

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. 50. TORONTO, APRIL 21st, 1927. Whole No. 260.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

COMFORT FOR THE BEREAVED—THE RESURRECTION AN ASSURANCE
OF REUNION WITH, AND RECOGNITION OF, LOVED ONES
BEYOND THE GRAVE.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, April 17th, 1927.
(Stenographically Reported.)

"He shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs."
—Acts 1: 3.

"But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward they
that are Christ's at his coming."—I Cor. 15: 23.

"Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light
through the gospel."—II Tim. 1: 10.



MAN'S life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth"; nor does life, in fact, consist in "things" at all: life consists in our relationship to God, in the spiritual sense; to our environment, in the physical sense; and, affectionally, in our relationship to our fellows. Home does not consist in the house in which we live, but in the people who live with us. A man may lose his house, all his goods, and all his wealth, and still be possessed of his dearest treasures; his loved ones left to him, he has all that life can give to him. The fact is, we live in our affections, or we do not live at all.

During the Great War there were men of prominence, men of affairs, who seemed to rise above all personal and domestic interests, who seemed to be married to the State, and to the great cause in which we were all engaged; but when the Shadow fell athwart their own door-step, and the war took a son from their side, again and again it was made abundantly evident that these towering personalities were only human after all, for they had to weep like ordinary people. It is said of Mussolini that he has left his wife and his children, that he never sees them, that he has interests of greater moment which occupy his thought; he too is married to the State—or, more particularly, to his ambition, and to his passion for power. Yet even he, sooner or later, will discover that life cannot thus be lived richly and nobly. At the height of his power Napoleon once remarked, "Alexander, Charlemagne, and I have built and established empires—but upon what have we reared the creations of our genius? Merely upon force. Jesus Christ", said he, "founded His empire upon love, and at this hour there are uncounted millions of men who would gladly die for Him."

Many a man has laid in a narrow grave that which was more to him than all the world's wealth; because we live as our personalities are extended into the personalities of others, we wrap the tendrils of our affections about other souls; and we live as they live—and die sometimes with their death. And when thus that which is of more worth than all the world contains, is taken from a man, or from a woman, when some loved personality is removed, what shall we say of the future? What say you mothers of the children God has given you? Some of them are with you still, and some of them have left you; but those who have left you are nearer to you, in some respects, than those who still live with you, they are scarcely ever absent from your thought—instinctively you feel, as we all feel, that the interests of life span the grave, and that there must be beyond something larger and fuller and richer than we have experienced here below.

What guarantee have we that those whom we have loved and lost will come back to us? What guarantee have we of reunion beyond the grave? That is a vital question, far more important than whether a man can regain a lost fortune. That personality persists, that our friends do not cease to exist, we know; the instinct of immortality is not in any sense dependent upon the resurrection: whether there be a resurrection or not, the instinct of immortality is universal. Just as surely as the birds gather in their sanctuaries when the autumn leaves are turning, and are beginning to fall, and spread their wings for southern sunny climes, because by instinct they know there is a land to which they may go where they may escape the blasts and all the disabilities of winter, so in all ages men have felt that death is not the end, but that beyond there is another form of life, another condition of existence.

What is it? One of my texts says that Christ "brought life and immortality to light." Men were immortal from the beginning, made in the image and likeness of God; but of the life beyond, the saints of the Old Testament knew but little—while they knew there was another life, they lived but in the twilight of divine revelation in this respect. Some there were who saw more clearly than others, as, for instance, Job, when he said, "I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." But most of them saw but dimly into the future; that God was not the God of the dead but of the living, they knew; yet what was beyond was another question. Our Lord Jesus went through death, into resurrection power and glory; He entered the grave, and He came back from the grave the Firstfruits of them that sleep, the Earnest of the harvest yet to come, the Type, the Example, of what, by God's wondrous power, shall yet be accomplished. And so if we study our Lord Jesus in His resurrection life, if we examine some of His appearances to His disciples, we shall be able therefrom to learn something of what awaits us on the other side of the grave, for He was the Firstfruits of that great harvest: "Every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." He "brought life and immortality to light"; He withdrew the veil, and gave us a clearer view of the life beyond the grave.

