

# 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.

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. 41. TORONTO, FEBRUARY 17th, 1927. Whole No. 251.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

ARE THE DOCTRINES OF "THE RUSSELLITES", NOW KNOWN AS "INTERNATIONAL BIBLE STUDENTS", SCRIPTURAL?

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, February 13th, 1927  
 (Stenographically reported)

"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

"Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God:

"And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is in the world."—I John 4: 1-3.

**T**HE spirit of antichrist has always been in the world even from the dawn of history. "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." We are admonished in these verses I have read to you not to believe every spirit, but to "try" the spirits whether they be of God; and we are forewarned that many false prophets are gone out into the world. Surely we live in a day of a religious babel, when so many voices are calling from every direction,—and many of them in the name of the Lord, that it is necessary for us very carefully to weigh and estimate the value of the testimony given.

In religious matters we are dealing with the realm of the unseen. We are told that Noah "being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." Noah's faith rested upon a divine revelation which had to do with things "not seen as yet"; he accepted God's Word as a prediction of that which was to come to pass; and because God had spoken it, he was simple enough to believe it; and therefore prepared an ark for the saving of his house. The Word of the Lord deals with many things "not seen as yet", the Bible is a revelation of a realm of truth into which the natural man cannot enter; it is a distinct disclosure of the divine purposes of grace.

There is only one way, surely, of safely "trying" the spirits. My opinion on any given religious subject, I am sure, is not worth the breath it would

take to utter it, and your opinion is worth no more. It would be the height and depth and length and breadth of presumption—presumption to the utmost degree—for me, or for any other preacher, to ask a company of people to come together to listen to the deliverance of a mere opinion about things concerning which no mortal can possibly have any first-hand knowledge. Apart from the divine revelation which we call the Bible, no voice can speak on these matters with authority. We are to “try” the spirits whether they be of God, we are to bring everything to the touchstone of the Word of God, “to the law and to the testimony” must ever be our rule.

There are many people to-day who are busy seeking to destroy the Word of God by denying it: our modernistic friends would destroy the faith of men and women by their insistence that the Bible is not wholly reliable: by this means the devil would seek to lead us away from the Word of the Lord. But there are other systems which profess to honour the Word of the Lord—and, in many respects, they are the most dangerous enemies of all. If one should come to you with a perfectly clear glass of water as this glass I hold in my hand, and were then to open a paper marked “arsenic”, and pour it into the glass and stir it up, making it green, and then say, “Take a drink”, would you take it? I think in such circumstances, you would be certain to decline the proffered drink: “Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird”—even a bird has too much sense to be caught when the net is spread in its sight. But our adversary the devil does not spread his net after that fashion, he knows that a few grains of poison are likely to be as deadly as a larger quantity—in fact a larger dose is not always as injurious as a smaller portion. It is almost invariably the devil’s trick to mix error with Scripture. When he came to the Lord in the wilderness he quoted Scripture—and he has been an adept in quoting Scripture from then until now; and perhaps the most dangerous cults of to-day are those who profess to magnify the Word of the Lord, and profess to find authority for all their teaching in the Holy Book.

I shall discuss this evening a cult which has many disciples, many devotees, throughout the world; and in what I have to say, if there should be any of them here to-night, I have no desire whatever to offend: I speak on this subject in the interest of truth, to try to show you from the Word of the Lord what the truth respecting some of these matters is.

I think we ought to learn even from the enemy, we ought to learn even from those who are in error—for we may learn much that is good even from those who are gravely mistaken. There is much about the Roman Catholic Church which I am frank to say I admire: I wish that some Protestants would emulate their Roman Catholic neighbours, in some respects—I was referring to it in my class this morning. You will remember when Peter and John were let out of prison, they went into the temple and taught, “early in the morning”—and as I came to church this morning, I saw crowds of people (and I came more than an hour before the regular time for morning worship—coming to Bible Class somewhere between nine and ten o’clock) and I saw crowds of people going into a Roman Catholic Church—and that, I suppose, was their second or third service. I went into Montreal one morning about six or seven o’clock, and, from the train window I saw the streets thronged with people going to their various churches to attend early morning service. The average Protestant thinks he is quite entitled to lie in bed all Sunday morning—some are on time, and others arrive late at the eleven o’clock service, but a good many others only wake up in time to get down to dinner! I wonder by what principle we can justify such lethargy? Surely we ought to learn to be up and about the Master’s business—“early in the morning” they went into the temple to pray. Of course, our Roman Catholic friends do not keep at it as long as we do; they begin at the other end of the day, and perhaps there is something to be said on that account.

And our Russellite friends can teach us something—they have been propagandists from the beginning. I have admired their use of the printed page. Charles T. Russell was one of the greatest advertisers of the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. And it is legitimate to advertise. That is what our Lord commissioned us to do when He said, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” I do not know what else He commanded us

to do, but to advertise the gospel; and we are to use every legitimate means to make Jesus Christ known. Russellism, in the form of tracts, has gone under the doors of thousands of homes into which no other Russellite messenger ever entered, and the printed page has done the work. We ought to learn from that the value of the printed page, and seek by every means to publish the glorious news of salvation.

The same is true of nearly every one of these modern cults: the most ardent Romanists are people who were not so born; Christian Scientists are always busy advocating Eddyism; and Russellites are always at work propagating the views of Charles T. Russell.

How shall we determine this matter? It is a very easy thing to denounce people who do not agree with you, but it is not a very profitable practice: the only way to meet error is to meet it with the truth; the only way to show the unscripturalness of any particular cult, is to bring it to the test of Scripture itself. Where shall we begin? With an elaborate system, such as that of Charles T. Russell who has written much, how can I possibly digest his volumes, and bring to you any reliable, worthy, word in the short compass of one address?

I will tell you how it may be done: there is always a key to these cults, and that key is this: Find out the teaching of any cult, or of any person in respect to the Person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. You do not need to go into the ramifications of it—

“What think ye of Christ is the test,  
To try both your plan and your scheme;  
You cannot be right in the rest  
Unless you think rightly of Him.”

I shall not weary you this evening with a prolonged discussion of the strange doctrines of Russellism: I shall examine the teaching of Russellism in respect to Jesus Christ; and if Russellism is wrong there, it is wrong everywhere. You can discover whether any cult is Christian or anti-Christian, by its teaching respecting the Person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We ought to let every man speak for himself—and Russellism is of age, and it can speak for itself.

### I.

WHAT HAS RUSSELLISM TO SAY ABOUT THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST? In the first place, Pastor Russell taught that *Jesus Christ was a man, a perfect man, but only a man, nothing more than a man; he denied that there were two natures combined in Jesus Christ.* Here is what Russell says on that point:

“Notice that this teaches not only that angelic nature is not the only order of spirit being, but that it is a lower nature than that of our Lord before he became a man; and he was not then so high as he is now, for ‘God hath highly exalted him’, because of his obedience in becoming man’s willing ransom (Phil. 2: 8, 9). He is now of the highest order of spirit being, a partaker of the divine (Jehovah’s) nature.

“But not only do we thus find proof that the divine, angelic and human natures are separate and distinct, but this proves that to be a perfect man is not to be an angel, any more than the perfection of angelic nature implies that angels are divine and equal with Jehovah; for Jesus took not the nature of angels, but a different nature—the nature of men; not the imperfect human nature as we now possess it, but the perfect human nature. He became a man; not a depraved and nearly dead being such as men are now, but a man in the full vigour of perfection.” (Studies in the Scriptures, Vol. I, p. 178).

So far, so good—He was a perfect Man. But observe further:

“Again, Jesus must have been a perfect man else he could not have kept a perfect law, which is the full measure of a perfect man’s ability. And he must have been a perfect man else he could not have given a ransom (a corresponding price—I Tim. 2: 6) for the forfeited life of the perfect man Adam; ‘For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.’ (I Cor. 15: 21.) Had he been in the least degree im-

perfect, it would have proved that he was under condemnation, and therefore he could not have been an acceptable sacrifice; neither could he have kept perfectly the law of God. A perfect man was tried, and failed, and was condemned; and only a perfect man could pay the corresponding price as the Redeemer." (Studies in the Scriptures, Vol. I, p. 178.)

