

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, *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. 32. TORONTO, DECEMBER 16th, 1926. Whole No. 242.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE WRITING ON THE CROSS.
 A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Pulpit, Toronto, Sunday Morning, December 12th, 1926.
 (Stenographically Reported.)

"And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS.
 "This title then read many of the Jews; for the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city: and it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin.
 "Then said the chief priests of the Jews to Pilate, Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews.
 "Pilate answered, What I have written I have written."—John 19: 19-22.



HERE are few studies which more certainly tend to the confirmation of faith than the study of Scripture, with a view to observing how Scripture fulfills itself. This particular chapter in every line shows God to be a sovereign God. Satan entered into Judas, and he betrayed his Lord and sold Him for silver. While he is not to be excused for his wrong-doing—"it must needs be that offences come", yet by his very betrayal, he fulfilled the Scripture. Caiaphas, the high priest, said to his confederates, not knowing that he uttered a prophetic word, "Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation." They brought Him to the cross—that was the instrument of death—they had sought to kill Him many times, but His hour had not yet come: He chose the time, the place, and the method of His death, and He said, "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 wore a seamless robe, and they cast lots upon His vesture "that the scripture might be fulfilled". He cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and thereby He fulfilled the prophetic word. The very enemies of the Cross as they passed by wagged their heads and said, "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now"—not knowing, or forgetting, that that word had been put into the Sufferer's lips by the pen of inspiration centuries before when the twenty-second Psalm was written. They gave Him vinegar to drink "that the scripture might be

fulfilled". He was crucified between two thieves, that the Scripture might be fulfilled which said, "He was numbered with the transgressors." And when at last they came to break the bones of those who were hanging on the cross, that they might thereby hasten death, when they came to Jesus they found Him dead already, "that the scripture should be fulfilled. A bone of him shall not be broken." Then they took Him from the cross to lay Him in the grave, and one called Joseph of Arimathaea, being a rich man, begged the body of Jesus and laid it away in his own new grave wherein never man was yet laid, that the scripture might be fulfilled which said, "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death." Then over His head, as He hung upon the cross, the people who passed by saw written, "JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS." And they said, "This is a mistake", and they hurried away to Pilate and said, "Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews." But Pilate said, "What I have written I have written." And beneath that writing He hung as He bowed His head and gave up the ghost. Jesus is, always has been, always will be, not a King, but THE King, —King of kings, and Lord of lords.

Let us look for a few minutes at the Writing on the Cross, then observe the human attempt to change the superscription of His accusation; and at last share the joy of the discovery that the writing is indelible: there is no power that can change it, "JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS."

I.

Observe then THE WRITING ON THE CROSS.

To begin with, *He is THE King*. He sat upon no earthly throne, He wielded no visible sceptre, He wore until now no crown upon His brow, He wore no royal robe, He lived in no palace,—indeed, He pathetically exclaimed, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." He was numbered among the poorest of the poor, He had to work a miracle to get money enough to pay the taxes. He was often weary; sometimes hungry; "despised and rejected of men"—and yet with it all, He was THE King. Kings of ancient times were wont to hold the doctrine of the "divine right of kings", they declared that certain men by birth inherited the right to rule. That doctrine has long been abandoned. But there is one King who is *the King* by divine right. Some questions He would not answer, but when Pilate said, "Art thou a king?" Jesus answered, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

You will never be rightly related to Jesus until you accord Him His place as THE King. The brother who was with us Thursday night referred to the too common practice of Christian people of speaking of our crucified Lord as Jesus. I remember Dr. Dixon's telling me that he was once at breakfast with a number of men in London, Sir Robert Anderson among them. Dr. Dixon had spoken at the breakfast table, and there he had referred to the Lord as *Jesus*. As they left the place where they had met, he said Sir Robert Anderson slipped his arm through his, and as they walked along the street together he said, "You will not object if I criticize your speech of the morning a little, will you?" Dr. Dixon replied, "Certainly not; what did I say that you did not approve of, Sir Robert?" "You spoke of the Lord Jesus Christ as 'Jesus'. Unitarians call Him Jesus; give Him His full title, the Lord Jesus Christ". He is Jesus; but He is more than that. Give Him His full title, so that whenever you mention His name, all will hear and know what He is to you; call Him the Lord Jesus Christ, for He is anointed to reign.

The name Christ has in it the kingship of our Lord: "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed—(or, against his Christ)—saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give

thou the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore"—who are exhorted to be wise?—"O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."

Let us see to it that in our thought of Jesus Christ we ascribe all majesty, and power, and dominion, to Him Who is **THE KING**—not a man among other men. Let us make our protest whenever men would class this Book with other books: it is not a book—it is **THE Book**; it is not a gospel—it is **THE gospel**; He is not a King—He is **THE KING**, and there is no other. The failure of every form of human government points to the necessity for the coming of One Who shall possess and exercise absolute power, Who shall be universally recognized as **THE KING**.

Then He was spoken of as "*the King of the Jews*": That title was especially obnoxious to the Jews: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." They brought Him forth wearing the crown of thorns, and in mockery they cried, "Hail, King of the Jews!" Pilate, when they cried, "Crucify him", said, "Shall I crucify your King?" And they said, "We have no king but Caesar. He is not our king!" They refused to recognize Him: "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until"—Oh, until! Not yet have Israel generally received Him as a King; but, my dear friends, He is King of the Jews. And some day even the Jews will bow to His sceptre: "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son"; "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." Whether they will or no, Jesus is the King of the Jews.

"It was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin." It was written in the three principal languages of the world of that time: the language of religion; the language, shall I say, of culture and education; and the language of commerce—and He is said to be in all languages **THE King**.

Ah, *in the realm of religion Jesus is THE King*. You students who are engaged in the study of comparative religions, beware! The popular thing nowadays is to teach that in our foreign mission efforts we are to take the best out of heathen religions, and graft it on to the religion of Christ; we are told that there is good in all religions!—and the end of it all is to be a combination of what may be true in all the philosophies of the heathen. That is not according to the teaching of the Word of God. No one can share the throne religiously with Jesus, no one can share His glory; in the realm of religion the absolute authority is with Jesus Christ, He is **THE King**. You may call me a controversialist, or what you will, but I have a quarrel with every man—if I had to stand alone I would dare to say, I have a quarrel with the world that would dare to say that any other hand than the wounded hand of Calvary shall wield the sceptre, or that anyone shall share His authority in matters of religion. "Let God be true, but every man a liar." Let us receive the revelation of God as the divine ultimatum; God's last Word to a sinful world is Jesus, **THE King**; submit to Him, bow to Him, obey Him—or take the consequences of your disobedience!

And the same is true in *the realm of education*: "The Greeks seek after wisdom"—there it is written in Greek, "Jesus the king", that is the supreme wisdom! Ah, to those who are saved, "Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God"! And hear me, you boys and girls in high school, I do not care who your teacher is, man or woman, I do not care what his training is, if ever you hear your teacher anywhere suggest that there is anything in this Holy Book that is not true, that the Bible is not reliable, whenever you hear your teacher substitute human wisdom for the wisdom of God as revealed in Christ, you say in your heart, "That is one thing I will not believe"—no matter who your teacher is, you Christian boys and girls, put Jesus Christ first in school, and insist that anything that contradicts Him is not true, no matter where it comes from. **Jesus THE King!**

Ah, yes! And then in the workaday world, *the world of commerce and*

Industry and politics—I do not think He will be the King by any legislative process, I do not think we are going to gradually come to a millennial state by any process of evolution. But in the language of business, of industry, of politics, of statesmanship, in all these departments of life, ultimately it will be recognized that Jesus Christ is THE King; and we approximate the millennial ideal only in the measure in which that is recognized. That being so, we are a long, long way from the millennium, it seems to me. "JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING."

But more especially, I want you to see that *this writing was on the cross*. A strange place to put it, was it not? It was a striking contradiction, surely. There He is, stripped of His one seamless robe; wearing a crown, but a crown of thorns; His precious body defiled by the spittle of the rabble crew who spat in His face, and said, "Hail, King of the Jews!" They put a reed in His hand in mockery; they nailed Him to the cross; then they gradually reared it and dropped it into the socket prepared for it, until the weight of His precious body hung upon the cruel nails; and as they passed by the people saw the mocking title on the cross. "JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS"! Oh, but that was the right place to put it: *the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ is the symbol of His sovereignty*. Listen: "Satan entered into" Judas, the enemies of Christ designed to destroy Him, to put an end to Him and His teaching; and yet the Devil never did a more fatal thing for himself than when he reared the cross! There he dealt a death-blow to his own kingdom, he repeated the history of that marvellous story of Esther, when Haman built a gallows for Mordecai, and was hanged upon it himself.

The cross, I say, is the symbol of sovereignty. You and I could not be trusted with power. We believe in a constitutional monarchy, for the reason that no man can be trusted with absolute authority. A human despot soon becomes a human devil; therefore it is necessary that men should be restricted in the exercise of power. But here is One Who had all authority in heaven and on earth: He could have called twelve legions of angels to His side, He could have spoken one word and Hell itself would have opened its jaws to receive His enemies. When they approached Him in the garden and He asked them the question, "Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he As soon then as he had said unto them, I am he, they went backward, and fell to the ground"—yes, and had He willed it they would have fallen backward into the pit and never have recovered themselves. He had power to blast a million worlds into hell with one word, had He cared to do it. Omnipotence was in His hand; He upholdeth "all things by the word of his power"; "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance He taketh up the isles as a very little thing"—and yet, omnipotent as He was, He meekly yielded His hands to the nails, and said to Pilate when Pilate asked Him, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?"—Oh, what a subject for discussion!—a little bit of a man, afraid of his life, "whose breath is in his nostrils", afraid of losing his job! saying to Incarnate Deity, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?" And Jesus said, "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above. This is your hour, and the power of darkness. For one hour hell is to have its way, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." So He sovereignly yielded His hands to the nails! They pierced His feet with iron sin had forged, and yet the very clouds are the dust of His feet!