How is personality recognized here? In various ways. I should not like to say that we are dependent for such discernment wholly upon the senses. There is a realm there into which we have but glimpsed: but mainly we recognize each other through the senses. The dog can pick up the scent and follow his master. We recognize our friends sometimes by their physical appearances, sometimes by the sound of their voices, sometimes by some manifestation of a familiar mental posture, sometimes by the outshining of the soul's habitude.

I.

After His resurrection CHRIST WAS RECOGNIZED BY HIS PHYSICAL FORM. I am not going to argue the resurrection this morning—I shall give more attention to that this evening, but just now I shall assume it to be a fact; and so far as believers are concerned, we know it to be a fact, that by many infallible proofs the Lord Jesus showed Himself alive after His passion ("Hallelujah!").

And when He thus showed Himself, what lessons would He teach us?

First of all, His body was *the same as to its identity*. The body that went into the grave, came out of the grave; He bore in His hands the marks of the nails; there was the wound made by the spear in His side. He showed His disciples His hands and His side, "then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord." They saw Him, they recognized Him by His wounds; because it was the same body they had seen hanging upon the cross. Then you remember

that Thomas said that unless he could put his finger into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into His side, he would not believe; and so after eight days the Lord Jesus appeared again to His disciples, and He said to Thomas, "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"—He gave him the opportunity he asked for. My friends, if language means anything at all, it means that Jesus Christ appeared after His resurrection in identically the same body that was crucified; and He is "the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming".

Our resurrection bodies will be the same, and yet not the same—but the same as to their identity. There will be something of the same form, we shall have, in the resurrection, real bodies. I should not like to say that your hearing will not be clearer there; or that if one is blind now, that he will be blind then; or if one is lame now, he will still be a cripple then: there will be a difference, as we shall see in a moment, and yet, although it may sound paradoxical, though it be different, it will be the same. Our bodies, of course, are changing continually here. When you were a child you had a scar perhaps, on your hand or some other part of your body, and that scar has remained with you through all the years; though as to the particles that compose your body, it is entirely different to-day from what it was in the days of your youth; yet in another sense it is precisely the same. And I rejoice to believe that in this our Lord Jesus "brings immortality and life to light"; He shows us that in the resurrection we shall have literal, physical, bodies like His, the same in identity.

His body was a *material body*. A certain professor, whom I will not name—because I have named him so often—is reported to have told his students that when the two disciples walked on the Emmaus road, and the Stranger drew near and opened to them the Scriptures—you will remember the incident when their hearts burned within them as He talked with them by the way—that professor said that if you had had a camera and had taken a photograph of the three of them walking, the photograph would have shown not three but two! Be that as it may, our Lord Jesus had a body of flesh and of bones. There are some who think the resurrection body will be without blood. It may be a body composed of flesh and of bones, not animated by blood, but by an immortal spirit—there will be "a spiritual body", but though it be spiritual, it will be essentially material, a real body such as Jesus had. So that our friends who have left us may be recognized again by the bodies in which they will appear to us when the Lord Jesus shall come in His glory.

Yet, dear friends, I would emphasize this, which I have anticipated at least, that *our bodies, in the nature of the case, will be greatly changed*—I hope they will. I do not want the same body, in the sense that it is to be subject to the same limitations. I did not go to prayer-meeting last night—what do you think of that? It was the first Saturday night when I have been in the city that I have missed. Why? Because night had been turned into day all the week long, and although this body is fairly strong, it was all but tired out. But do you know, in the resurrection we shall serve Him day and night in His temple, and we shall never grow tired! I do not know what will be the foundation of that new body. There are some people who are blessed with an attractive appearance, and they need a good deal of grace to keep them humble—and the rest of us need grace to be preserved from being utterly discouraged. Yet even the most unattractive have something good-looking about them. You have heard it said of certain people, "They are not much to look at, but when you get the light of their eyes, when they smile, they are almost beautiful." There is something about every one of us that makes us, I suppose, at least tolerable to those who love us. All I know is that the resurrection body will be perfect in every particular, freed from all the present limitations of the flesh; and we shall be like Him even as to our bodies, "for our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body—or, the body of our humiliation—that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." I have a fancy that we shall be like the Lord Jesus even as to our bodies—and He was the most perfect man the world ever saw, perfect physically; and some day all blemishes will be removed, and we shall have bodies that are not subject to our present limitations, but as He is, so shall we be in that life that is to come.