Now that is all true; He became a perfect man beyond the shadow of a doubt—the only perfect Man the world has seen since Adam sinned. But listen now:

"Now we have the question fairly before us in another form, viz.: If Jesus in the flesh was a perfect man, as the Scriptures thus show, does it not prove that a perfect man is a human, fleshly being—not an angel, but a little lower than the angels? The logical conclusion is unmistakable; and in addition we have the inspired statement of the Psalmist (Psa. 8: 5-8) and Paul's reference to it in Heb. 2: 7-9.

Now listen carefully (The italics are ours, not Pastor Russell's):

*"Neither was Jesus a combination of the two natures, human and spiritual. The blending of two natures produces neither the one nor the other, but an imperfect, hybrid thing, which is obnoxious to the divine arrangement. When Jesus was in the flesh he was a perfect human being; previous to that time he was a perfect spiritual being; and since his resurrection he is a perfect spiritual being of the highest or divine order. It was not until the time of his consecration even unto death, as typified in his baptism—at thirty years of age (manhood, according to the Law, and therefore the right time to consecrate himself a man)—that he received the earnest of his inheritance of the divine nature. Matt. 3:16, 17.) The human nature had to be consecrated to death before he could receive even the pledge of the divine nature. And not until that consecration was actually carried out and he had actually sacrificed the human nature, even unto death, did our Lord Jesus become a full partaker of the divine nature."* (Vol. I, p. 179) of Studies in the Scriptures.

Russellism denies the Deity of Jesus Christ, it denies that He was made of the divine Nature. Logically, what is the implication of that? What saith the Scriptures? Was He human only, or was He both human and divine—what does the Scripture say? This man Russell pretends to magnify the Word of God, but what does the Scripture say? What did the angel say to Mary, according to the inspired record?—"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Jesus Christ was divinely-begotten of the Spirit of God, with a human mother, but without a human father, both God and man; very God of very God and, at the same time, the one and only perfect Man, fulfilling in Himself the long desire of the ancient patriarch when he said, "Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both." Jesus came to be our Daysman, a perfect Man, and, at the same time, God; laying hold of God with His Deity, and of man with His humanity, and by His blessed atonement removing sin out of the way, He brought them both together, that we might be partakers of the divine Nature, and be made one with Him.

I do not need to go any further with that matter: that which thus denies the essential Deity of Jesus Christ, is stamped at the outset as an anti-Christian system, emanating from the pit,—that is where it came from.

Let us go a little further. Russellism is not Unitarianism; or, at least, at this point it is a different brand of Unitarianism. One is led to admire its ingenuity in some matters; while in other cases its interpretations are positively grotesque. *Russellism believes and teaches the pre-existence of Jesus: His life did not begin at Bethlehem, He was a spiritual being before He became a human being, He was a "perfect spiritual being" of a somewhat higher order than that of the angels—He was somewhere between the angels and God! But this cult teaches that He laid aside His spiritual nature, and He was "made a little lower than the angels"; taking upon Him "the seed of Abraham", our human nature, our flesh, He became a man, but in order to become a man He divested Himself of His spiritual nature! That is something new, is it not?*

What saith the Scripture about the pre-existence of the Lord Jesus? What did our Lord Himself say?—"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." In Philippians, Paul tells us that "Jesus Christ, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God"—being in the form of God, He thought it not a prize to be grasped at, as an ambition set before Him: He thought of unity and equality with the Godhead as that which was His eternal and inherent right; it was His from all eternity, equal with God, yet He "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

But there is another great Scripture that you will recall in the epistle to the Hebrews—the writer is arguing the superiority of the priesthood of the Lord Jesus over that of the the priesthood of the house of Levi, and he says, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they"—Then he argues—"For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him"—and listen—"And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." That is in the prophetic Scriptures: His throne is the very throne of God Himself, with the Father and the Holy Ghost—one God.

Now Russellism denies that Jesus Christ, in His preincarnate state, was equal with the Father.

Furthermore, *Russellism denies that Jesus carried His human nature with Him*: Russell taught that Jesus has ceased to be human. Let me quote you another passage (The italics are ours):

"We must bear in mind, also, that our Lord is no longer a human being; that as a human being he gave himself as a ransom for men, having become a man for that very purpose. (I Tim. 2: 6; Heb. 10: 4, 5; I Cor. 15: 21, 22.) He is now highly exalted, to the divine nature. Therefore Paul said, 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now, henceforth, know we him (so) no more.' (II Cor. 5: 16.) He was raised from the dead a life-giving spirit being (I Cor. 15: 45), and not a man, of the earth earthy. *He is no longer human in any sense or degree*; for we must not forget what we have learned (See Vol. 1, Chap. 10), that natures are separate and distinct. *Since he is no longer in any sense or degree a human being, we must not expect him to come again as a human being, as at the first advent.* His second coming is to be in a different manner, as well as for a different purpose." Studies in the Scriptures, Vol. II, p. 107.

We shall see the implications of this position presently; but you see, first, He was not divine—He was a high order of spiritual being; He laid aside His spirit nature.—He became a man, a creature of flesh and of flesh only; but at His resurrection He ceased to be a man—He laid aside His human nature, and now He became partaker of the divine Nature, and He is no longer a human being in any sense or degree. What is the implication?

What saith the Scripture? "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin"—still a High Priest touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Now read your gospels again, the concluding chapters of the four gospels, the record of the resurrection of Christ and His many appearances, when, during the forty days, "he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs." Study that carefully; and then turn to the fifteenth

chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians and read there what the inspired apostle has to say about the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will see how ingeniously Pastor Russell accounts for these things in a moment. What have you in the record of the resurrection? *You have Jesus of Nazareth in the very body in which he was crucified*—now mark that, remember how He appeared to His disciples. I know very well that Mary did not immediately recognize Him, she recognized him only when she heard His voice; but when He came into the room where the disciples were assembled behind shut doors, and they were joined by the two other disciples of the Emmaus road, He showed unto them His hands and His side, "Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord." And He said to Thomas, knowing what Thomas had said, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." And He said to His disciples, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." He ate a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb—the cooked breakfast!—It was one morning early, and when the disciples came to shore they found a fire kindled, and coals there, and the Lord Jesus acting as servant, getting breakfast ready for the poor tired fisherman. You women in the kitchen, when you are getting breakfast in the morning, remember the Lord Jesus knows how to get breakfast—for He prepared it; the Word of the Lord tells us He got it ready for a lot of tired fishermen. Well, surely if the Scripture record proves anything at all, it proves that the very same body which was crucified, came out of the grave, and that the Lord Jesus appeared in that body to His disciples; and furthermore, it was in that same body He went up to Olivet, and He spread abroad His hands in parting benediction, and was taken from them until "a cloud received him out of their sight." And you remember what the angels said, "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."

I have just read to you Pastor Russell's statement that we must not expect the Second Advent to be in the same manner: "His second coming is to be in a different manner, as well as for a different purpose." One thing is perfectly clear from the Scriptures that the crucified body of Jesus was raised from the dead, and it was with that crucified body He ascended into heaven, and He did actually carry our corporeal nature with Him; and the Scripture says that He was the firstfruits of the resurrection, "Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Now Russellism denies that Jesus carried His physical nature with Him. But what has that to do then with the resurrection? What bearing has that upon the resurrection? someone will ask. It denies the resurrection! It denies the literal, physical, resurrection of Jesus Christ,—that is a cardinal principle of Russellism, and I propose to prove it to you.