And as He hung there, *all nature recognized the sovereignty of Him who was nailed to that central cross*: at sight of that cross, the heavens put on sackcloth, the constellations formed in funeral procession, and the sun exchanged at noon his wonted bridal vestments for the mourning robes of night! And when Jesus cried, "It is finished", the veil of the temple was rent in twain, and the earth quaked, it shuddered, it shook, in sympathy with the indescribable agony of its Maker. And the centurion, when he saw the things that were done, looked up at the cross and said, "Truly this was the Son of God."

Ah, and *He was sovereign over man at the cross*. Wicked men nailed Him there—I love that word of Peter's in his sermon at Pentecost. Listen, observe

these two principles, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain"—they thought they were winning a victory against truth and righteousness, but God from the beginning ordained that it should be; and He sovereignly put His hand upon men, and compelled them to do His will; and "wicked" as they were, every man who took part in the crucifixion was compelled to execute the sovereign will of God.

And He is *sovereign over the Devil*. "Satan entered into Judas," and said, "Come on, Judas, we will put an end to Jesus now, we will finish Him, we will crucify Him, and we will bury Him out of sight". He reared the cross—and the cross has been a battering ram that has been breaking down the ramparts of evil ever since; the cross has been the supreme attraction that has won unnumbered millions to yield allegiance of Jesus Christ. And, do you know, the Cross is to be the central door-post, and blood-sprinkled lintels, beneath and on either side of which the very gates of pearl will swing to admit the ransomed into the presence of God?

Oh, at the cross Jesus Christ was sovereign over all; and it was fitting that above His head there should be this superscription of His accusation, "THIS IS JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS."

II.

Men did not like it then—they do not like it still—and so they said, LET US CHANGE THE WRITING. And men have been busy trying to change that superscription ever since! Why? I repeat, Why is it? It were useless to talk historically merely, rather, I ask you a question, Why is it that men object to the absolute supremacy of Jesus Christ? Is there anyone worthier to wear the crown? Is there anyone who can wield the sceptre with more consummate wisdom? Can Heaven itself produce one worthier than the Lord Jesus Christ? The veil is drawn and we hear all heaven singing,—every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea—all join in this great, glad, song, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." Why is it men object to it? There was a time when they did not object, there was a time when they came by force to make Him King, great multitudes of them. They said, "This is the King for us; let us put the crown on His brow, let us acclaim Him King of the Jews, let us have the kingdom established here and now. He is just the King we need." What made them do that? Why, they had come to Him, and had sat at His feet, and listened to Him until they were hungry—and then the lad with the five loaves and two fishes had been found, and through His disciples Christ organized the company, making them sit down by fifties; then He took the bread and brake it, and gave to His disciples, and kept on breaking it, until the five thousand men, beside women and children, had had enough, and twelve basketsful were left! They said, "Would it not be fine to have a king like that? Would it not be a great thing to have a religion that was profitable for the life that now is?" Godliness is profitable for the life that now is, but it "is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come".

The sin of the modern church is that it has forgotten the life that is to come, and the emphasis is upon time instead of upon eternity, upon the "now" instead of upon the "hereafter". And if you preach that, and keep on preaching it, you must not be surprised if all your ministers want place and power in this life; you must not be surprised if the church and all its activities are measured by worldly standards; you must not be surprised if the rank and file demand a religion that will make this present life into a heaven. There is nothing in the Word to support it,—on the contrary, persecution, tribulation, the hatred of the world, all kinds of suffering are promised here; and the reward hereafter; that is the emphasis of Scripture. Not at His first coming does the Lord deliver the whole creation "into the glorious liberty of the children of God"; but, blessed be His name, He will when He comes again ("Hallelujah!" "Praise the Lord!") It is no vain hope to look for a religion that is good for this world—and for all other worlds—for that is the religion of Christ; but in the meantime we have to suffer; and wherever the love of the world, and the things of the world, and the friendships of the world, take possession of the

hearts of men, they will always say, "Write not the King, but that He said, I am the King"; they want the loaves and fishes!

An old man who remembered years ago the origin of a certain political party in the United States, told me that someone described that party as a party of sound principles, a party made up of men who were ready to die for their principles. He said it was a party of seven principles, namely, five loaves and two fishes! There have been many political parties like that since! And, my friends, there are many religious people also who are people of sound principles,—and they have seven, too, five loaves and two fishes! They are ever opposed to anything that conflicts with the interests of the loaves and fishes!

There lies the difficulty in our present controversy in this Denomination. I intend no reflection upon our ministry, but I declare to you that if men and women so loved Jesus Christ, and so trusted Him, that they would put Him first, before all other considerations, and say, "As for me, Jesus Christ is THE King, and I will proclaim it if I have to go down to starvation", we should settle all our problems in a very short time. But it is the wretched, uncomplaining, spirit of Pilate that brings us to this state, we have too many Pilates. Let us beware, for not one of us is of value to the Lord until we have come to the place where we can get our eyes off the loaves and fishes, and our hearts and our trust shall be given wholly to Him Who is King.

That is a suggestion you can work out for yourselves, the age-long human protest against the kingship of Jesus Christ. This philosophy you can turn over in your own mind, and if He is not your King, find out why He is not; and when you have found out why He is not your King, you will have found out, largely, why He is not King of other people's lives.

III.

Once more: THE ENEMIES OF CHRIST DISCOVERED THE WRITING TO BE INDELIBLE. They came to Pilate and they said, "Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews." They said, "There is a difference between what He said, and what is true." Do you note that? They said, "There were some things that Jesus said that were not true"—they said, "He said, I am the King, but that is not true—that is not true. Will you please change it?" But Pilate said, "You are too late; I have already written it, and what I have written I have written, and it cannot be changed. There it is, go and read it; it is on the cross, 'Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews.'" Ah, my friends, I will tell you why Pilate did not change it: Somebody else had written it long before Pilate came to town. Oh, it was written—I quoted it to you from the second Psalm—it was written there, and it was written in the counsels of the Eternal before ever the worlds were made, "Jesus of Nazareth the King". And there was not power enough in earth, or in hell, to change that writing.

Pilate intended no compliment when he wrote that. He was rather angry that the Jews had pushed him into a compromising position, he was distressed, I imagine, in his own soul, that he had been compelled to give sentence as they required; but now he would return the compliment to them. And so he took a pen—or whatever he used to write the superscription of the accusation—and I suppose he wondered, Now, how shall I write it? What shall I say? He did not know it, but a sovereign Hand was laid upon his, and that which had been in the mind of God from the beginning, found expression through Pilate's pen; it was the hand of God that wrote it on the cross, "Jesus the King". And nobody can change that writing. Blessed be God, all the critics in the world cannot make what Jesus Christ said to be untrue! If he said, "I am a king", then it is true; if Jesus Christ said that Jonah really lived, and all the rest of it, it is true. Did He say that? Did He say it? Then someone says, "Write not that it is true, but that He said it. Of course, He said it, but it is not true"! The same old story, is it not? Whatever the problem is, whether in the Old Testament or the New Testament, you have it all in germ here, "Write not, the King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews." Blessed be God! what is written is written: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven", and you cannot change it up there; you cannot play false with the minutes that are written in God's minute-book:

it is written, to be there when the judgment seat is revealed. "What I have written I have written!"

Well, my friends, had I time I should like to elaborate at this point, but I must finish by asking you this question, Are you in accord with the writing? Can you come into agreement with the writing this morning? Can you say, "Amen", to what is written on the cross? When you do, you are a Christian. "Is that true? Is that so?" Yes; when you accept God's estimate of His Son, and come into agreement with God in respect to His Son, then all controversy between you and God is over; He will forgive you all your sins: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men"; He will forgive all your sins, but you must not say that Jesus Christ was not born of a virgin; do not deny His supernatural character, because the Holy Ghost says He was virgin-born—and you had better not contradict the Holy Ghost. Do not say that He is not sovereign, that He was limited in His knowledge; for the Bible says He was not. But He will forgive us all our mistakes, all our blunders, our sins of ignorance—yes, blessed be His matchless name, even sins of presumption too, if only we accept His estimate of Jesus Christ, and receive Him as Saviour, Lord, and King.

What did the centurion do? The centurion superintended the plating of the crown of thorns, the centurion directed the soldiers who nailed Him to the cross, he was there when they thrust a spear to His heart, he was the superintendent of the crucifixion—more than any other one man, he was responsible for the actual crucifixion of Jesus Christ; and yet when he had done it all, he bowed before the cross and said, "Truly this man was the Son of God." I believe he was converted at that moment. Oh, if I might reverently say so, heaven itself stooped to say to that centurion, "Heaven is at one with you in your estimate of the One Who died on the cross." And when you and I can trust Him as our Saviour Who came to die for our sins, who was slain for our offences, and raised for our justification, God will forgive us.

And then make your heart the palace, the throne-room of the King. Make Him your King in such a way that all the world may know, wherever you go, that you ascribe glory, and honour, and wisdom, and power, and majesty, "to Jesus of Nazareth the King".