II.

There is another way by which personality frequently is recognized, and that is by THE QUALITY OF THE VOICE. The voice is often an index of the mind, it is a revelation of personality. I sometimes fancy I can measure a man without seeing him, when I talk to him over the telephone. His voice may be heavy like the voice of Boanerges, like the sons of thunder; and yet it may be the voice of a baby, there may be no quality in it, no strength in it. I had often desired to hear Theodore Roosevelt. I thought of him as the embodiment of human strength, and I imagined that associated with that masterful personality there would be a stentorian voice, a voice of heavy timbre. I had always pictured Roosevelt to myself as being a tall man, and a man of physical vigour; I supposed that when he spoke, he spoke in deep-toned words of command. I was astonished when I heard him, to find that he had rather a thin voice, not a heavy voice at all; and yet when Theodore Roosevelt closed his fist and spoke, you felt that an empire was behind it; there was an indefinable something in his voice that expressed and communicated personality.

Well, you have anticipated my proof, have you not? Mary did not leave the sepulchre with Peter and John,—Mary was very much of a woman. Peter and John went into the sepulchre, they examined everything, they reasoned about things, they said, "This is the napkin that was about His head, He left it here. There are the grave-clothes"—they examined every corner and said, "Beyond question, the tomb is empty, He is not here." And they went out of the sepulchre and determined to go home. They probably said to Mary, "Mary, you had better come too, there is no use of your staying here. He is not here." But Mary decided to stay a little longer—and you know the wondrous story of how, after Peter and John had gone to their own homes, she stooped down again, and saw something in the sepulchre which Peter and John, with all their masculine reasoning, had been unable to discover—she saw two angels, "the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain." They had a word for her; and then she turned about, and, supposing the Person standing there to be the gardener, she addressed Him—not yet believing in the resurrection, for she said, "Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." Then He said, "Mary", and instantly she knew Him and said, "Rabboni; which is to say, Master."

Sometimes we sigh for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still; but even the voices that are still shall be heard again: beyond the grave we shall hear the voices of those we have loved and lost. We have Scripture for it, that when we hear them—although they have passed through the grave, that when we hear their voices, we shall recognize our loved ones by the voices which are the expression of their personalities; and we shall have our loved ones again.

III.

Have you ever thought of some absent friend, someone who has perhaps crossed the river, and said, "I wish he were here to-day. How he would have enjoyed this sight!" Or, "I wish she were here to-day. I should like to talk this matter over with her." LONG ACQUAINTANCE WITH OTHER PERSONALITIES GIVES US SOME UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR MENTAL POSTURE, and we say, "If he were here, I know how he would look at it"; or "If she were here, I know what her mind would be." Someone asks us, How do you know? "I knew her so well, I knew the disposition of her mind, I knew her taste, I know exactly what such an one would think in respect to a certain matter."

There is all that in the resurrection. Those two disciples of the Emmaus road came to their home at last, and they said to the Stranger Who had walked with them on the road, "Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them." The evening meal was prepared, and the food was spread upon the table. I wonder as they sat down, were they saying, "Now if He were here, we know what He would do. We have seen Him do it so often: if He were here He would bring God near to us before we eat"? And the Stranger took the bread and gave thanks, and heaven opened, and God's angels came down—and they knew Him in the breaking of bread. It was so like Him, just exactly what they expected Him to do—"and he vanished out of their sight." They rose up the same hour of the night and went back to Jerusalem, and they found the disciples gathered together, and others were saying that they had seen the Lord: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." And they had their testimony, they were able to say, "And

He appeared to us too." "How did you know—did you touch Him?" "No! We heard Him asking a blessing at the table—and that was enough. It was so like Him that there could be no mistake about it. We know He is risen." ("Hallelujah!" "Praise the Lord!").