Let me find one other passage—If there are any McMaster students here, you may commend this book carefully to the reading of Professor Marshall, for he too, has a strange view of the resurrection. Pastor Russell gets rid of the difficulty created by the records which I have quoted,—Christ's appearance to His disciples when He told Thomas to reach hither his finger,—by the supposition that Christ put on and put off the material body at will—very much as one would produce a credential from his pocket to prove where he came from. Here is what Russell says:

"With our Lord, after his resurrection, it was simply a question of expediency as to which way of appearing to his disciples would best accomplish his object, of making known his resurrection and change of nature. Had he appeared as a flame of fire, as the angel appeared to Moses in the burning bush (Exod. 3: 2), he might indeed have conversed with them, but the evidence thus given would have been far from being as convincing as the method he did adopt, both to the apostles and to the world at large to whom they witnessed.

"If he had appeared in the glory of the spirit form, as the angel did to Daniel (Dan. 10: 5-8), the glory would have been greater than the witnesses could have borne. They would probably have been so alarmed as to be unable to receive instructions from him. To none except Paul did the Lord ever thus show himself; and Paul was so overcome by that glimpse

of his glory that he fell to the ground and was blinded by its brightness, which was above that of the sun at noonday."

So Pastor Russell conveniently forgets the disciples' experience on Mount Tabor when He was still in the flesh, when He allowed the inherent glory of His Deity to shine through the veil of His flesh, and they fell at His feet even as Paul did on the road to Damascus.

We come now to this (The italics are ours):

*"The creating of the body and clothing in which he appeared to them, in the very room in which they were gathered, was proof unquestionable that Christ was no longer a human being, though he assured the disciples that the body which they saw, and which Thomas handled, was a veritable flesh and bone body, and not a mere vision or appearance. As a human being he could not come into the room without opening the door, but as a spirit being he could"—(as Eternal Creator, what about the door? Could he not have done something with the door)—"and there he instantly created and assumed such a body of flesh and such clothing as he saw fit for the purpose intended"—(He came into the room as a spirit, and instantly created a body, and clothed it, and wrapped Himself in it, and appeared before His disciples! If that be so, if He created a body which was not the body that was crucified and that rose again, and that for the purpose of proving the resurrection, it makes my Lord Jesus a deceiver such as Russell himself proved to be.)*

"Nor can we for a moment admit the suggestion offered by some, that our Lord opened the doors without being observed; for the record is plain and clear that he came and stood in their midst while the doors were shut—probably very carefully barred and bolted too—for fear of the Jews.—John 20: 19, 26.

"The lesson of his changed nature was still further emphasized by his manner of leaving their sight: 'He vanished out of their sight.' *The human body of flesh and bones, etc., and its clothing, which appeared suddenly while the doors were shut, did not go out of the door, but simply disappeared or dissolved into the same elements from which he had created them a few moments before*"—(Well, if you interpret the Word of God after that fashion, there is nothing on earth, or in the heavens above, that you cannot explain away. There is not a solitary Scripture anywhere to support it.)—"He vanished out of their sight, and was no longer seen of them when the flesh and bones and clothing in which he had manifested himself were dissolved, though doubtless he was still with them—invisibly present; and so also much of the time during those forty days."

What do you think of that? Do you suppose that sort of evidence would pass in any court in the world?

But that is not all. Listen to this:

"Many Christians have the idea that our Lord's glorious spiritual body is the very same body that was crucified and laid away in Joseph's tomb: they expect, when they see the Lord in glory, to identify him by the scars he received on Calvary. *This is a great mistake, which a very little consideration should make manifest—Firstly, It would prove that his resurrection body is not glorious or perfect, but scarred and disfigured: Secondly It would prove that we do know what a spirit body is, notwithstanding the Apostle's statement to the contrary: Thirdly, It would prove that our redemption price was taken back; for Jesus said, 'My flesh I will give for the life of the world.'* It was his flesh, his life as a man, his humanity, that was sacrificed for our redemption. And when he was raised to life again by the power of the Father, it was not to human existence; because that was sacrificed as our purchase price. And if that price had been taken back, we would still be under the condemnation of death, and without hope.

*"We have no more reason to suppose that our Lord's spirit body since his resurrection is a human body than we have for supposing that his spirit body prior to his human birth was human, or that other spirit beings have human bodies: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones; and, says the Apostle Peter, our Lord was 'put to death in the flesh but made alive in spirit.'*

*"Our Lord's human body was, however, supernaturally removed from*

the tomb; because had it remained there it would have been an insurmountable obstacle to the faith of the disciples, who were not yet instructed in spiritual things—for the spirit was not yet given.' (John 7:39). We know nothing about what became of it, except that it did not decay or corrupt (Acts 2:27, 31.) Whether it was dissolved into gases or whether it is still preserved somewhere as the grand memorial of God's love, of Christ's obedience, and of our redemption, no one knows;—nor is such knowledge necessary. That God did miraculously hide the body of Moses, we are assured (Deut. 34: 6; Jude 9) and that as a memorial God did miraculously preserve"—(Is not this ingenious?)—"from corruption the manna in the golden bowl, which was placed in the Ark under the Mercy Seat in the Tabernacle, and that it was a symbol of our Lord's flesh, the bread from heaven, we also know (Exod. 14: 20, 33; Heb. 9: 4; John 6: 51-58). Hence it will not surprise us if, in the Kingdom, God shall show to the world the body of flesh, crucified for all in giving the ransom on their behalf—not permitting to corrupt, but preserved, as an everlasting testimony of infinite love and perfect obedience. It is at least possible that John 19: 37 and Zech. 12: 10 may have such a fulfilment. Those who cried, 'Crucify him!' may yet, as witnesses, identify the very body, pierced by the spear and torn by the nails and thorns.

"To regard our Lord's glorious body as a body of flesh would not in the least account for his peculiar and sudden appearances during those forty days prior to his ascension"—

Surely absurdity could scarcely go further than that! But the point I am making is this, that Russellism denies the Deity of Christ, it says that in His pre-existent state He was not God; that in His resurrection state He is no longer man; and has not carried our body with Him—but that His Spirit rose from the dead, and His body was supernaturally disposed of! I fear that Pastor Russell had learned from those who gave the soldiers money, saying to them: "Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept." Somebody took the body of Christ away; according to Pastor Russell, it never actually rose from the dead, and He has not a body now!

And so of the atonement, a perfect man gave his flesh for the life of the world! I read it to you just now where Russell said that as a man, and as a man only, He died. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin"—will you tell me that the price of the world's redemption was paid by Christ's physical suffering? Do you reduce Him merely to a thing of the flesh? and that by the sacrifice of His flesh only the price of the world's redemption was paid? Is that the gospel? (Chorus of Noes.) Ah no; listen: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." His nature was infinite in all its qualities—His justice, His truth, His righteousness, His mercy, His love, His grace, infinite as God Himself, for He was God, His heart was the Fountain of all life, the very Centre and Source of all creative power; and when He laid down His life, and permitted His blood to flow, His precious blood was not the blood of a man only, His precious blood was the wealth of all worlds, of the universe, in solution,—"the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." If He had been a man, your sins would have killed Him without mine; my sins, without yours; His Deity gave to Him an infinite capacity, and infused a boundless degree of compensation into all the pangs He bore; and when He died—I say it reverently—God mortgaged the universe, He emptied heaven's exchequer, He gave His all that we might be saved—"A merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it."

So you see, Russellism is wrong: it implicitly denies the Virgin Birth, denies the Deity of Christ, denies His abiding union with the race, the Federal Head of a new race, the second Adam; implicitly it denies the atonement. And what else? (Well, is that not enough! What more do you need to show that a system that is so at variance with the teaching of Scripture respecting the Person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ, is essentially anti-Christian?

### III.

I think I must add this word: PASTOR RUSSELL'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE WORD ITSELF IS SIGNIFICANT. It is true that every kind of heresy either takes from the Word of God, or adds to the Word of God—one or the other.