Let us ask Him to help us: O Lord, there is not one of us who does not deserve to be ruled with a rod of iron, to be dashed in pieces as a potter's vessel; for we have lifted the hand of rebellion against the Ruler of the universe. O, forgive us, Thou gracious King! We thank Thee that we met Thee at the Cross, we thank Thee that Thou hast come to us at the Cross rather than at the great white throne; we thank Thee that there our sins may be forgiven, there our guilt may be washed away. With full hearts we praise Thee that,—

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

Some of us have plunged beneath that flood, and we are able to say:

"The dying thief rejoiced to see
That fountain in his day;
And there have I, though vile as he,
Washed all my sins away."

Now our prayer, O Lord, is for those who have not bowed to Thy sceptre, who have not received Jesus as Saviour and King. Wilt Thou help them to do so this morning? O, may there be a great turning of those who have never confessed Thy name, and may Thine own dear children who have been trying to compromise with the world, abandon the middle course and come boldly out as loyal subjects of the King. Lord, bless us; and give us a special sense of Thy presence now for the few minutes in which we sing our closing hymn. Hush every heart, solemnize every mind, help us to confess Him Who is our King, for His glory's sake, Amen.

AN IMPORTANT LETTER AND ITS ANSWER.

We have received a letter from the Deacons of the First Baptist Church, Calgary. We regret that we have not been able to deal with the matter earlier, but our space has been so occupied as well as our time, that it has been impossible until now. We print the letter from the Calgary Deacons below, with our reply. They speak for themselves:

CALGARY DEACONS' LETTER.

First Baptist Church,
Thirteenth Avenue and Fourth Street West,
Calgary, Alberta.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
Jarvis St. Baptist Church,
Toronto, Ontario.

November 30th, 1926.

Dear Sir:

It has come to the attention of the Deacons' Board of the First Church, Calgary, that you exchanged telegrams with a Western Church which sought a statement from you as to the fitness of our pastor, Dr. H. H. Bingham, to become pastor of this Church.

The submitting wire seeking your judgment reads: "Dr. T. T. Shields, Toronto, Ontario—Would you wire us day letter your judgment real fundamentals and fitness of Dr. H. H. Bingham, Calgary, for pulpit of our late Dr. Hinson? Frank W. Beach."

The wire you sent in reply to this has been given considerable publicity. It is most condemnatory to our pastor who is highly esteemed both by his church here and in the community at large. The deacons' board feels very keenly that you have been most unfair in making statements and has appointed the undersigned as a committee to ask you to make an explanation of what you mean or to retract what you have written. It is strongly felt that what you have said is unwarranted and untrue. The Board would like you to reconcile this message with what you print in *The Gospel Witness* of date November 4th, page 118, which reports the proceedings of the last convention of Ontario and Quebec Baptists. "I have only to say that I never described Mr. Bingham—Dr. Bingham—as a modernist in the world. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). I have not, nor did I send any word at all. I received a long telegram asking me if this gentleman might be depended upon to carry on Dr. Hinson's work. I knew Dr. Hinson; I knew the position he had taken. I knew his fear lest the thriving institution he had built up should be torn away after his passing; and what I said I say now frankly, that so far as this brother's personal views were concerned, I believed he was entirely orthodox and evangelical, but my acquaintance with Dr. Bingham led me to believe that he would not take the stand which their late lamented pastor had taken. And they told me that they wanted no man who would not carry on Dr. Hinson's work.

"Now, I have no doubt—at least I presume that the recipient of that letter must have misunderstood my caution. But I think that telegram can be produced. And my fear expressed there, is the fear I have expressed in so many places—I know so many men who are in their personal views thoroughly orthodox, but who seem always to countenance those who depart from the faith. (Cries of "Hear, hear.")—and that was my word of caution.

"I do not know what that telegram had to do with the present discussion . . . I absolutely deny its accuracy, and I challenge Dr. MacNeill to prove it."

The telegram has been produced and came to Calgary unsolicited. It reads—"Frank W. Beach, Hinson Memorial Baptist Church, Portland: Answering your wire, have known gentleman named more than twenty years. He is a type by whom fundamentalism is being everywhere betrayed. He refused use of his Calgary building for fundamentalist meeting, and has defended Brandon professor liberal as Fosdick. Pleasing personality, but weak preacher, a stereotyped politician who would destroy Dr. Hinson's work and deliver your church over to the enemy. Choice of him as Dr. Hinson's successor would be disastrous to Fundamentalism on the coast. Writing. T. T. Shields."

We ask any fair-minded person to set these venomous words over against the mild remarks delivered at the Convention. One may make his own deductions. To the unkind personalities referred to in the telegram we shall make no further reference, but there are two statements contained therein which challenge attention.

You say that "he refused the use of his Calgary building for fundamentalist meeting." This is not an accurate statement. The First Church was not in accord with the mission on which you came to Calgary and its co-operation was withheld on these grounds and not on the grounds of fundamentalism.

In *The Gospel Witness*, September, 1925, prior to your coming to Calgary, you will find under caption, "The Editor Goes to Calgary"—"Enthusiasm for the Baptist Bible Union is increasing and spreading everywhere. The great success of the Greater Vancouver Branch has led a strong influential group of Baptists in Calgary to do likewise." The church welcomes the fundamentalist message. Its pulpit has been open and occupied by such men as Dr. Gaebelein, Rev. Leon Tucher, Dr. A. C. Dixon, Dr. W. B. Riley, and Dr. Masee, who delivered fundamentalist messages. The church is not in sympathy with the methods and spirit of the Baptist Bible Union and you were so informed at a meeting in the First Church when you were on this mission. To repeat, the church building was not refused on fundamentalist grounds, but because it believed that Baptist Bible Union propaganda was being used.

Again you say in your telegram that Dr. Bingham "has defended Brandon professor liberal as Fosdick." Reference is apparently made to Dr. Harry MacNeill of Brandon College. It refers to the fact that our pastor was a member of the Brandon College Commission appointed by the Baptist Union of Western Canada to investigate charges against Dr. MacNeill. The matter was gone into very thoroughly and in no place was it discovered that the professor denied any fundamental of the faith. He is a man of deep spiritual life, a soul winner and a great believer in evangelism. His position is clearly set out in the Report of the Commission. This statement contained in the Report was accepted as satisfactory by the Ministerial Association of Greater Vancouver, from which place much of the criticism originated and was fostered. Practically all the Vancouver Ministers were fundamentalists in their theological outlook and this is also true of the Baptist Ministry of Western Canada. The fact that the Commission's Report was adopted by an overwhelming majority at the meeting of the Baptist Union of Western Canada in 1923 by a standing vote after which was sung "Blest be the Tie that Binds" surely does not indicate that it was thought that there was any great departure from the great fundamentals of Christian religion.

We feel that you have done our church a grave injustice. You have made a serious reflection on its pastor. We must request of you as a Christian gentleman an explanation or retraction. Inasmuch as your wire has already had publicity, we feel that this letter should also be published, and for this reason we are sending a copy to the *Canadian Baptist* and to the *Western Baptist*.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Thos. Underwood,
W. G. Carpenter,
Geo. Hilton."

DR. SHIELDS' REPLY.

December 14th, 1926.

To the Deacons of the First Baptist Church, Calgary, Alta.

Dear Brethren:

I am in receipt of a letter dated November 30th, and signed in your behalf by Messrs. Thos. Underwood, W. G. Carpenter, and Geo. Hilton, in which you refer to a telegram from a Western church, enquiring as to the fitness of Dr. H. H. Bingham for the pastorate of that church, and my reply.

In the concluding paragraph of your letter you say:

"Inasmuch as your wire has already had publicity, we feel that this letter should also be published, and for this reason we are sending a copy to the *Canadian Baptist* and to the *Western Baptist*."

This reply will therefore be published in *The Gospel Witness*. I do this

because I know it would be useless to send my reply to *The Canadian Baptist*. And, first of all, before discussing the questions which your letter raises, I desire to disclaim all responsibility for the publicity this matter has been given. I have before me a letter dated the 17th of June, 1926, from a gentleman who was a member of the Pulpit Committee of the East Side Baptist Church, as it was then called, Portland, asking me if I could recommend a man as Dr. Hinson's successor. In that letter the writer says:

"I believe we of the East Side Church realize we will never get another man like Dr. Hinson, but God knows, we need the best we can get for the sake of the church and the Northwest, to wage war against Modernism."

I received a letter also, dated June 16th, 1926, from the Chairman of the Pulpit Committee of the same church. From that letter I quote the following excerpt:

"The writer is persuaded to write you on a matter in which I feel sure you have an interest, i.e., helping the HINSON MEMORIAL BAPTIST CHURCH, to find a worthy successor to the late Dr. Hinson.

"Could you favor us with an opinion of the qualifications of two men, and any other which might come to your mind, if in your judgment they could qualify. You know the very high plane on which Dr. Hinson worked, how adamant was his work against the modernist and per contra aggressive for Jesus Christ; and, how his work was blessed of God in bringing souls into the Kingdom. It seems we simply must try, under God's immediate guidance through the ministrations of the Holy Spirit, to secure a worthy successor."

On October 4th, 1926, I received the following telegram:

"Would you wire us day-letter your judgment re fundamentals and fitness of Dr. H. H. Bingham, Calgary, for pulpit of our late Dr. Hinson.
(Signed), FRANK W. BEACH,
For Pulpit Committee."