There are some people who are getting ready for heaven. I was at Gravenhurst last Thursday to conduct the funeral service of my old friend, Rev. A. H. Brace. Some of you remember him when, not so very long ago, he came to us here and prayed. I said to the friends assembled there that I should always remember Mr. Brace as a man of prayer. I told them that he had the rare gift of a reverent humour, that he was the jolliest man I ever knew, or one of them. But his fun was always related to his faith, and never did he permit that "foolish jesting which is not convenient." I told them of one day when I was with him years ago, when, as a company of ministers, we were having a happy time, a rollicking time—as I think Christian people ought to have. There had been gales of laughter; and Brother Brace, the senior of us all, had been the happiest of the company. As we were standing in that room, he put his hand on the shoulder of the brother in whose house we had met, and said, "All right, brethren, we shall have some prayer"—he had not a step to take from his happiest mood to his holiest mood, for they were one; and his prayer was just as appropriate as his fun; and everybody felt in the mood for prayer. And, I think I shall know Brother Brace yonder by his prayer, I think I should recognize him as he asked a blessing, I should recognize the fervour of his soul. And it is possible for us so to live that others may mark our commerce with God, so that we may be known, like our Lord, in the breaking of bread.

IV.

There are many other principles in our text, but with this I must close: PERSONALITY MAY BE RECOGNIZED BY A DISCLOSURE OF THE SOUL'S HABITUDE. The disciples had been talking all night, and had taken nothing, and with the morning they were weary; but as the day broke they saw a Stranger on the shore: "but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus". They told Him, in response to His enquiry, that they had caught nothing; and He told them to cast their net on the right side of the ship and they should find. They did so, and they enclosed a great multitude of fishes; and they came to land, dragging the net. Now the Lord Jesus had never come into their lives at any point without being serviceable to them; He was always helping them; always His hand was extended to bear other people's burdens. And when they came to land, they found that the breakfast fire was already burning, and He said, "Bring of the fish that ye have now caught"—and the Lord Jesus, in His resurrection body, got breakfast for the disciples, cooked the breakfast, saying to them, in effect, "You are tired, I will do this for you"—and He prepared the meal. It was so like Him! "Jesus saith unto them, Come and dine. And none of the disciples durst ask him, Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord". Before His death He had gone about doing good, ministering to others was so the habit of His life, that He could not be anywhere without helping somebody. And the same habitude of soul disclosed His identity when, after His resurrection, He made breakfast on the sea shore for His toll-worn fisherman disciples.

There are some people like that. I suppose we shall need dishes and kitchens in the resurrection; for Jesus Christ ate a piece of fish; and if there is to be fish, there will need to be dishes. I wonder who will do the washing of them? The same people who did it here. Did you ever have people come into your house who were so in the habit of sitting down and folding their hands that it never occurred to them to help you? But there are other people who, no matter where they are, find work to do: it is second nature for them to help other people. That applies not only to women, but men. There are some Goliaths who have not strength enough to carry a chair across the room; if there is work to be done, you may be sure someone else will have to do it. But there are others who are always getting their shoulders under the load, bearing someone else's burdens. You mothers know what I mean, and that daughter of yours on the other side will be just the same serviceable daughter she was here, she will be doing the same things. They knew the Lord Jesus by His habit of life, it was so natural for Him to go about doing good.

Well, that means that the qualities that are being developed here by divine grace, will be the qualities by which we shall be recognized over yonder. How thoroughly prepared was the Lord Jesus for the resurrection life! Up to the

cross, down through the grave, He went; but He was the same Jesus—and He will be the same Jesus Who will come back again.

And so our friends that have left us for the summerland for just a little while, according to the teaching of Scripture, we shall meet on the other side of the river; and if they are Christ's we shall know them, and recognize them for what they really are by His abounding grace.

That is not a philosophical discussion of the resurrection: it is just a little practical application of the great truth of the resurrection for the comfort of your hearts.