Modernism would take from the Word of God. Rome, at times, magnifies the Bible, she says it is the Word of God—but then she tells you you cannot understand it, you must come to the church, and she will tell you what it means! It is the Word of God—plus; and you must come to the church for the only true interpretation, you cannot understand the Bible unless you go to the church, and so through all its sacramentarianism—the Roman Catholic Church plays middleman—and makes merchandise of the souls of men, giving them a little truth, but much error. Christian Science magnifies the Word of God up to a point—but it tells you that you cannot understand it without Mrs. Eddy's key to the Scriptures! It is an extraordinary thing that Mrs. Eddy had the key, and unless you go to the Bible through her books, you cannot understand the Scripture—for myself, if I went to the Bible through her books, I could not understand the Scriptures. Mormonism does not ignore the Bible—but it adds the book of Mormon.

I was holding a service in a certain city last week, and there was a lady sitting in the front seat who, at the close of the service, asked if she might talk to me. She paid me a great many compliments!—and said I might be a very useful man if I would only accept her interpretation of Scripture! She said she had had a special revelation from God—and it would be worth my while to stay all night just to hear it! I said to her, "It is all right, Mrs. So-and-So, I have met you before. You came to see me during the war with one of your special revelations. I did not have time to talk to you then—and I have not time talk with you now." She was perfectly sure she had the only revelation then—yet notwithstanding the fact that she had changed it since then, she is equally sure she has the only one now! I am always afraid of people who are in the Lord's confidence, and who tell you you cannot understand the Bible unless you sit at their feet.

Well, what is Russellism? It is just that: you cannot understand the Bible without Russell's "Studies in the Scriptures." Some Russellite friend here perhaps would say, "That is rather extravagant." Well, let us see. It must be very interesting to find yourself almost named in the Bible so long before! But here is a book, volume seven, which deals with Ezekiel's prophecy. Take this passage for instance:

3: 9. "As an adamant harder than flint have I made thy forehead; fear them not, neither be dismayed at their looks, though they be a rebellious house."—The forehead is symbolic of wisdom. A man of high forehead, as was Pastor Russell, is of a high type of intellect. Pastor Russell's mind was made strong against opponents of the Reform which is ushering in the everlasting Kingdom of Messiah." (Vol. 7, p. 383, Studies in The Scriptures.)

Here is another passage substantiating my contention that that is the general drift of all Pastor Russell's teaching (Italics are ours):

"Pastor Russell, as a member of the great High Priest and as Christ's sole representative in the world, the sole steward of the meat in due season"—Vol. 7, p. 433, Studies in the Scriptures.

Did you get that? Pastor Russell "Christ's representative in the world, the sole steward of the 'meat in due season'", specially raised up to teach this thing—I believe he was specially raised up, but I do not think he was raised up of the Lord!

Let me call your attention to another thing while still dealing with Ezekiel's prophecy (Chap. 9: 2), Vol. 7, 417-418, Studies in the Scriptures. I hope you are familiar with Ezekiel:

"And, behold, six men came from the way of the higher gate, which lieth toward the North, and every man a slaughter weapon in his hand; and one man among them was clothed with linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side: and they went in, and stood beside the brazen altar"—The six with earthly weapons are the rulers of the six great nations—Russia, Germany, Austria, France, England and Italy. The six with the Sword of the Spirit symbolize all the Elijah class, the six, with one other, making up the seven, the complete number. These have their commission from 'the north,' from the seat of Divine Dominion, from God Himself. Prac-

tically all Bible translators and commentators agree that the one with the writer's inkhorn by his side was not one of the six, but a seventh, garbed as a priest, as a clerk or officer in an army of the East. The linen signifies the imputed righteousness of Christ (Rev. 19:8). The writer's inkhorn symbolizes that the seventh man's function was to write. *God identified him thus: When the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society was at Allegheny, Pa., an open Bible was to be painted on one of the large front windows of the office. A sign painter, not in the Truth, painted the open Bible; and without any instruction from any one, of his own volition, he painted the Bible as open at Ezekiel, Chapter 9. The man in linen was the Laodicean servant, the Lord's faithful and wise steward, Pastor Russell. When Pastor Russell saw this, he turned pale. Ezekiel seeing the man in linen, types Pastor Russell thereafter seeing himself to be the anti-type of that man—one of the most prolific writers of the Age, and the only one to write and publish widely the glad tidings of the actual Second Presence of Christ."*

God identified Pastor Russell as the man of the inkhorn!—he was a man with an ink horn without doubt!

The personality of the man need not concern us, but I have gone through these volumes, and I find that Pastor Russell undertakes to sweep aside nearly every translation of Scripture at points, and substitute his own—"The Greek is so-and-so"—"the Greek is so-and-so". Well, a man needs to know something about Greek before he undertakes to set aside such translations! What happened? Some years ago a Hamilton pastor repeated from his pulpit what the *Brooklyn Eagle* had published—I read it in the *Brooklyn Eagle* at the time, page upon page of revelations as to who and what Pastor Russell was. I need not go into that—it is unimportant for the moment—but the Hamilton pastor ventured to deal with it, and he was sued by Pastor Russell for criminal libel—as he deserved to be sued, if the things he stated had not been true. Pastor Russell came to Hamilton to prosecute his case, and when on the witness stand under oath, the counsel handed him a Greek New Testament, and asked him to find a certain passage—and he could not find it: under cross examination he was compelled to admit that he did not even know the Greek alphabet, to say nothing of any further knowledge of Greek! He could not find a single passage in the Greek Testament, yet posing before the world as a great Greek scholar! When a man builds a doctrine upon a word, he had better know what that word means—and the whole doctrine of Millennial Dawnism is built upon a word relating to the coming of Christ. I am not going to discuss that, just now, but I say to you that whenever you read Pastor Russell as a guide to the understanding of Greek, you had better remember that under oath he was compelled to acknowledge that he did not know the alphabet.

I will quote only one other passage from the comments on Ezekiel—I had almost forgotten it.—(Vol. 7, p. 483, *Studies in the Scriptures*.)

"Also the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, behold, I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke: yet neither shalt thou mourn nor weep, neither shall thy tears run down."—God took away from Pastor Russell the desire of his eyes, her whom he loved, with a stroke, or 'plague' of spiritual error, which completely separated them. By the Mosaic ordinance a priest on the death of father, mother, or wife, was to show no special sign of grief, but was to remain in the Tabernacle, or Temple, and attend as usual to the service of God. Pastor Russell, as a member of the great High Priest and as Christ's representative in the world, the sole steward of the 'meat in due season, suffered deeply, but shed no tears.

And that paragraph is headed, "Pastor Russell A Sign", because he did not weep when his wife left him! The divorce courts suggest that he was not the only "sign"! What are the facts? The facts are that in that libel case in Hamilton, Mrs. Russell came, of her own volition, and was the guest of the Hamilton pastor referred to, waiting to be called to give evidence against her own husband—and when every species of deception is practised, and an attempt made to support it with the Word of God, it ought to be exposed; "wolves in sheep's clothing" ought to be unmasked.

Why have I said this? Just to point out to you the danger. The air is flooded with these false doctrines—simply flooded. (Voice from the gallery: "What about hell fire? Is not that a false doctrine? Tell the people the truth.") What about it? Well, I will come to that in a moment, inasmuch as our friend invites me. It is a dangerous thing to challenge me in a matter of that sort. But what is the essence of Russellism? It is this: that in this dispensation, in the dispensation of the church, there is a spiritual salvation, and just as our Lord shed His human body, we are to shed our human body, and we, or rather such as are "in the Truth," (the church) are to be the spiritual bride of Christ; but that in a later dispensation, everyone is to have a second chance—not a chance to become spiritual, but a chance to obtain a perfect human nature, to regain what Adam lost, namely, a life in the flesh!—and that is what the overwhelming majority of people want, a heaven that is a fleshy heaven.