It will thus be seen that I received three separate communications from the Pulpit Committee of the Hinson Memorial Church: one mentioned no name, but asked me to recommend some one; the second letter asked my opinion of two men named in the letter; the third asked for an opinion respecting Dr. Bingham. Like other ministers, as I suppose, I frequently receive confidential communications from business and financial houses, as well as from educational institutions, enquiring as to the character and ability of persons who have given my name as a reference. Almost invariably such communications are labelled, "confidential". If, in such circumstances, one's recommendation is to have any value at all, he must be free to write what he believes about the person concerning whom enquiry is made. If his reply is to be given to the public, unless he is prepared to reply favourably, he will be compelled to decline to express an opinion at all.

I am reluctant to pass any word of criticism upon the Pulpit Committee of the Hinson Memorial Church, or its Chairman; but in sheer self-defense, I am compelled to say that whoever was responsible for the publicity given this matter was guilty of the grossest possible breach of confidence. If that person, whoever he was, felt that an injustice was done Dr. Bingham, in view of the confidential character of his communication, his enquiry being voluntary from his side, he ought at least to have taken the matter up with Dr. Bingham and myself; but to have wired Dr. MacNeill, or anyone else other than Dr. Bingham himself, on the subject, was an inexcusable betrayal of confidence.

I am not now discussing the merits of my reply, but merely explaining that the responsibility for the publicity given this matter rests, first of all, with the Committee of the Hinson Memorial Church.

But there was a second betrayal of confidence, and the Pulpit Committee of the Hinson Memorial Church found that the measure it had meted to me was measured to it again by Dr. John MacNeill. We do not think that the person wiring Dr. MacNeill expected him to bring their telegram into a Convention—where it had no place—and publicly read it into a report which would be broadcast over the world. We know of nothing more reprehensible than

Dr. MacNeill's action. The telegram had absolutely nothing to do with the questions at issue in the Ontario and Quebec Convention, and was introduced by Dr. MacNeill only in the hope that in the eyes of those who were ignorant of the facts, it would damage the chief witness against his own and others' perfidy in the betrayal of the Denomination into the hands of Modernism.

So much, therefore, in explanation of the publicity given to my telegram. I would recommend you to seek satisfaction on this score from the Committee of the Hinson Memorial Church, Portland, and Dr. John MacNeill, of Toronto.

Let me now express my personal attitude toward Dr. Bingham. I have always supposed he was perfectly orthodox in his own beliefs. So, professedly, are Dr. J. H. Farmer and Dr. John MacNeill! I have never had the privilege of a very intimate acquaintance with Dr. Bingham, and my estimate of him has been formed chiefly from his public acts. If, after I have finished my argument on this matter, additional evidence can be found to disprove the position I have taken, I shall be most happy to publish an apology to Dr. Bingham in the pages of *The Gospel Witness*.

There is no greater present need of the church of Christ than stalwart men who will stand uncompromisingly against the terrible apostasy that is sweeping over the churches to-day. I would much rather discover that I am wrong in this matter than that I am right; for then Dr. Bingham would be added to the list of the defenders of the faith.

The letters from Portland from which I have quoted will show that the Committee asked my opinion of certain men because they believed I was acquainted somewhat with Dr. Hinson's work and spirit. In loyalty to my late beloved friend, in view of what I know of Dr. Bingham, I was forced to say what I said.

I come now to consider the report of the discussion of this matter as printed in *The Gospel Witness* of November 4th in which I say: "I never described Dr. Bingham as a modernist in the world." Following this, there is a sentence which, if taken out of its connection, would appear to be misleading: "I have not, nor did I send any word at all." You will bear in mind that the discussion at the Convention had continued from 11.15 in the morning until 10.15 at night before I began to speak. During all that time, excepting an hour and twenty minutes, Dr. MacNeill and his associates, utterly avoiding the question at issue, had been pouring out the vials of their wrath upon Dr. Shields. The Portland telegram was an incident in the long day's discussion. I had not the copy of the telegram I had sent to Portland before me, nor could I recall the exact text of it; but knowing that I had never thought of Dr. Bingham as a modernist, I was absolutely certain that I had never so described him. The telegram which Dr. MacNeill read in the Convention from Portland said: "We must have a thoroughgoing fundamentalist and have always believed him to be such. However, Shields, Toronto, advises us he is modernistic."

Following is a copy of my telegram to Portland:

"Answering your wire: have known gentleman named more than twenty years. He is a type by whom fundamentalism is being everywhere betrayed. He refused use of his Calgary building for fundamentalist meeting, and has defended Brandon professor liberal as Fosdick. Pleasing personality, but weak preacher; a stereotyped machine politician who would destroy Dr. Hinson's work, and deliver your church over to the enemy. Choice of him as Dr. Hinson's successor would be disastrous to fundamentalism on the coast. Writing."

An examination of my telegram will surely prove that I did not say Dr. Bingham was a modernist, or modernistic. The sentence, "He is a type by whom fundamentalism is being everywhere betrayed", would certainly identify him as one who was regarded as a fundamentalist. The sentence, "Nor did I send any word at all", is perfectly plain in the light of its context; for its intention was to show that I did not initiate the correspondence. The context which I quote below shows that I wired in reply to Portland's enquiring telegram:

"I received a long telegram asking me if this gentleman might be depended upon to carry on Dr. Hinson's work. I knew Dr. Hinson; I knew the position he had taken. I knew his fear lest the thriving insti-

tution he had built up should be torn away after his passing; and what I said I say now frankly, that so far as this brother's personal views were concerned, I believed he was entirely orthodox and evangelical, but my acquaintance with Dr. Bingham led me to believe that he would not take the stand which their late lamented pastor had taken. And they told me that they wanted no man who would not carry on Dr. Hinson's work."

"Now, I have no doubt—at least I presume that the recipient of that letter must have misunderstood my caution. But I think that telegram can be produced. And my fear expressed there, is the fear I have expressed in so many places—I know so many men who are in their personal views thoroughly orthodox, but who seem always to countenance those who depart from the faith. (Cries of "Hear, hear")—and that was my word of caution.

"I do not know what that telegram had to do with the present discussion . . . I absolutely deny its accuracy, and I challenge Dr. MacNeill to prove it."

The three paragraphs I have quoted above illustrate what I meant when saying, "I did not send any word at all." Of course, it did not mean that I had had no communication with Portland, but merely that I did not initiate the correspondence, for the three paragraphs explain the correspondence that passed between us. Furthermore, the paragraphs I have quoted are in perfect accord with the telegram I sent, and this I shall proceed to prove.

You refer to my telegram as containing "venomous words". This I utterly deny. It does contain strong words, and I greatly fear, words which Dr. Bingham's record abundantly justifies.

You refer to my statement, "He refused use of his Calgary building for fundamentalist meeting." You then register your objection to the "methods" and "spirit" of the Baptist Bible Union. My visit to Calgary was arranged by others than myself. I went there by the invitation of others, and had absolutely nothing to do with the arrangements for the meeting, but was informed that the First Church had refused the use of its building. I did not know until arriving there, as I recall, that its use had been asked for. And now you say that the building was not refused on fundamentalist grounds, but because it was believed that Baptist Bible Union propaganda was being used.

In this connection you also say, "The church welcomes the fundamentalist message. Its pulpit has been occupied and occupied by such men as Dr. Gaebelein, Rev. Leon Tucker, Dr. A. C. Dixon, Dr. W. B. Riley, and Dr. Massee." Some years ago, I think it was about the year 1920, when the Rev. W. F. Roadhouse was Moderator of the Toronto Association of Baptist Churches, under his leadership, arrangement was made for a series of meetings to be held under the auspices of the Toronto Association in Massey Hall. Those meetings were to be addressed by Drs. Dixon, Riley, and Massee. I was asked to meet with a Committee to make local arrangements. I had absolutely nothing to do with bringing these brethren to Toronto, but after all arrangements had been made for them to come, I was asked to assist in the local arrangements for the services. The Committee met in McMaster University, and during the course of the discussion, a certain McMaster professor confessed his lack of enthusiasm for the coming of these brethren; and in justification of that attitude he drew from his pocket a letter which he said he had received from Dr. H. H. Bingham, of Calgary. He did not read the entire letter, but in the portions he read, Dr. Bingham spoke most disparagingly of the visit of Drs. Dixon, Riley, and Massee, and said that their meetings were evidently held for the propagation of the verbal inspiration theory of Scripture and of premillennialism. I distinctly remember the surprise I felt that, having received these brethren as his guests, Dr. Bingham should have written thus in an attempt to discount them in their coming to Toronto. The views which these meetings were said to propagate, until then, I had supposed were held by Dr. Bingham himself. In any event, it seemed to me to be a very unfair and underhanded method to oppose the teaching of these brethren by means of a private letter which no one could answer.

I would remind you that at that time the Baptist Bible Union was not in existence. One of the brethren referred to was Dr. Massee, who now appears as the champion of a mediating fundamentalism. Notwithstanding, it was of the ministry of these men Dr. Bingham wrote so disparagingly.