I wonder how many of us have seen the Lord Jesus at the Cross? I wonder how many of us have, first of all, believed in the cleansing of the precious blood? How many of us are ready for the resurrection life? May God help us this morning, that we may be prepared to meet Him, and be with Him in the life to come.

Let us pray: We thank Thee, Lord, for the light that is shining from across the river, for the "light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ". We thank Thee for the confidence we have of a life that is freed from pain and sorrow, "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." Help us that we may set our affections on things above "where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God", that we may live for the other life rather than this. Bless this simple meditation this morning, and help us to live in the power of His resurrection, Who loved us and gave Himself for us. We ask it in His Name, Amen.

Editorial

WHAT IS NOW THE GREAT ISSUE?

For years Bible-believing Baptists in the Ontario and Quebec Convention have striven to prevent Modernism from establishing itself in McMaster University. When, at the Convention in 1924, the delegates were asked to pronounce on the straight issue of whether the Convention approved of the honouring of the theological liberalism in the person of Dr. Faunce, the Convention refused a vote of confidence in McMaster University for the first time in its history, and passed a resolution instructing the University never again to do what it had done in the case of Dr. Faunce. This was an overwhelming victory for theological conservatism in the Ontario and Quebec Convention.

Smarting under the defeat, the modernistically-disposed administrators of McMaster University determined to precipitate another issue, in the hope of reversing the verdict. For this purpose Professor Marshall was imported from England. Dr. Farmer has himself implicitly confessed that he knew Professor Marshall was a modernist, and he knew that his coming would cause trouble. But he preferred to fight on the issue of a personality, rather than a principle. By a most vicious campaign of misrepresentation, a temporary victory for Modernism was secured at the Conventions in Hamilton and First Avenue, Toronto. Having packed the Convention with proxy voters (they dare not tell the Baptist public what proportion of votes cast for McMaster came from Toronto), they passed a resolution doing away with proxy votes for the future; and on the morning of the last day of the Convention, when certainly not more than four hundred delegates were present—we believe it would be well within the truth, from all reports received, to say there were not over three hundred—a resolution was sandwiched in between many other formal votes of thanks, and resolutions on narcotics and other perennial subjects, in the following terms:

"Resolved, that no person may act as a delegate to this Convention whose conduct has been declared by a resolution of the Convention to be inconsistent with, or injurious to the purposes and enterprises of the Convention as set out in Section 3 of the Act."

We do not suppose there were half of the people who voted for that resolution, if they gave it attention at all, who had any idea they were authorizing the Executive of the Convention to prepare an amendment to the Constitution, and have it passed through Parliament, that it might come to the next Convention with the prestige of a measure having Parliamentary approval, without the Convention itself being permitted to consider the terms of the proposed amendment. But whatever the interpretation of that resolution, the fact is that such

legislation was asked for. A legal firm, having to its credit the iniquitous Church Union Bill, was employed to worm this equally vicious measure through Parliament. Had the proposal been a just one, one might have supposed the good sense of the Private Bills Committee, and of Parliament in general, might have been relied upon to pass the bill. Instead of that, the most thorough lobbying campaign was conducted—such distinguished gentlemen as Chancellor Whidden and Dr. John MacNeill having their full share in the proceedings.

When the measure actually came before the Private Bills Committee, the argument submitted consisted in a tissue of partial misrepresentations, woven together with absolute falsehoods. The Bill passed—and that Bill is now the issue in the Ontario and Quebec Convention. That Modernism of the most conscienceless type is rampant in McMaster University, there is no longer the shadow of a doubt; but that, for the time being, has ceased to be the issue. The question before the Ontario and Quebec Baptists now is, Shall the Constitution-amending Bill be approved at the next Convention? Until it receives the approval of the Convention, it has no effect.