And what about future punishment? You can tell whether a system is Christian or anti-Christian by the man's attitude toward that doctrine, and I will tell you why: In the beginning the tempter said, "Yea, hath God said?" And the woman answered, "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." And the tempter answered, "Ye shall not surely die"—and the voice that promises man immunity in spite of his sin, that declares that everybody is to be restored or annihilated, that unwrites the Bible from Genesis to Revelation—that voice is the voice of hell. And I declare further that if there is not a hell, there ought to be! The denial of the doctrine of future punishment impugns the moral government of the universe, it is a blow at the very foundation of the throne of Him Who is the Judge of all; and as God's Word is true, and as Jesus Christ died to save us from the awful consequences of our sin, I warn you this evening against the testimony of the so-called International Bible Students as agents of the pit—I do not mean as individuals, a great multitude of them are mistaken; let me put it, rather, in an impersonal way, and say, that the doctrines they teach come from the pit, they are anti-Christian. Russellism at nearly every point, is a denial of the Word of God, of the Deity of Christ, and of the sure promises of the security of the redeemed. Talk about hell fire!—I heard a man say once that he had already seen a man in hell; I think I have, too. I take the Bible at its face value, my dear friends, and my earnest prayer is that every man and woman in this house may never know anything about hell fire, may have no reason to fear the judgment, but rather that you may look to the Cross of Calvary:

"There lies beneath its shadow,  
But on the farther side,  
The darkness of an awful grave  
That gapes both deep and wide.  
And there between us stands the Cross,  
Two arms outstretch'd to save,  
Like a watchman set to guard the way  
From that eternal grave."

Oh, I call you to simple faith in Him Who died "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God" ("Hallelujah!") If that does not save the soul, what can? If His precious blood does not blot out all our iniquities, what hope is there for any one of us? And if, my dear friends, you hear the gospel of His grace, and have this blessed Word put into your hands, and the promise of the Holy Spirit's ministry, so that it is possible for you to know what God has said; and if you do not advantage yourself of these great privileges, and blindly go on following false gods, saying, "After death we shall have another chance"—what right have you to believe that there is a probation beyond the grave? I tell you that I know absolutely nothing about it—and I am perfectly sure that Pastor Russell knew nothing about it. No man who has ever lived, knew anything about it while on earth, save Jesus Christ Himself—and He knew the truth of both sides of the grave, He drew the veil and showed the picture of a man who in his lifetime had received his good things, and who had despised Moses and the prophets, who died and was

buried, and in hell he lift up his eyes being in torments—that is not my word: that is the word of the Lord Jesus Christ, that is the word of the Lord Himself.

The Lord Jesus Himself is the only safe Guide. He is "the way, the truth, and the life." And even if there were a shadow of doubt in your mind about it, why not be on the safe side? Put your trust in Christ here, trust in His precious blood here and now, and receive His promise of everlasting life,—then we need have no fear of the future.

Let us bow and ask God's blessing: O Lord our God, we thank Thee for the light of Thy Word; we thank Thee for the key to it all, the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and for the illuminating ministry of the Holy Spirit. We pray Thy blessing on our meditation to-night. We pray Thy blessing upon this dear friend who does not agree with us. We trust he is sincere; but if so, we believe he is sincerely mistaken—but let Thy gracious Spirit speak to His heart. Send him back to Thy holy Word, cause him to read Thy Word; speak to him, touch his heart, enlighten his understanding, and make him genuinely Thine. Bless him, and everyone within these walls who may not have agreed with this testimony; and if at any point there has been anything out of perfect harmony with Thy Word, we pray that we may search the Scriptures and know the truth. And then, Lord, we pray that to-night many will put their trust in Christ, many who will commit themselves for time and for eternity to the risen Saviour. We thank Thee that some day Thou art coming again, in like manner as Thou wert seen to go; some day Thou wilt come down the skies, Thou wilt come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; and we shall see Thee as Thou art. O keep us fast by the Book; save us in these days of many winds of doctrine, of shifting tides, that our faith may be as an anchor to our souls, that our eyes may ever be open to behold Jesus Christ, and, beholding Him, may we be, like John, and lean upon His breast; and if it be said that one of us shall betray Him, help us to be found so leaning upon His breast that we may enquire, "Lord, who is it?" O Lord, humble us because Thou hast given us the truth; make us very patient, and yet very firm, in our declaration of the counsels of God. Spirit of God, brood over this assembly; quiet our minds, Thou sovereign Saviour; bring souls to Thyself to-night. We ask it all in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

*(Over twenty responded to the invitation, and came forward to the front seat seeking Christ.)*

#### MEMORY HYMN FOR WEEK BEGINNING FEBRUARY 20.

Jesus, the very thought of Thee	O hope of every contrite heart!
With sweetness fills my breast;	O joy of all the meek!
But sweeter far Thy face to see,	To those who fall how kind Thou art!
And in Thy presence rest.	How good to those who seek!
Nor voice can sing, nor heart can frame,	But what to those who find? Ah, this,
Nor can the memory find	Nor tongue nor pen can show,—
A sweeter sound than Thy blest name,	The love of Jesus, what it is,
O Saviour of mankind.	None but His loved ones know!

Jesus, our only joy be Thou  
As Thou our prize wilt be;  
Jesus, be Thou our glory now  
And through eternity.

#### REGULAR BAPTIST MISSIONARY AND EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY OF CANADA.

We would remind our readers that while a permanent Secretary-Treasurer has not yet been appointed, the acting Secretary-Treasurer of the new Society is Rev. G. W. Allen, 75 Delaware Ave., Toronto 4, Canada, to whom all contributions may be sent, and all enquiries addressed.

## Editorial

### DID WE SPEAK TOO SOON?

Last week we published an excerpt from an article by President E. Y. Mullins, of Louisville, Ky., taken from *The Western Recorder*. In the same issue of *The Western Recorder* we had read an article by Editor Masters, entitled "Essential Unity of Southern Baptists Vindicated and Strengthened"; and we confess to have read President Mullins' article through the glasses of Editor Masters. We have such profound respect for Dr. Masters' view of things, that we were inclined to accept his verdict, and we published Dr. Mullins' article on the principle that we should give "honour to whom honour" is due. A re-reading of Dr. Mullins' article convinces us that he has not changed the position taken by him at Memphis. The first and second clauses of the resolution passed by the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary are as follows:

- "1. That this Board accepts the action of the Convention at Houston on the subject of the origin of man.
- "2. That the Faculty of the Seminary have already given assurance through the denominational press that they are in harmony with the Houston statement."

In his speech at Memphis Dr. Mullins, implicitly at least, said that he did not believe in Evolution; but in some of his articles, he not only defends Evolution, but says the Bible teaches it.

In an article on "Evolution and Special Creation", written between the Memphis and Houston Conventions, Dr. Mullins quoted six definitions of "evolution" from *The Century Dictionary* to show that some form of evolution was taught in Genesis. We quote from our article on Dr. Mullins' Memphis speech, printed in *The Gospel Witness* of April 29th, 1926:

"Dr. Mullins put a severe strain upon both the charity and the candor of his readers who were present at the Southern Convention, when he asks them to believe that he rejected Dr. Stealey's phrase "not by evolution" to avoid the confusion which would arise in the mind of one who, on searching *The Century* or other dictionary, should find a subordinate definition of evolution in Genesis! Dr. Mullins applies his six subordinate definitions of evolution to the first chapter of Genesis, and discovers "process," "unfolding or development" in the production of light, grass, seed, animal life. He says, 'God uses means, that is the dust, to create man. Breathing into man's nostrils is a process. So that definition No. (5) is clearly seen.' (And this is definition number five referred to: 'Evolution is a "turning or shifting movement; a passing back and forth; change and interchange of position, especially for the working out of a plan".') Dr. Mulling explains: 'That is; it was "a change and interchange of position for the working out of a purpose or plan." 'The change was in the dust. The "purpose or plan" was the making of man. "Now God could have made man without means and without process, but He chose not to do so. The whole story of creation shows development or unfolding of God's plan and purpose. Thus definition No. (2) is clearly seen in the unfolding.' (Definition number two as quoted by Dr. Mullins is: 'The process of evolving or becoming developed; an unfolding or growth from, or as if from, a germ or latent state, or from a plan; development; as the evolution of history or of a dramatic plot.')