I come now to the statement in my telegram that Dr. Bingham "has defended a Brandon professor as liberal as Fosdick." Replying to this you say:

"Reference is apparently made to Dr. Harry MacNeill of Brandon College. It refers to the fact that our pastor was a member of the Brandon College Commission appointed by the Baptist Union of Western Canada to investigate charges against Dr. MacNeill. The matter was gone into very thoroughly and in no place was it discovered that the professor denied any fundamental of the faith. He is a man of deep spiritual life, a soul winner and a great believer in evangelism. His position is clearly set out in the Report of the Commission. This statement contained in the Report was accepted as satisfactory by the Ministerial Association of Greater Vancouver, from which place much of the criticism originated and was fostered. Practically all the Vancouver Ministers were fundamentalists in their theological outlook, and this is also true of the Baptist Ministry of Western Canada. The fact that the Commission's report was adopted by an overwhelming majority at the meeting of the Baptist Union of Western Canada in 1923 by a standing vote after which was sung "Blest be the Tie that Binds" surely does not indicate that it was thought that there was any great departure from the great fundamentals of Christian religion."

Thus you frankly admit that Dr. Bingham endorsed Professor Harry MacNeill. With that endorsement, the Deacons of the First Baptist Church apparently are in full accord!—and it was with that strange act of Dr. Bingham in mind I sent my telegram to the Hinson Memorial Baptist Church. The last public act of Dr. Hinson I was privileged to witness was his moving the celebrated "Hinson Resolution" at the Seattle meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention in 1925. In the evidence upon which Dr. Hinson's resolution was based, there was nothing that was more at variance with evangelical truth than the position taken by Dr. Harry MacNeill; and I felt sure that the man who could sign the report of the Brandon College Commission approving of Professor MacNeill, would unquestionably have voted against Dr. Hinson's position at Seattle. As my reply will, as I have said, be published in *The Gospel Witness*, and thus broadcast over the world, it is necessary that I should analyze the report of the Brandon College Commission, that the larger circle, to whom this is addressed as much as to yourselves, may be able to judge how far I was justified in the wording of my telegram to Mr. Beach.

I now quote a summary of the report of the Brandon College Commission as contained in the Year Book of the Baptist Union of Western Canada, pages seventy-one and seventy-two. The Commission sums up its findings respecting the teaching of Dr. Harry MacNeill in six paragraphs which I quote with some comment upon each:

"1. He believes in the great fact of the Inspiration of the Scriptures, and their final authority, when properly interpreted, as a sufficient rule of faith and practice. He would distinguish between the eternal and inspired truth of the Scriptures and the garment in which it is revealed and conveyed to men. Only as this distinction is recognized can there be any meaning at all in that phrase 'when properly interpreted', which implies that there is an inward truth reposing in the heart of the language used, which can be discovered only through the exercise of our judgment illuminated by the spirit of God. And while he does not hold to the traditional verbal theory, he holds most profoundly to the great throbbing, vitalizing fact of inspiration."

It will be observed Dr. MacNeill distinguishes "between the eternal and inspired truth of the Scriptures and the garment in which it is revealed and conveyed to men"; and this "inward truth reposing in the heart of the language used can be discovered only through the exercise of our judgment illuminated by the spirit of God." The most radical critic we have ever heard of would subscribe to that paragraph; which means nothing more than that there is some truth in the Scriptures, and that we are ourselves to be the judges of what is true and what is untrue. This view, it seems to me, absolutely destroys the authority of Scripture.

"2. He believes profoundly in the great fundamental fact of the incarnation and the deity of Jesus. Here again he would make a distinction between the essential and basic fact and the method of the realization. Concerning the Virgin Birth as the method of realizing the incarnation, he frankly states his uncertainty, and gives as the ground of his uncertainty, his conviction that the incarnation is the essential and vital matter, while the method of realization is a secondary question. He emphatically states that he does not deny the Virgin Birth, and thinks of it as possibly the method of incarnation, and holds in his mind the hope that some day he may see it clearly."

In this it will be observed Dr. MacNeill "emphatically states that he does not deny the Virgin Birth, and thinks of it as possibly the method of the incarnation, and holds in his mind the hope that some day he may see it clearly." This is very plausible; but what does it involve? There is absolutely no escape from the conclusion that in Dr. MacNeill's view, the record of the Virgin Birth in the gospels of Matthew and Luke may possibly be untrue. This throws light upon his attitude toward the Scripture in general. The paragraph declares that "he frankly states his uncertainty" about a matter concerning which the Scripture speaks in the most positive and unequivocal terms.

"3. He believes in the fundamental place of the supernatural in the Christian revelation, but distinguishes between that fundamental faith and principle and the liberty to investigate specific facts and events."

This can mean only one thing: "Liberty to investigate specific facts and events" can mean nothing less than liberty to accept or deny the scriptural record of such specific facts and events, as his judgment may determine.

"4. He believes in the tremendous fact of sin, not as something nebulous and negative, but as a tragic and positive reality, and as basic to the whole problem of redemption.

This fact of sin makes the atonement of Jesus a stern necessity. This great fundamental fact of the atonement made by Jesus he believes in, and accepts, but distinguishes between the great fact itself and the theories which seek to explain it."

It is refreshing to find that Dr. MacNeill believes in the fact of sin and atonement! But, again, we are told that he "distinguishes between the great fact itself and the theories which seek to explain it"; which leaves the way open to regard sin as the result of disobedience as recorded in Genesis, or as a stage in man's evolutionary development. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, or Dr. Shailer Mathews, or Dr. W. H. P. Faunce would have no hesitation in subscribing to Dr. MacNeill's statement. And so of the atonement: Dr. MacNeill's statement may mean anything at all. He is careful not to commit himself to belief in salvation through the precious blood of a vicarious Sacrifice.

"5. In the great truth of the resurrection, which vindicates the reality of the atonement, he believes most deeply. He believes in the resurrection of the living Christ, distinguishing between the great fact of the resurrection and the nature of the bodily form in which He appeared."

Here we observe "he believes in the resurrection of the living Christ"; which means little more than to say that he believes Christ is still alive; so, according to the Scripture, are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; so is David; yet "he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Dr. MacNeill distinguishes between the "fact of the resurrection" and "the nature of the bodily form in which He appeared". What does this mean? He appeared in a bodily form; but had He a body? or was it merely an "astral" body? How easy it would have been for Dr. MacNeill to say that he believed absolutely the scriptural records which declare that Jesus rose again from the dead! Again we say, there are very few, even of the most radical critics, who could not subscribe to Dr. MacNeill's statement.

"6. In the last place, he believes in and trusts the gracious hope of the Lord's return, making, however, a clear distinction between the essential fact and hope and the manner in which He may appear."

Here we are told Dr. MacNeill believes "the gracious hope of the Lord's return, making, however, a clear distinction between the essential fact and hope and the manner in which He may appear." What does this mean? It certainly leaves room to deny the personal return of the Lord. The most extravagant of modernists tell us that Christ returns again and again. Dr. MacNeill distinguishes between "the essential fact and hope" and "the manner in which He may appear." How easy it would have been for him to open his New Testament at Acts 1: 9-11, and to have read: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." He might have read that and told the Commission he believed it. Dr. MacNeill does not tell us that he believes Christ will come again "in like manner" as He was seen to go.

In paragraphs five and six of the Commission's recommendation we read:

"5. It is the judgment of this Commission that in the Academic and Arts departments of the college the teaching of the English Bible be an expositional rather than a critical study, and that the work be assigned the professor of practical theology to be appointed."

"6. Should recommendations four and five be adopted and such action be realized some readjustment of work would be necessary. In that case the recommendation of the Commission is that the splendid asset we have in the remarkable personality, the consecration, the evangelistic fervour, and power to hold student character, of Dr. MacNeill be conserved to the Denomination and the Master's work in this West."

Notwithstanding the extremely liberal position taken by Dr. MacNeill, the Commission recommended his retention on the staff; but that the teaching of the English Bible should be assigned to someone else. What a terrible commentary on the character of Dr. MacNeill's teaching! He was to be permitted to teach Latin and Greek; but in a so-called Christian college, appealing for the support of Baptist churches, he was to be retained, though he could not be trusted to teach the Bible! I have no hesitation in saying that a college that continues on its staff a man holding Dr. MacNeill's views of the Bible, and of the doctrines of the Bible, is not worthy of the support of any one who believes the Bible to be the inspired and authoritative Word of God, and Jesus Christ to be God manifest in the flesh, Who "died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."

I cannot close this examination of the pronouncement of the Brandon College Commission without the quotation of a paragraph from a statement in connection with the report of the Commission, made by the then Principal, Dr. H. P. Whidden, who is now Chancellor of McMaster University:

"I have no hesitation in declaring myself without sympathy for the views of 'Extremists' of any kind in our denomination (if we have any). I am simply a 'middle-of-the-road Baptist'. And that not because the great majority are such, but because of personal experience and conviction. As such I would have been untrue to my trust if I had consciously encouraged or entertained the teaching of 'extremist' or 'radical' views, at either end, in Brandon College. Each and every teacher is loyal to the great essentials of Christian life and truth, emphasizing in experience and in teaching the divine Saviourhood and Lordship of Christ."

In your letter you refer to a statement by Professor Harry MacNeill and say: "This statement contained in the Report was accepted as satisfactory by the Ministerial Association of Greater Vancouver, from which place much of the criticism originated and was fostered. Practically all the Vancouver Ministers were fundamentalists in their theological outlook, and this is also true of the Baptist Ministry of Western Canada."

