12. The prophets wrote what they were inspired to write, but could not understand their own writings. 4. The Spirit is promised to guide them into all the truth. It was said that He should not speak from Himself, but should speak that which was given Him to speak. This promise was, of course, fulfilled in the writing of the New Testament. We have in the Acts and the Epistles the "many things" which Christ had to say, but which, on the other side of the Cross and the grave, the disciples could not bear,—but it is none the less Christ's Word. We should put no difference between the words actually spoken by the lips of Christ and the words written by the Apostle Paul, for the reason that the record of each is preserved to us only by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. 5. The theme of the Spirit's message will be Christ: "He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of Mine, and shall shew it unto you" (vss. 14, 15). This promise should be borne in mind as we read the New Testament. It was, indeed, fulfilled in John's own experience actually in the light of the marvelous Book of Revelation; as it was also in the writing of all the Epistles and of the Acts; and it finds a further fulfilment in the present

ministry of the Spirit in the heart of the believer, interpreting that which He Himself has written.

III. THE PARENTHESIS OF DEATH.

1. The problem of "the little while": "They said therefore, What is this that He saith, A little while? we cannot tell what He saith" (vss. 16-19). We are but little children in relation to the things of the infinite future. Most of us remember how distressed we were when father or mother told us to wait "a little while" for something we desired to possess: that little while seemed to us an eternity. In the view of Christ, death is but a parenthesis: "a little while" we are separated one from another, but it is only "a little while". (1) This applied to Christ: He was to die and be buried and be separated from His disciples—"a little while" and then they would see Him again. Again He ascended into the Glory and He has left this world for "a little while", but some time soon He will come again. His tarrying is only for "a little while" to Him, for with Him a thousand years are as a day, and a day as a thousand years. (2) This applies also to the believer: there are some whom we have "loved but lost a while". They have gone from us and years have passed since their departure. We talk of the procession of the years as though they represented a long time, but they are only "a little while" in comparison with the unending reach of eternity beyond. 2. He warns them of the shadow and of the accompanying sorrow: the glory of His personal presence will be eclipsed by the shadow of death, and they will sorrow because of His departure. So must it always be when the shadow falls upon our pathway (vs. 20). 3. But He promises joy in the morning: "But I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you". This was partially fulfilled in His resurrection, but will be fulfilled to all the saints at "His glorious appearance". Moreover, them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him.

IV. FURTHER TEACHING RESPECTING THE RELATION OF THE DEPARTURE OF CHRIST TO THE PRIVILEGE OF PRAYER.

1. It was expedient that He should leave us in order that He might more fully represent us in the presence of the Father. Thus it is written, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous". 2. Therefore we pray in His name, for He is in the Holy of Holies appearing in the presence of God for us to take our poor prayers and, stamping them with His merit, present them to the Father. 3. Through the ministry of prayer we are to find the fulness of joy (vs. 24). How blessedly suggestive this is! Too many Christian people think of prayer as an incumbent duty, as an exercise to be resorted to in the time of trouble; but here our Lord tells us that it is the only way by which we may have the fulness of joy. 4. Faith endears the believer to the Father (vss. 26, 27). What a royal welcome a stranger receives at the hands of a loving father when he is informed that he is the intimate friend of the son living in a distant part of the world! How he is received for the son's sake! So Christ tells us that he is dear to the heart of God who has believed that Christ came out from God. 5. Leaving the world empty-handed, and apparently driven hence by the cruel hand of human hate, Jesus dared to say, "I have overcome the world". And in Him we may have peace: though in the world we have tribulation, through faith in Him we may share His glorious triumph.

ORDERS FOR NEXT WEEK'S WITNESS.

The issue will be at least six *Witnesses* in one. Every argument of McMaster in defense of Marshallism which the limitations of time prevented our answering on the Convention floor, will be met. It will contain crushing and conclusive proof of McMaster's surrender to Modernism. Single copies will be sent postpaid for ten cents, but Pastors and others are urged to help circulate next week's issue throughout the denomination, endeavouring to put a copy in every church family. Ten cents a copy will not pay for the printing, and the bill for the double stenographic report will be a heavy one. But we will put no price on copies for distribution, but ask every pastor or other person desiring copies for distribution to raise what they can toward the expense of publication and order as many copies as they can effectively use. If possible send orders by wire or letter so as to reach our office by Wednesday, November 3rd.