"Dr. Mullins adds:

"Now it is of course true that all these are perfectly innocent and harmless forms of evolution. But they are forms of evolution nevertheless, set in the very heart of the Genesis account of creation. Some are so obsessed with the meaning of one form of evolution that they seem to forget every other form. And to insert in an article of faith on the subject of creation the phrase "not by evolution" is to introduce confusion, because Genesis presents four or five meanings of the word in the very heart of the creation story itself.

"None of the six preceding definitions present the idea of evolution in its dangerous form."

The purpose of this note, however, is to call attention to what some of the independent Southern papers have to say about Dr. Mullins' speech. Our first quotation is from *The Baptist Messenger*, Oklahoma City, Dr. C. P. Stealy, Editor; the second is from *The Sling and Stone*, Lexington, Ky., of which Dr. George Ragland is the Editor; and the third is from *News and Truth*, Murray, Ky., of which Dr. Boyce Taylor is Editor.

### From "The Baptist Messenger".

Dr. E. Y. Mullins gave an address on Thursday night on "The Place of Christian Education in the World Outlook." All he said was interesting and most of what he said would be acceptable by fundamentalists generally, but he followed his characteristic style of so expressing himself as to lend comfort to the liberalist and the modernist. Like his Kansas City statement, read one section of it, it seems air tight, but when you read it all, to many minds at least, there are openings satisfactory to a large class of those who are not classed as fundamentalist. And in fact one of the leading Baptists in the world said to us that without question the statement would be used as a warrant for teaching evolution in our schools.

So his address in New Orleans was heralded by the press as being a rap at fundamentalists. Headlines in the *Times-Picayune*, a great New Orleans paper, as follows, "Dr. Mullins Raps Fight to Outlaw Evolution Theory." *The New Orleans Item* gives his picture with the following words, "Rev. Edgar Y. Mullins, D.D., President of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Isn't Scared a Bit by Science and Wishes There Were More in the Church in the Same Frame of Mind." Of course, the implication here is that there are many in our Churches who are scared by science, while the facts are that no fundamentalist is an enemy of science. What they object to is calling the foolish theory of evolution science. Friends all over the country are sending us clippings from papers to the same effect. One paper carries the heading, "Baptists Warned to Shun Ape Laws," then quoting some of the things Dr. Mullins said and generally giving the reporter's reaction to the same. Another paper says of his speech, "Baptist Hits Legal Ban on Evolution." Another says, "One Refreshing Utterance." And so we might go on quoting.

It seems rather strange that a great outstanding Educator finds it difficult to so express himself as to be clearly understood without further explanation of what he means, or do the reporters really understand? So far as we have observed, while it is true that he may not have said the exact things they use in their headlines, what he did say gives warrant for the interpretation given by the reporters.

\* \* \* \* \*

We understand that the Board of Trustees of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary voted endorsement of the resolution by a majority vote. The same is reported of some other Boards. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that such a method is in compliance with the request. We believe that at least some brethren have resigned from boards because they could not bring themselves to agree with the position and as we see it, that is the honourable attitude for any one who cannot individually agree with the expressed wish of the Convention.

### From "The Sling and Stone".

#### DR. MULLINS' MODERNISTIC MESSAGE.

##### Editor Taylor Vigorously Condemns New Orleans Speech.

The Lexington papers of Friday, Jan. 28, 1927, carried Associated Press dispatches to which had been attached large headlines calling attention to the address of Dr. E. Y. Mullins, before the Southern Baptist Educational Association in New Orleans. *The Herald's* significant headline read as follows: "Dr. E. Y. Mullins Criticizes Attempts to Exclude Evolution Through Law in Address Before Baptist Association." The Associated Press dispatch as given in *The Leader* is as follows:

New Orleans, Jan. 28.—Discriminating treatment of the theory of organic evolution on the Christian assumptions is the only wise way to handle the subject, Dr. E. Y. Mullins, president of the Southern Baptist Theological

Seminary, Louisville, and of the Baptist World Alliance, declared in an address prepared for delivery Thursday night, before the Southern Baptist Educational Association.

"I think it is a blunder and foreign to the New Testament faith to lay hold on legislatures and the civil power to compel certain interpretations of the Bible," he said. "It is a reversal of our Christian position. The provocation is sometimes great, as when wanton attacks are made upon the Christian religion by teachers in State schools. But Christ's religion calls for spiritual weapons of defence, not laws and penalties, courts and juries."

Christian education, he continued, "must give a square deal to the growing mind of boy or girl." They will meet the theory of organic evolution "at every turn in later reading. You had better prepare them for a true and sane attitude."

"The universe is fireproof; at least all of it that is worth preserving. The Christian religion can survive the hottest flame. We need not fear any test. But if our religion is to make its contribution to the spiritual life of the world we must cease harrassing our Christian schools and adequately equip them."

After outlining what he called an "extreme tendency in modern education," Doctor Mullins said the real danger has been recognized by Christians. The opposition to this influence, he declared, "often has missed the point of the enemy's attack upon the Bible by reiterating with dogmatic energy the doctrines taught in the Bible; whereas, the modern attack is not upon the testimony of the Bible, but upon the character of the witness. There is little controversy nowadays as to what the Bible teaches. But there is a very systematic effort to discredit its character as a witness to divine truth."

Some of the needs of Christian educators, he said, were to be fully and frankly Christian, to be genuinely scientific, loyal to all the facts of both the physical and spiritual realm; Christian education must cope intellectually with non-Christian scholarship; it must be able to discriminate; it must give a square deal to the growing mind of the boy and girl.

"The scientific attack upon the foundation of faith can only be met by equally scientific defense of truth," he continued. "Evangelism and preaching to the unconverted will always be a basic necessity. But it does not meet the issue in the class room. The defense must be as competent as the attack."

### From "News and Truths":

#### PRES. MULLINS' MODERNISTIC DELIVERANCE AT NEW ORLEANS.

The Southern Baptist Scholastics met at New Orleans in the capacity of the Southern Baptist Educational Association last week. Some paper said the Editors of the subsidized papers and the State Secretaries met at the same time and place. That is fitting, if true. We hope it is not true. The Bible says, "evil communications corrupt good manners." Fine chance to play politics—dirty politics—with the pastors and churches at home. Last Friday's daily papers reported Pres. Mullins' speech. There were three significant things about that speech.

1. The only consoling thing in it was the consolation it brought to evolutionists, agnostics, infidels, atheists and other enemies of God and the Bible. As usual it was a straddle with a leaning towards modernism.

2. Pres. Mullins said: "The modern attack is not upon the testimony of the Bible, but upon the character of the witness. There is little controversy nowadays as to what the Bible teaches. But there is a very systematic effort to discredit its character as a witness to divine truth."

There isn't a high school boy in the land that doesn't know better than that. Take A. T. Robertson's statement in his printed lectures on New Testament (page 77) in the Louisville Seminary. "Evolution, I am willing to believe in it, I rather think I do, but not in atheistic evolution \* \* I say write God at the top and what if He did use evolution? I can stand it if the monkeys can." The very point at issue is what the Bible teaches about evolution. That was the point at issue with E. E. Wood and the State Board. That is the very point at issue with all so-called theistic and Chris-

tian evolutionists. What the Bible teaches is the point at issue in the contention as to whether this earth is a few thousand years old or millions of years old. Has Pres. Mullins been taking a Rip Van Winkle nap or is he dodging the issue? Is that scholarship? Can scholarship ever settle anything so long as they quibble and dodge and evade and straddle and try to stand in with both sides?