The questions submitted by the Ministerial Association of Greater Van-

couver to Dr. MacNeill, with his answers, are set out in the Commission's Report under the head, "Statement No. 2," and are as follows:

"The following are the questions submitted to Professor MacNeill by the Baptist Ministerial Association of Greater Vancouver, in March, 1920:

1. (a) Do you believe that the Scriptures teach that Christ was born of a Virgin?
(b) If so, do you accept the teaching?
2. (a) Do you believe that the Scriptures teach that Christ's body was raised from the dead?
(b) If so, do you receive and teach the same?
3. Do you believe the shedding of Christ's blood to be essential for salvation?
4. Do you believe and teach that God holds men responsible for strict obedience to the teaching of the whole Bible when properly interpreted? In other words, do you believe that the whole Bible is the final authority, and binding as to what one shall believe and practice?"

"To the Board of Directors of Brandon College:
Gentlemen:

The following are my answers to questions of the Vancouver Ministerial Association:

1. Question (a) Answer—Yes.

(b) Answer—Yes, I accept it and present it as the teaching of Scripture. Personally, however, I find difficulty in thinking through, satisfactorily in my mind, this question. I, therefore, emphasize the Incarnation. I firmly and positively believe and teach that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. I believe in the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ.

2. Question (a) Answer—Yes.

(b) Answer—Yes, I receive and teach it as the teaching of the Scripture. I find difficulty, however, from the teaching of the Scriptures themselves in forming a satisfactory conception of the nature of Christ's resurrection body. Luke 24:39, and John 20:20-25; 21:13, emphasize the material aspects; while Paul in an earlier account (1 Cor., ch. 15) says it was a "spiritual body" not "the body that was" (1 Cor. 13:44), not "the image of the earthly," but "the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. 15:49). That He has a body of some form is clear enough. Here again, however, the important thing is not the body but the life and personality. I believe that Jesus is a living, active personality, triumphant over death and the grave and so I believe in the resurrection.

3. Question. Answer—Yes, when properly interpreted.

On question No. 1, Dr. Harry MacNeill frankly declares his belief that the Scriptures teach the virgin birth of Christ, and that he presents it as the teaching of Scripture; but adds, "Personally, however, I find difficulty in thinking through, satisfactorily to my mind, this question. I therefore emphasize the Incarnation." If this does not mean the denial of the virgin birth, what does it mean? And a denial of the virgin birth carries with it the denial of the authority of Scripture. Things which are revealed in the Word of God, Professor MacNeill does not find satisfactory to his mind. He says he believes the Scriptures teach the resurrection of Christ, and he teaches it as the teachings of Scripture; but, following that, we have the usual reservation, "I find difficulty, however, from the teaching of the Scriptures themselves," etc.

I go back to another item (pp. 65, 66 of the Baptist Year Book of Western Canada, 1922):

"REV. JOHN LINTON AND DR. MACNEILL—Rev. John Linton of Point St. Charles, Montreal, Quebec, details certain charges against Dr. MacNeill as follows: 'The lesson was the life of Christ.' Dr. MacNeill said, 'You are not to think that when Jesus died that he knew he was dying for the world. He was a man. He was a Jew. His horizon was bounded by human limitations and limited by Jewish prejudices. Did he

not say to the women of Samaria 'Salvation is to the Jews'? Jesus did not perceive the influence his death would have upon the world. He did not have the universal vision.'

'But,' ventured one student, 'did not Jesus tell His disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature?'

'No,' answered Dr. MacNeill, 'Jesus never really said that, the universal vision came to His disciples after Jesus died, and in their admiration for their great Master, they, in writing the Gospels, put words into His mouth that He never really said.'

'According to that,' said the student, 'there would likely be other sayings of Jesus in the Gospels attributed to Him by His hero-worshipping disciples, but which Jesus never really said?' 'Yes,' was the answer.

'Then,' said the student, 'one would be apt to get a false impression of Who and What Jesus really was, by merely believing the Scriptures?' 'Yes,' was the answer.

'Well, Dr. MacNeill,' said the student, 'when Jesus was on earth He said to some, 'Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures,' but according to what you say, if Jesus came to earth to-day he would have to say 'Ye do err through believing the Scriptures.'

"This is in substance and to a large degree the same statement as Mr. Linton made before the 1919 Ontario and Quebec Convention in Ottawa, a stenographic copy of which was placed before the Commission. To this, Dr. MacNeill makes the following statement: 'I consider the statement quite misleading and unfair. I never said what is contained in this statement. I would not say it. I do not talk like that. I do not mean that Mr. Linton has made this statement of whole cloth or even that Mr. Linton is even consciously insincere, but the simple fact remains that when Mr. Linton made that statement he uttered an untruth. These ideas impressed him in a certain way, he expressed his thoughts in the words of this statement. They are his words, not my words, and naturally, also, most of the ideas are his ideas, not mine.'"

To avoid the possibility of mistake in this matter, I have communicated with the Rev. John Linton respecting this testimony, and have received from him the following signed statement:

Rev. John Linton's Statement.

"Dr. Shields having informed me of his intention of publishing my statement regarding the teaching in Brandon College, and having offered me the opportunity of making a further statement, I readily do so.

"Professor MacNeill's answer to my charges was that he did not use these words, and that he does not speak that way. And of course he did not use these very words. I am not a stenographer, I do not write shorthand: I was merely stating the Professor's teaching on these matters in my own words. But the facts as stated by me are true to Dr. MacNeill's teaching. The Professor did say to us in class that Jesus did not give the Great Commission; he did say to us that Jesus did not realize all that His death would mean to the world; he did say to us that he did not accept that part of the Gospel Narrative that described Jesus eating fish and honeycomb after His resurrection; he did teach a class of teen age students that the story of Jesus cursing the fig tree was not true because he could not think of Jesus doing such a thing. It was Dr. MacNeill's teaching on this last point that led to a protest by members of the Student Body. These students protested to the Principal against such teaching being given to the younger students.

"Professor MacNeill may deny having used these words, and of course they are not the ipsissima verba of the Professor; but I do not believe Dr. MacNeill will deny the four facts outlined above. I know that they are true.

"Notwithstanding his teaching, the Professor declared to the Commission his belief in 'the Bible as the inspired word of God to men' and the Commission gave him a clean bill of health, and branded the testifying student as an 'unreliable witness'. Does anyone know when it was otherwise?

"The Commission, in discounting my testimony, gave as the reason

that there were 'several inaccuracies'. One was that I had stated that Dr. Patterson was in the Ottawa Convention in 1919 when I spoke of Brandon College. Dr. Patterson testified that he was not present at the time I spoke. The simple explanation is that Dr. Patterson was at the Ottawa Convention—I saw him there along with Dr. Whidden. He happened to have gone out of the building before I rose to speak, and, knowing he was at the Convention, I presumed he was present when I spoke. Because I did not notice Dr. Patterson leave the auditorium before I spoke, *that makes my testimony regarding Dr. MacNeill's teaching untrue!* Anyone can judge by that the attitude of the Commission.

"When I spoke to the Toronto Baptist Ministerial Association, November 1st, 1920, they passed a motion requesting me to publish my evidence against Brandon College in *The Canadian Baptist*. I left for a Montreal pastorate that week, and two weeks later the Ministerial Association, in dealing with the minutes of the previous meeting, decided to expunge the motion in question from the minutes, solely on the ground that the luncheon at which the motion had been made was not a part of the regular business meeting. *This action had nothing whatever to do with the merits of the question involved.* It was the observance of a rule of order, and was supported by the ministers who voted for the motion in the first place. I received no notification whatever of this action, and mentioned the Toronto ministers' request for publicity when I sent my evidence to the West some months later.

"While the Commission was in session in Calgary they wired me, asking why I had made public the first motion of the Toronto Ministerial Association without referring to its later being erased from the minutes. I wired reply at once stating that I had known nothing whatever from anyone of such subsequent action. Yet the report published by the Commission, and sent all over Canada, makes it appear as if I acted insincerely in withholding reference to the expunging of the motion; while all the time the Commission had my telegram in their hands stating that I had never been notified of the subsequent action of the Toronto ministers, and knew nothing whatever about it.

"This shows the attitude of the Commission that approved of Dr. MacNeill's theological position. I have been silent for four years under the imputation of their Report, and am glad of the opportunity of making this reply.

(Signed) JOHN LINTON."

With all this evidence in view, I find it impossible to understand how any Commission of honest evangelical believers could do other than find Dr. Harry MacNeill guilty of the rankest heresy—and you will understand, gentlemen, if you please, that my personal view in this matter is an important factor in this discussion. I have been asked to give my opinion as to the fitness of a certain man to succeed Dr. W. B. Hinson, and on reviewing that man's record before sending my reply, I find that he was a member of the Brandon College Commission, who, with this overwhelming proof of Dr. Harry MacNeill's modernism before them, without protest, agreed to the Commission's finding, that the services of Dr. Harry MacNeill should be "conserved to the Denomination and to the Master's work in this West".

So far as I am able to judge, Dr. Harry MacNeill is as bad as Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, and as utterly unfit as he to occupy a teaching position in any Christian institution. I have no doubt Dr. MacNeill is an engaging personality, a delightful and amiable gentleman in every particular; but in this letter I am discussing his theology, which you endorse. I tell you frankly I utterly and absolutely repudiate it, as did Dr. W. B. Hinson, such principles in others. Dr. Bingham was guilty of assisting in perpetuating the destructive teaching of Dr. Harry MacNeill in Brandon College; and until he repents of that wickedness and confesses his error, I at least, can say no less of him than I said in my telegram to the Pulpit Committee of the Hinson Memorial Church.