What is the proposal of the Bill? The amending Bill is as follows:

An Act Respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

WHEREAS, by an Act passed by the Parliament of Canada, in the fifty-second year of the reign of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, chapter one hundred and five of the statutes of 1889, it was enacted as therein set forth; and whereas the said Act was amended by an Act passed by the Parliament of Canada in the first year of the reign of His Majesty, chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1911; and whereas doubts have arisen as to the extent of the powers of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec to make or pass rules, by-laws or resolutions; and whereas it is desirable that such doubts should be removed; and whereas a petition has been presented praying that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth; and whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. Section one of chapter one hundred and five of the Statutes of 1889 is amended by adding the following after the word "Quebec" where it appears in the last line thereof:—"provided that the said convention may from time to time at any annual or special meeting by resolution passed by a vote of three-fifths of the delegates present and voting declare that any church, the conduct or attitude of which, in the opinion of the said convention, is not in harmony and co-operation with the work and objects of the said convention, shall cease to be entitled to send any delegates to the said convention and thereupon any and all delegates of any such church in attendance at such meeting shall cease to be delegates and any such church shall cease to be entitled to send delegates to any meeting of the said convention. The said convention may in like manner at any subsequent annual or special meeting revoke any such resolution or resolutions."

2. Section two of the said chapter one hundred and five of the statutes of 1889, as amended by section one of chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1911 is amended by adding the following as sub-section three:—

"(3) The said convention may from time to time make or pass rules, by-laws or resolutions not inconsistent with this Act, with regard to the conduct of the affairs of the said convention or to any matter to which the objects of the said convention extend, and may from time to time rescind, revoke, amend or vary any such rule, by-law or resolution and make others."

3. (1). This Act shall not come into force unless and until accepted and approved by a resolution passed at an annual or special meeting of the said convention, and, if so accepted and approved, this Act shall come into force upon a subsequent day to be fixed for that purpose by the said resolution. A certificate of the President or the Secretary-Treasurer of the said convention as to such passing shall be filed with the Secretary of State.

(2) Notice of such acceptance and approval and of the day so fixed shall be published in the *Canada Gazette*.

Section one of the Constitution which this Bill amends reads:

"Each Regular Baptist Church within the limits of the said Provinces shall be entitled to send two or more delegates to an Assembly to be called 'The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.'"

What is the meaning of this measure? First, we may enquire, Was it necessary? Regular Baptist churches have been founded upon a Confession of Faith. That Confession of Faith is written into the Trust Deed of McMaster University. Section one of the Constitution provides for the admission to the Convention only of delegates from Regular Baptist churches; therefore if any church called "regular" ceases to be regular, by departing from the faith in any particular, it is possible by this section, without any amendment, to discipline such church, and to refuse to seat such members. But the Bill provides means whereby a church shall be expelled, not for ceasing to be a Regular Baptist Church, but for refusing to allow itself to be something else!

A study of the Bill will show that the amendment would authorize the Convention to "pass rules, by-laws, and resolutions, not inconsistent with this Act, with regard to the conduct of the affairs of the said convention or to any matter to which the objects of the said convention extend". Any fad which the Convention at any time, at a dying session, might adopt, might be defined as one of "the objects" of the Convention. The amendment to section one makes it possible, by a three-fifths vote, for the Convention to declare any church, however true it may be to the principles of Regular Baptist Churches, to be "not in harmony and co-operation with the work and objects of the said convention."

But there is nothing like concrete illustration to make matters plain. Let us take the High Park Church for example, of which Rev. John Linton is the Pastor. Mr. Linton's attitude toward the matters which have disturbed our Convention is well known. Mr. Linton was responsible for the organization of the First Baptist Bible Union unit in Canada. When he was at Point St. Charles, Montreal, by his invitation, we visited him there; and at his suggestion the Quebec Branch of the Baptist Bible Union of North America was organized, with Rev. John Linton as President. At the 1919 Convention in Ottawa Mr. Linton, on the floor of the Convention, made a merciless disclosure of the modernism of Professor Harry MacNeill in Brandon College. The statement he then made he repeated later at a luncheon given in his honour on the occasion of his leaving Parkdale Church, Toronto, for Montreal. On January 14th, 1926, a meeting was held in Jarvis Street Church, to protest against the appointment and retention of Professor L. H. Marshall of McMaster University. At that meeting Mr. Linton was among the speakers, and in support of a resolution, Mr. Linton spoke, in part, as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and Christian friends: In speaking to this resolution I would like to say, first of all, that we are not here because of personal animus against any brother-man; we are not met here to-night—either to speak or to listen—because we have not at heart the welfare of our University, and the unity and prosperity of our beloved Denomination: we are met here to-night, my friends, because these things lie on our hearts, and are the things which we most earnestly covet. It is to be deplored that the one real issue before our people to-day is being lost sight of amid personalities. The issue before our Canadian Baptist people is not personalities: the issue, my friends, to-night—this year—is Modernism.