Compare these strong words from Mark A. Matthews, the big Presbyterian preacher in the West, with the silly plea of our wabby Seminary President, not to stop the evolution teaching by infidel teachers by law in our public schools: "There isn't a real scholar on earth who claims evolution to be a science or a success. There are pigmies and puppets who say they believe in the theory of evolution, but there is not a scientific fact to substantiate the theory, and, any man who says there is is a perjurer or an ignoramus. Some of us have studied the so-called theory of biological evolution for the past thirty years, and we challenge every so-called scholar on earth to submit a single fact that could be labeled by a real scholar as a scientific fact substantiating the theory. Therefore, we must accept the God-created man as we find him, and recognize the fact that if he is to be changed in nature, in heart and in purpose, that change must be effected by the supernatural power of the eternal Son of God.

"Secondly, the educational system to which he must look for training must have a righteous, moral foundation if he is to be properly, righteously and truly educated. Common school education, even superficial as it is, must have a moral foundation if we are to save the youth of this land. God must be recognized, the Bible must be supreme, the regeneration of the heart must be first, and the training of the head and the hand must be in keeping with the regeneration of the heart if the man is to become a well-rounded and well-grounded educated unit. We do not need religious education, but we must have Christian education if the educational system of the country is to be preserved and become useful.—Mark A. Matthews, *Bulletin First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington.*"

### 3. Pres. Mullins, Modernistic.

The two things above in Pres. Mullins' speech at New Orleans were bad, wholly bad, inexcusably bad, even from a man who makes as many blunders as Pres. Mullins. But what follows is far worse. His speech was a complete sell-out, lock, stock and barrel, to modernism. Baser perfidy to the Baptist faith and Baptist traditions Harry Emerson Fosdick, Shaller Matthews, H. C. Vedder or Judas Iscariot was never guilty of.

Here are his very words: "Christian education must cope intellectually with non-Christian scholarship; it must be able to discriminate; it must give a square deal to the growing mind of the boy and girl. The scientific attack upon the foundations of faith can only be met by equally scientific defense of truth," he continued, "evangelism and preaching to the unconverted will always be a basic necessity. But it does not meet the issue in the classroom. The defense must be as competent as the attack."

### Remarks.

1. What a fool Jesus Christ was if that is true. He was no school man Himself. His apostles were "ignorant and unlearned men." The 12 and the 70 had to meet exactly the same forms of infidelity we do to-day. The Sadducees were at the head of their schools and of their religious machines then just as that bunch in New Orleans last week are among Baptists in the South to-day. The Sadducees denied miracles, the deity and personality of the Holy Spirit, the virgin birth and resurrection of Jesus, the historicity and inerrancy of the Bible and the supernatural then just as the school men and modernists do to-day. What a fool Jesus was if Mullins is right when he says: "The scientific attack upon the foundations of the faith can only be met by equally scientific defense of truth." Jesus met it Himself with a dogmatic "Thus saith the Lord." No science; no scholarship. He met it with the Old Testament Scriptures. He told those infidel Sadducees that they erred "not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God."

If Mullins is right, Jesus was a fool, for He didn't have a "scholar" among the 12 or 70. If that language seems harsh, bear in mind that Jesus



Himself called any man a fool who puts man's wisdom above God's Word. Luke 24: 25. Mullins does that. If Jesus was right, Mullins is a fool and that bunch of high-brows and functionaries, who sat there like young birds and swallowed what he said, are no better. Officialdom and scholasticism among Southern Baptists are honeycombed with Modernism and it is time to begin to talk out in meeting. State organs cover up and condone modernism in our seminaries and colleges and state and south-wide machines. Free Baptists can't get a hearing in the subsidized papers. Only the fellows who wear machine collars can get in a word sidewise with them. Baptist papers are multiplying in the South so fast you can't count them. Why? Because God wants trumpets not organs.

2. Mullins' contention is fundamentally modernistic. What is modernism?

Modernism is putting the authority of scholarship on an equality with or above the authority of the Bible. That is what Mullins does. Read his words: "The scientific attack upon the foundations of the faith can only be met by equally scientific defense of truth." What does that mean? It means a country preacher with his Bible can't defend the truth; it takes a scholar to do that. Shades of Peter and James and John! It means only an educated man with college and seminary degrees is competent to defend the truth. It means all of us little country and town preachers ought not to try to defend the truth. It means a graded ministry with high-brows in the saddle. It means the Master was mistaken when He called and sent out "ignorant and unlearned" men to preach His Word against all gainsayers. It means Luke told a lie when he said the learned Jews were not able to "resist the wisdom" of the unlearned Stephen. Or it means Mullins, is a slanderer and traducer of our Baptist forefathers. Bah! What consummate egotism and conceit! Jesse Neal or J. M. Hooker or L. R. Riley or Ed Skinner or J. R. Clark, or any one of a host of other Baptist preachers in West Kentucky or West Tennessee or Arkansas or Oklahoma or Texas are far superior to E. Y. Mullins or any of the balance of that bunch of high-brows as defenders of the truth, and I don't mean maybe. High-brows are compromisers of the truth, not defenders of it. These men I speak of know the Book and woe betide the errorist who stands up before one of them, depending on his learning to meet the sharp thrusts with which they pierce him through with the sword of the Spirit. Mullins is heretical in the extreme as to the Baptist defense. We need no scholarship to defend the truth. David's sling is mightier than Goliath's sword and armour. The Baptist defense is not scholarship, but the Bible. It is a wicked, arrogant, gratuitous slander of our Baptist fathers to say it takes scholarship to defend the truth against any heretic, scholarly or otherwise. And it is high time that country preachers were standing up on their hind legs and talking out in meeting. The schools have run Baptist affairs in the South long enough. The churches ought to be in the saddle and that whole high-brow crowd, including W. M. U.'s, B. Y. P. U.'s, and the high-brow Sunday School women at Memphis who ruthlessly and wickedly trampled God's Word under their unhallowed feet by speaking where God the Spirit forbids women to speak, ought to be given a back seat. "Cry aloud and spare not." Let them call us "ignorant and unlearned men." Who cares? They called the apostles that. They said Jesus was crazy and Paul was mad. It is time for country preachers and all whom the high-brows call unlearned men to unloose your batteries on the infidelity in our colleges and seminaries. It never was Baptist doctrine to put up an educational standardization for the ministry. Like Job's miserable comforters, Mullins and his New Orleans conspirators against the common people and Baptist liberty no doubt think wisdom will die with them. But they've got lots to learn about God and the Baptists.

3. Mullins' New Orleans deliverance was not only modernistic and anti-Baptist, but it is contrary to God's eternal purposes as revealed in His Holy Word.

Mullins says, win by scholarship; the Bible says, win in spite of and against scholarship. Mullins say, bolster up the truth with scholarship; the Bible says, tear down and destroy infidel scholarship with the Bible. Mul-

lins says, fight infidel scholarship with Christian scholarship; the Bible says, destroy the wisdom of men with the foolish of this world that no flesh should glory in His presence. Mullins says, education is the main thing in defending the truth; the Bible says, the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God is the *sine qua non* in every battle for the truth. Mullins says ignorant evangelists can win the rabble and the barbarians; the Bible says, the gospel, not scholarship, is "the power of God unto salvation, both to the wise and to the unwise." And history and experience both prove the Bible is wholly right and Mullins is wholly wrong. Here is a case in point. In Acts 6: 7, it is said: "A great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." Who were these priests? The Sadducees and Pharisees who were the scholars and *litterati* of their day. Were they won by scholars? No, they were won by the Word spoken by laymen and "ignorant and unlearned" preachers, who knew their Bibles. Were they won by the arguments of the scholars of their day in meeting their sophistries and subtleties? No, a thousand times no! They were won by the warm-hearted testimonies of men who knew and loved the Lord and testified to what they knew. That is a case in point. Here is the unanimous testimony of the Scriptures. "I (God) will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.

"It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. 'Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?'

"The world by wisdom knew not God.

"God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; the weak \* to confound the mighty; base things \* \* things despised—yea, things which are not to bring to nought things that are."

#### NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

##### Shenstone Memorial, Brantford.

The services in this church last Sunday were conducted by Pastor W. G. Brown, B.A., of Orangeville. A fine congregation assembled in the morning, and in answer to much prayer (this church has three prayer meetings weekly), a revival spirit was manifestly present. In the evening, the church was full. Following a sermon on "Who is on the Lord's side?" Mr. Brown gave a three-fold invitation—for those who had received or would receive Christ to confess, to unbaptized believers to declare their readiness to be baptized, and to middle-of-the-road professors to take an uncompromising stand for Christ. More than twenty came down the aisles to the front seat, eight confessing Christ for the first time, eight for baptism, and the rest for separation for Christ.

Shenstone Memorial Church has put its flag to the top of the mast, declaring it will make no truce with infidelity. It is a singular fact that whenever Pastor or Church does this, revival follows.

##### ORANGEVILLE.

Mr. Arthur Risely, a student of the Toronto Baptist Seminary, was the preacher last Sunday. Both services and the afternoon school were occasions of blessing, and there was one clear conversion.

##### STANLEY AVE., HAMILTON.

The programme of the previous Sunday was repeated last Sunday, Mr. William Fraser preaching in the morning, and the Toronto Baptist Seminary Evangelistic Band conducting the service at night. Rev. C. J. Loney reports a day of great blessing with many conversions and re-consecrations. Such showers of blessing descended that it was found impossible to close the service until midnight—a five-hours service! And even then many lingered singing the songs of Zion for nearly another hour. One remarkable feature of the meeting was that after six had been baptized, a young woman came forward, requesting immediate baptism. After examination by the deacons, she too was baptized—the Pastor going into the baptismal waters the second time. Another visitor present Sunday was baptized this Wednesday evening before a large congregation.

The Evangelistic Band will return to Stanley Ave. at Mr. Loney's request

for next Sunday. Sunday, Feb. 27, they will conduct the evening service in Mount Pleasant Road Church.

Churches desiring the services of the Seminary Band will please address Dean W. J. Millar, at the Seminary Building, or at 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto. Invitations are coming in rapidly.

#### JARVIS ST. CHURCH.

The sermon appearing in this issue was preached by the Pastor at the evening service last Sunday to a great congregation. At the close, over twenty responded to the invitation. Six were baptized earlier in the evening. The attendance at school in the morning was 1,144. Revival fires are burning. The Holy Spirit's presence and power are manifest in all the services. The Monday evening lecture has been transferred to the large Lecture Hall to make room for those who for several weeks had been crowded out of the smaller room. The three great prayer meetings are held in the "heavenly places". The attendance at the Thursday evening Bible lecture last week was at least five hundred.

#### SEMINARY NEWS.

Great enthusiasm prevails among students and teachers. We hope to be able to announce before the end of March the doctrinal basis with details of the Seminary Constitution, when it will have been put into legal form. We are grateful for those who have generously contributed to the Seminary Fund, and to those who have promised to do so. We have received one contribution from a church as the portion of its budget devoted to Christian education. The cash receipts for the month of January were a little over \$1,900.00.

We are planning to increase our Faculty so as to be in a position to offer a strong fall Seminary course. We estimate we shall need to begin with about \$15,000.00 a year. Enquiries and applications from prospective students are reaching us from places as remote as the Atlantic and the Pacific. We ask our readers to pray for the Seminary and that He may move rich and poor to give to its support.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. II.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 1.

Lesson 12.

First Quarter.

March 20th, 1927.

#### PAUL CONVERTED.

Lesson Text: Acts 9: 1-31.

Golden Text.—"Behold, he prayeth" (Acts 9: 11).

#### I. AN EXAMPLE OF THE CARNAL MIND.

The Apostle Paul by inspiration wrote, "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Speaking of Christ as coming into the world to save sinners, Paul described himself as the chief. Yet on the natural plane he had much to be proud of (Phil. 3: 4-7). Saul of Tarsus had religiousness, legal righteousness, great natural ability, and much learning; yet he breathed out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord. He was indeed, at heart, an enemy of the truth. By his conduct he approved the crucifixion of Christ, and had already had a part in the murder of the first Christian martyr, Stephen. His antagonism to the Gospel was aggressive in the extreme. His whole character and conduct illustrate the nature of the carnal mind.

#### II. HOW A SINNER BY NATURE IS TRANSFORMED BY GRACE.

1. Saul became the subject of a Divine revelation. No one ever finds God for himself. It is always the result of revelation. The elements of this Divine revelation were a light from Heaven, a voice from Heaven, both leading to a disclosure of Heaven's knowledge of Saul's person and purpose. In every conversion these elements are found,—spiritual illumination, the authority of the Divine call, and a revelation of a man's own nature and purposes. The further and special truth communicated to Saul was that Jesus was not dead,

but alive, and in Glory; the revelation, in fact, of the resurrection and exaltation and sovereign Lordship of Jesus Christ.

2. This resulted in the surrender of himself. "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do"?

3. It was a test of the genuineness of Saul's conversion when he was required to go to one of the very disciples whom he was seeking to destroy, to receive instruction. Thus it is ever God's way to humble human pride.

4. The proof of the genuineness of his repentance is found in the fact that he did as he was told.

### III. THE HUMAN INSTRUMENTALITY EMPLOYED IN THIS GRACIOUS TRANSFORMATION.

1. A man whose address was known to the Lord, and who was responsive to His call (vs. 10); in other words, a man who was in fellowship with God. The Lord has much work to do, and they are sure to be used who are ready to answer.

2. Very minute direction was given him as to where he would find Saul. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost"; He not only knows His sheep, but He knows where they are; He has their address; He knows how to send one direct to the place.

3. An indubitable sign of Saul's changed attitude was involved in the fact that he was praying. When men pray so that God hears them, they are spiritually alive.

4. He had had a further vision of Ananias coming to instruct him so that no one could take Ananias' place. God always chooses appropriate instruments, and selects tools that are fitted for His work.

5. Notwithstanding Ananias had some objection (vss. 13, 14); his reply to the Lord is parallel to Peter's "Not so, Lord", in the tenth chapter. There is nearly always something to be overcome in the disciple before he can be used in leading another to Christ.

6. The Lord answers his objection by saying that Saul is a chosen vessel, and that He would show him "how great things he must suffer" for His Name's sake. Thus in John, chapter 15, Christ says, "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you". We are chosen in Christ Jesus before the world began.

7. Ananias did as he was told, and found Saul fully prepared for his messages. It is always so.

8. As he received sight, he was baptized. Conversion is always followed by baptism, in the New Testament.

9. Saul preached Christ at once. He had been trained in the Scriptures from his youth, and now that the new light from Heaven had come, all that was written in the Old Testament contained a new significance.

10. The complete transformation effected in Saul was a large element in his testimony (vss. 21, 22).

### IV. THE NEW CONVERT IS TRIED IN THE FIRES OF PERSECUTION.

1. His former associates took counsel to kill him. Paul could well understand this attitude toward him because it had been his own.

2. He found fellowship among the disciples of Damascus. They had shared Ananias' fear of him, but had been abundantly convinced of the genuineness of his conversion. How strong the ties that bind real disciples together!

3. Saul must have felt some disappointment that the disciples at Jerusalem were not so easily convinced. It was a natural instinct which led him to "assay to join himself to the disciples", and knowing in what temper he had left Jerusalem, it was perhaps not surprising that the disciples did not readily believe he had been converted.

4. God had one man of special spiritual discernment, who recognized in Saul a true disciple, and he recommended him to the fellowship of the brethren. And as Paul continued boldly to declare his Gospel, he must have been a great inspiration to the Jerusalem church.

5. Following the excitement and consequent persecution occasioned by Saul's conversion after his departure from Jerusalem, the churches of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had a period of rest (vs. 31). This verse is suggestive. The churches had rest! They were edified, they walked in the fear of the Lord, that is, their conduct was consistent. They enjoyed the comfort of the Holy Ghost and were multiplied.