Your letter would give the impression to the uninformed that British Columbia was now quite reconciled to Dr. MacNeill's continuance in Brandon College. If that be so, will you be good enough to explain the existence of

the British Columbia Baptist Missionary Council? Why have they withdrawn support from the Western Union? Why are they carrying on their own mission work independently of the Union? The deacons of the First Baptist Church, Calgary, know just as well as I do, that a large and influential element among British Columbia Baptists are as opposed to-day as they ever were to the teaching of Dr. Harry MacNeill.

I am exceedingly sorry to be put in a position where I am compelled to publish these facts about Dr. Bingham's record. Dr. J. H. Farmer professes to be entirely orthodox; but he has proved himself in this Convention again and again to be the enemy of Fundamentalism and the friend of Modernism. Dr. John MacNeill, a cousin of Dr. Harry MacNeill, professes to be orthodox; but he, too, has shown himself to be the enemy of Fundamentalism and the friend of Modernism. The present Chancellor of McMaster University professes to be orthodox; yet Dr. Whidden, while President of Brandon College, defended and supported Professor Harry MacNeill; and now defends Professor L. H. Marshall in McMaster University. So far as I am able to judge from his record, Dr. Bingham belongs to the same class. His personal views and teachings, so far as I know, are orthodox enough; but apparently he has been in perfect accord with yourselves in supporting the anti-Christian teaching of Brandon College as represented by Professor Harry MacNeill.

With all these facts before me, I regret that I have not one word to withdraw from the telegram I sent to the Hinson Memorial Church. I must, however, I repeat, refuse all responsibility for the publication of these telegrams. Asked my opinion of Dr. Bingham, I could do nothing but express my deepest conviction, a conviction which this letter reiterates. If Dr. Bingham has been injured by the publication of these telegrams, the responsibility rests, first of all, with the Portland Committee, and secondly, with Dr. John MacNeill of Toronto.

I have this word to add: I have never heard of Dr. Bingham's dissenting in any particular from the Commission's Report; but if now he does so, if now he takes his stand uncompromisingly for the faith, and in opposition to Professor MacNeill's teaching, I shall be most happy to acknowledge that a judgment based upon your Commission's Report—I say "your Commission" because I notice Mr. Carpenter was Chairman of the Commission—is unjust to Dr. Bingham's present position, and to offer him my most abject apology. But failing such a pronouncement by Dr. Bingham, he must be judged by his public acts as a member of the Brandon College Commission. And in view of the desperate war upon the faith being made in the Northern Baptist Convention, I am still of the opinion that a man of Dr. Bingham's compromising attitude would be ill-suited to fill the position vacated by the late Dr. W. B. Hinson. I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

ARE CANADIAN BAPTISTS WITHOUT A SINGLE MODERNIST?

(Editor's Note: From "The Western Recorder", Louisville, Ky., Dec. 9th, 1926.)

Dr. Frank M. Goodchild of New York is quoted in *The Canadian Baptist* of November 25 in a statement of the differences between Fundamentalists and Modernists. The editor of *The Canadian Baptist* represents that the terms of the statement of Dr. Goodchild give a "clean bill of health" to all Canadian Baptists. He writes:

"If Dr. Goodchild is right, then there isn't a Modernist in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec—as far as known—for there are no Baptist preachers or lay readers in this territory who deny the great fundamentals he enumerates."

Here are in part the words quoted from Dr. Goodchild:

"We need to keep clearly in mind what the issue is between the modernist and the fundamentalist. It is not a conflict between interpretations of the same facts; it is, on the one hand, an affirmation of certain fundamental facts of Christianity, and, on the other, a denial of

those facts. Fundamentalists declare that God inspired men to write the Scriptures; they are committed to no special view of inspiration. The modernists declare that the Bible is man's own record of his search for God and the results of it. The one side thus believes that God specially revealed Himself to man, the other side denies that there has been any revelation. Fundamentalists believe that Jesus is actually God's Son, miraculously born into the world. Modernists believe that He was naturally born and was simply a man in His powers and attributes. Fundamentalists believe thoroughly in the miracles narrated in the Bible. Modernists deny all of them and declare that miracles are unnecessary and unbelievable. Fundamentalists believe that man is so fallen in sin that an atonement for his sin is necessary. Modernists declare that no atonement is necessary except what a man can make by his own efforts. Fundamentalists believe that after Christ's death He rose from the grave bodily; modernists deny that the body ever came back to life.

"Fundamentalists assert that as the Scriptures say, He ascended bodily into heaven; modernists treat the ascension story as an old wives' tale. Fundamentalists declare that Christ will keep His promise to return again in person to the earth. Modernists, while admitting that Jesus made such a promise, declare that He erred, being misled by the notions of His time. Keep the issue clear. The present controversy is between the affirmation of certain facts which are the foundation of the Christian church and have been believed devoutly for 1,900 years, and an utter denial of those facts."

At the recent meeting of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec there was great contention over the alleged Modernistic theology of Professor Marshall, a recent addition to the McMaster University faculty from England. Among the statements of belief of Dr. Marshall which were presented before that Convention and not, so far as we can discover, denied by him, were the following:

On the blood of Christ: "The world in the apostolic age was reeking with sacrificial blood. Not only Jews but pagans were relying on blood. In opposition to this the Apostles naturally laid stress on the blood of Christ, but the Apostles never did think of the physical blood of Christ as a cleansing agent. They could have referred to the sacrifice of Christ without the blood had it not been that the world was full of it at that time. All the way through Paul's teaching his great thought is that the saving thing in his life [is] his fellowship with a risen and glorified Christ. Away with the crass physical notion! Who wants to wallow in blood?"

On baptism: "To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite a crucial importance for which there is no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense."

On the Book of Jonah: "Christ's references to the Book of Jonah do not necessarily imply the historical view. . . . If it could be really proved to me that Jesus Christ regarded it an historical document, I would say it is an historical document."

On the extent of the knowledge and authority of Christ: "I believe that on all the great questions of *morality and religion* [emphasis ours.—Ed.] the absolute and final word is with Jesus Christ."

His "clue" to the miracles: "Miracles of evil spirits entering the swine. This cannot be fully explained by any known law. But is there anything in modern science which can give us a clue?" Then he presented the following: "In an asylum in England there was a patient who was perfectly normal except for the delusion that his arm was glass. His doctor could not convince him to the contrary. Eventually when the monomaniac was walking alone, the doctor crept up behind him, and hitting the glass arm, he dropped a glass bottle at the same moment. From that time the man was normal in every way, for he believed the glass arm was broken."

In the light of these quotations, we do not regard the Canadian Baptist assurances of freedom from Modernism in the Baptist fellowship of Ontario and Quebec with that happy satisfaction which we could wish. The quotations point definitely to Modernistic views on the part of the person who holds them.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

SHENSTONE MEMORIAL BAPTIST CHURCH, BRANTFORD.

Brantford, Ont., Dec. 8, 1926.

WHEREAS The Shenstone Memorial Baptist Church, Brantford, stands for the full inspiration and authority of the Bible as the Word of God; and for the absolute infallibility of Jesus Christ as the Incarnate God; and for the truth that in His substitutionary death, Christ endured the punishment of our sins in our room and stead, "The just for the unjust to bring us to God;" and—

WHEREAS Professor L. H. Marshall of McMaster University endorses the Driver method of approach to the study of the Old Testament Scriptures, and by his teaching implicitly denies the full inspiration and authority of the Bible as the Word of God, and explicitly rejects the truth that Christ endured, in our behalf, the punishment of our sins; and—

WHEREAS the Convention of Ontario and Quebec at its Annual Meeting held in First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, Tuesday, October 19th, 1926, notwithstanding Professor Marshall's repudiation of the substitutionary and expiatory value of the death of Christ; expressed its confidence in him, and its approval of his teaching,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Church's first duty to be loyal to Jesus Christ and His Gospel, renders it impossible for it to longer contribute to any fund administered by any Board elected by the said Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec; and it is hereby determined that unless and until the said Convention shall reverse its said endorsement of false teaching, all contributions from this church or any organization connected with this Church, to Convention funds shall cease as from this date.

ANOTHER MONTREAL CHURCH.

Church Cuts Off McMaster Grant.

Objection Raised to Alleged Heterodoxy Within Baptist University.

St. Paul's bilingual Baptist Church at a business meeting held Wednesday decided by an unanimous vote to make no further financial contributions to the upkeep of McMaster University, Toronto. The university is charged with being heterodox. The following motion was adopted:

"St. Paul's Baptist Church stands for the full inspiration and authority of the Bible as the word of God and for the absolute infallibility of Jesus Christ as the Incarnate God; and whereas it believes McMaster University has within its faculty those who deny the full inspiration and authority of the Bible as the inerrant word of God and because it is this church's first duty to be loyal to Jesus Christ and His Gospel, it is impossible for it to contribute any further financial support, however administered, to the said university until existing conditions be reversed. Therefore, all contributions shall cease from this date and the resolution shall apply to any and all moneys which may be now in the church treasury. All contributions to other Mission Boards will also be held till the church have decided what is the right channel to pay through.

"And furthermore, since this church, as a regular Baptist church, within the Convention of Ontario and Quebec may be deemed to have a vested interest in McMaster University, this action shall be without prejudice to its status as part of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

(Signed) ARTHUR ST. JAMES, Pastor,

(Signed) GEO. SMITH, Clerk."

(The Montreal Daily Star, Saturday, December 11, 1926.)

THE TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY.