"The issue is not Dr. Shields: it was not Dr. Shields who brought Professor Marshall to Canada! (Applause). Dr. Shields did not examine Professor Marshall, and discover that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship! Dr. Shields did not, after making that examination and discovery concerning Mr. Marshall, commend Mr. Marshall to us in the columns of *The Canadian Baptist*! (Applause). Dr. Shields did not refuse to re-open that examination in order that we, as a Denomination, might be saved from the very situation which confronts us to-night! Dr. Shields did not publish that sermon in *The Canadian Baptist*, entitled, "The Insight of Christ"! Dr. Shields did not preach that sermon in James Street Church, Hamilton, entitled, "Coming to Christ"! Dr. Shields did not declare that the man who accepted the literal interpretation of Jonah would be considered in England an "uneducated fool"! Dr. Shields did not say that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship (Applause), which position has rendered the Old Testament a mass of unreliability—Dr. Shields did not do that! It was not Dr. Shields who examined Mr. Marshall, and, with his eyes wide open to what Mr. Marshall believed, and well knowing that Mr. Marshall's

views could not possibly find acceptance with our Canadian people, nevertheless brought Mr. Marshall with his family from England, and placed him in the humiliating position of coming to a strange country to be the storm centre of theological controversy in a Bible-loving Denomination—Dr. Shields did not do Professor Marshall that wrong! (Applause). Someone else did; but I contend, in all fairness, that Dr. Shields was not that man. Let me repeat it: the issue before us to-night, and at the coming Convention, is not Dr. Shields: It is the attitude of our Canadian Baptist Denomination toward Modernism."

At the Convention in First Avenue, presumably because his position was so well known, by vote of the Convention, Rev. John Linton was denied a hearing; and Dr. Farmer was preferred before him. But Dr. Farmer consented to give Mr. Linton part of his time. Mr. Linton then spoke as follows:

Rev. John Linton's Speech.

REV. JOHN LINTON (High Park Baptist Church, Toronto): Mr. Chairman and dear friends, I believe that I could say a word that would be helpful to our denominational work. My interest at the present time is absolutely impersonal; it is not for Dr. Shields' advantage. I desire to speak for a few minutes because I believe that the Convention made a great mistake a moment ago when they cut off the discussion. I will tell you why, because it is a very simple thing to hear Dr. Farmer and to close the discussion and to take your vote. The men on the other side from myself will certainly have an overwhelming majority. I know that.

What about it? It will settle some things that ought to be settled, it will be a vindication of some things for which Professor Marshall was unfairly charged; and so far so good. But, dear brethren, as Mr. Smalley said, Where do we go from here? and you must think of the next year. If you are going to have the co-operation of at least one hundred Baptist churches—now, I give that as my own judgment, and I think I know these churches—if you want to have the co-operation during the coming year and in other years of one hundred Baptist churches who, altogether independent of Dr. Shields, are taking a stand on this issue, then you must, brethren, hear us out. (Cries of "Amen"). You must allow us to deliver our souls. You must give us an opportunity to explain the difficulties that we have in accepting the position that Professor Marshall has outlined to-night.

Just think! If you overwhelmingly defeat the amendment as it is, and as you will do, and send us back to our churches, do you need anyone to tell you what that means? How would you like to go back to your church without having had an opportunity to present your side fully? I am not unfair when I say that two-thirds of the speakers and much more than two-thirds of the time to-day has been consumed by those on the other side.

Three Reasons For Not Supporting Professor Marshall.

MR. LINTON: I want to submit three reasons why I cannot support the amendment to the amendment. I want to submit three reasons to Professor Marshall why I cannot defend his retention.