This is the name by which the new Baptist educational institution will be known. We regret the necessity for this venture, but we are persuaded there is no other way. It is not to be supposed that we have any intention of withdrawing from the fight to clean up McMaster: we propose to do our utmost to expose its errors, and to awaken our people to a sense of their responsibility

in respect to that institution which is the property of the Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec. In the day that McMaster is brought back to allegiance to Christ and His Word, the Toronto Baptist Seminary will be glad to retire from business; but provision must be made whereby young men can receive preparation for the Baptist ministry without being exposed, not alone to the poison disseminated through the teaching of McMaster, but to that which is equally dangerous, the spirit of that institution.

It will not be possible to completely organize a faculty for the first term of the Seminary. We aim at doing very thorough work even for the first five months, but we expect before fall comes to be in a position to announce a strong course which will be attractive to men of strength everywhere. Included in the faculty for the next five months will be the following: Rev. W. J. Millar, Acting Dean; Rev. W. J. H. Brown; Rev. Alex Thomson, B.D.; Mr. W. Gordon Brown, B.A.; Miss Jessie Watson; Miss Elizabeth Fuller. Because of the relation of this institution to Jarvis Street Church, the Pastor of the church will be President of the Seminary. The Constitution will be published later. We call special attention to the announcement below:

Toronto Baptist Seminary,
337 Jarvis Street, Toronto 2.

This new Baptist College rendered necessary by the inroads of Modernism, will open its classes on January 4th, 1927, in the Seminary Building, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto.

A five months' (21 weeks') course, including among other subjects, instruction in Bible Doctrine, Missions and Evangelism, Church Organization, Pastoral Theology, Hebrew, Greek, and English, will start on above date.

A Pastors' Three Year Course will commence in the fall of 1927. Students taking the introductory course from January 4th will count in the three years' course.

Applications from intending students, and from others desiring information, should be made to the Rev. W. J. Millar, Seminary Building, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto 2, Canada.

"THE CANADIAN BAPTIST" THROUGH OTHER EYES.

The following note appeared in *The Word and Way* of Kansas City in their issue of December 9th, 1926:

"An editorial in a late issue of *The Canadian Baptist* is under the headline, 'Fundamentalists and Modernists'. The editor is disgusted with these terms and their frequent use. They should have no place, he thinks. 'in the languages of the apparently sane races.' The sympathies of the editor seem to be with the Modernists."

WOMEN'S SOCIETY FLOURISHING.

The first Open Board Meeting of the new Women's Missionary Society of Regular Baptists was held in Annette Street Church, Tuesday, December 14th, and was, in every particular, a glorious success. The attendance was equal to the attendance on such occasions of the old organization, except on a few very special occasions. There was a fine spirit, and the women are full of enthusiasm for their new work. They are hearing from all parts of the Convention expressions of approval of the new venture, and we are certain this new Society will have great things to report in the near future.

THE COMING MISSIONARY CONVENTION.

Preparations are being made in the expectation that there will be a great Convention January 11th and 12th. The co-operating churches will not only provide billets for bed and breakfast, but to all out-of-town delegates the noon and evening meals will be provided without charge. There are many people throughout the Convention who cannot longer, with a clear conscience, support any Board subject to a Convention which has repudiated the atoning blood of Christ. In addition to this, the Home Mission Board has renewed its muzzling

resolution of last spring. It is impossible that free men should support a Board which would put the ministers of the gospel in strait-jackets, and put a muzzle upon their lips. We are sure, however, that nothing would please those who have led in the proposal to form this new Society more than to wake up some morning and to discover that it was no longer a necessity. In the day that the Convention of Ontario and Quebec cleans house, we believe such a Society would be ready to be dissolved. But we are faced with this problem: we cannot contribute to the present Boards without a violation of conscience, and, on the other hand, it is folly, and would be wrong, to ask people to withhold their gifts without providing another channel through which their missionary contributions may flow. Beside all this, the spirit of persecution which is abroad threatens the liberty of every pastor who is in any way subject to the influence of these Boards.

The new Missionary Society will be organized for the support of all faithful pastors who are made to suffer for righteousness' sake. We urge all our readers to pray especially for this Convention.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 2.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 1.

Lesson 3.

First Quarter.

January 16th, 1926.

PETER'S APPEAL AND THE RESPONSE.

Lesson Text: Acts, Chapter 2, vs. 22-47.

I. HOW PETER PREACHED CHRIST.

1. As a man approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs. In our zeal for the deity of Christ, we must not forget His real humanity. He is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. The miracles and wonders which He wrought by the power of God were His divine credentials. 2. Peter declared His death and resurrection to have been fore-ordained (vs. 23, 24). It is idle to speculate as to what might have happened had Christ been received by those to whom He was sent. He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. His death and resurrection were no accident, but were all according to the divine plan. He was "delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." 3. Peter skillfully blends two great principles; while declaring that the death of Christ was according to the predetermined purpose of God, he yet declared that it was by wicked hands He had been crucified and slain. No finite mind can reconcile these two principles of absolute divine sovereignty and human responsibility, but that they are principles which operate in every human life, everyone must admit. 4. The death and resurrection of Christ are here shown to be according to the scriptures. We cannot too strongly emphasize the place of the inspired scriptures in apostolic preaching. Whatever may be said of the modern attitude which belittles the Word of God, the apostolic preachers found their weightiest arguments in the scripture itself. Indeed, it is indisputable that with these inspired men, the inspired scriptures represented a final authority. It is worthy of note also that this preacher did not argue respecting the inspiration of scripture, but took it for granted and quoted it as a lawyer would the statutes of the realm. Teachers and preachers can make no mistake by following apostolic example in this matter. The major part of Peter's reported sermon consisted of direct quotations from scripture. If preachers and teachers would spend less time reading books about the Bible and more time committing the words of the Bible itself to memory, their testimony would be vastly more effective. 5. But Peter also expounds the Psalm he quotes. He shows first of all that the words of David could not possibly have applied to David himself, but that he spoke concerning Christ (vs. 25-29). He refers also to the foresight of the inspired writer. Although David had lived many years before, he was enabled to anticipate the death and resurrection of Christ, and speak of it as an accomplished fact: "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ". This principle runs all through the prophetic scriptures. We read, "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel

unto Abraham". Had we the spiritual discernment to recognize it, we should find that all history has been prophetically anticipated. 6. The exaltation of Christ was proved by the experience of believers (v. 33). It was because He had been by the right hand of God exalted, He had shed forth this, the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Lordship of Christ was attested by the Holy Ghost (v. 36). The evidence of Christ's authority on earth proves His authority in heaven. Only by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit can the Lordship of Jesus Christ be established in the hearts of men.

II. THE RESULTS WHICH FOLLOWED THE SERMON.

1. Peter's hearers were "pricked in their heart". It is not said that the people greatly admired Peter's preaching, that anybody remarked upon his learning, or his eloquence. He did not preach for the sake of preaching. He was a messenger delivering the Word of God to men, and as he spoke the people were pricked in their heart. That is the inevitable result of the proclamation of the Lordship of Christ. 2. Peter's hearers made audible response to the sermon, and his congregation became a great meeting of enquirers; "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" As they heard the wonderful truth proclaimed that the Jesus who had been despised and rejected and nailed to a cross was actually the Messiah, and that God had raised him from the dead and set Him at His own right hand, they were filled with fear and said, in effect, "Tell us how we may adjust our lives to this great fact of revelation." A great many people assume that enquiry meetings are a modern invention, and that they partake somewhat of fanaticism. But when our preaching is as effective as it ought to be, every service will develop into an enquiry meeting. 3. Peter told the enquirers to repent and be baptized. The fact that they enquired showed that they had accepted the message and believed its truth, hence he does not tell them to believe, because their very enquiry had amounted to a confession of faith. He bids them repent and be baptized. On what authority does the modern preacher omit the second part of this answer? We are sent to summon men to repentance and faith, but we are also commissioned to baptize them. Every believer ought to be baptized. 4. They were promised the gift of the Holy Ghost. Does not our modern preaching and teaching fail in this respect also, that too often we are content to have people make a profession of faith without showing them that it is their privilege to receive the Holy Ghost? There is no reason why the reception of the Holy Spirit should be a second blessing. If we preach a full gospel, those who believe may be baptized and receive the Holy Spirit at the same time. 5. Part of Peter's sermon obviously was of temporary value only. We are told only that "With many other words, did he testify and exhort," etc. So true preaching will have in it the great principles which always abide, while there may be joined with it an exhortation that is of local and temporary value only. 6. It is significant that we are told, "They that gladly received the word were baptized". We have observed this principle again and again. The Thessalonians received the Word in much affliction and with joy of the Holy Ghost. When the Word is received with joy, when the surrender to Christ is whole-hearted and complete, when the Word of God is received gladly, invariably the new convert delights to obey the command of his new found Lord. 7. Those who were baptized were added to the church—to the company of believers. There is nothing here to indicate that any of the many converts said, "I should like to be baptized, but I don't want to join the church". It is the logical thing for believers to have a place in the church's fellowship. 8. The new converts were diligently taught: "They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." Another failure of the modern church is here; that new-born souls are not instructed in the ways of the Lord. But here are four means of grace,—teaching, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayer, and in all these every disciple should continue. 9. They had all things common. The Spirit of God breaks down all barriers, and people who naturally have no affinity for each other, are made one in Christ and thereafter share and share alike. 10. How they persevered: daily, publicly, and privately, with oneness of heart, they even ate and drank to the glory of God; and God in His grace gave them favor with all the people. 11. The church increased by daily additions.