The first is, because this statement that he has made proves on the very face of it his sympathy with that which we label Modernism on this side, and which has been destructive of the prosperity of every church that has received it. (Cries of "No, no" and "Hear, hear"). Now, I listened without a word all day, too. "Some of our people are the narrowest of the narrow and others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ."

Dear friends, our Baptist people do not believe that the "broadest of the broad", the out-and-out modernist, is as personally loyal to Jesus Christ as a Bible-believing Baptist. This Convention did not believe that when they by an overwhelming majority refused to ratify the honouring of Dr. Faunce, because Dr. Faunce was one of "the broadest of the broad".

Therefore with this attitude towards modernism, that which is the greatest menace confronting the Church to-day, Brother Marshall is out of harmony altogether with our Canadian Baptist people. (Cries of "No, no" and "Yes, yes"). I believe that Professor Marshall ought to speak again to-night, or to-morrow morning, in answer to these questions. I do not see why, Mr. Chairman, we should close this to-night. But do as you like.

Secondly, Professor Marshall accepts as an allegory, as a parable, the miracle of Jonah. I should like respectfully to ask Professor Marshall to tell this Convention what he does with the Saviour's alleged verification of the miracle of the Prophet Jonah. Does Professor Marshall believe that the men of Nineveh will rise in the Judgment Day, as Jesus Christ said they would, or is that not true? If Jonah was not in the belly of the fish three days and three nights as Jesus declares he was, what is the meaning of the words of Jesus Christ? An honest presentation of the words, an exposition of the words of our Saviour concerning the rising up on the Judgment Day of those repentant Ninevites is due to every delegate here. If Professor Marshall can give me a reasonably fair answer to that question, certainly I would be glad to support his retention.

Thirdly, Professor Marshall said here to-night concerning the historical method of approach to the Scriptures, that the Driver view gives the student the right method. I have shown in my pamphlet, which has never been answered here to-day, and in that pamphlet there has never been one statement made that was ever false or anything like false,—and let it be known to this Convention that there are at least some who are taking the stand against the University's course whose conduct has been, as far as it was possible, above reproach. Dr. Driver gives, then, the right method to the McMaster students, your future ministers, your own sons,—Dr. Driver gives the right method of approach to the Scriptures.

Dr. Driver Denies What Christ Attests.

Some reference to his book will show that a legitimate use of that very principle which Professor Marshall defends and himself accepts and commends to the students,—a legitimate use of that very principle means that before you go many pages you are face to face against the stated word of Jesus Christ. You apply that to the 110th Psalm. Dr. Driver takes that principle and applies it to the 110th Psalm. Jesus Christ said that the 110th Psalm spoke of Himself, "David testified of Me". Dr. Driver, by using his method—a legitimate use of his method, which leaves the supernatural out of it, mark you, discards the 110th Psalm. So that Professor Marshall is commending to our young students a method which he himself says—

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Linton is confusing Driver's method with Driver's conclusions. He is giving us Driver's conclusions all the time.

MR. LINTON: Not at all. I say that a legitimate application of the historical method means that the statements of the Scripture are not accepted at their face value. (Cries of "No, no" and "That is right".) I can only say the man who says no to that has not read Driver.

A DELEGATE: Yes, I have.

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, may I rise to a point of order? (Cries of "Sit down".)

MR. LINTON: I have just—

With these words, objection was raised to his continuing, and Mr. Linton's speech came to an end.

Any candid reader will agree that Mr. Linton put himself unmistakably on record as being out of harmony and co-operation with McMaster University, which was one of the "objects" of the Convention. As is well known, ultimately the packed Convention endorsed Professor Marshall and McMaster University. Supposing the proposed amendment had been part of the Constitution at that time, it would have been possible for anyone to have moved a resolution declaring Rev. John Linton, and the High Park Church supporting him, to be out of harmony with the Convention; and therefore no longer entitled to representation in the Convention. (Since the Convention, the High Park Church, by resolution, has discontinued all contributions to McMaster University; and passed a resolution against the amendment by unanimous vote. These two actions would serve only to accentuate the Pastor's positive utterances, and afford further proof that High Park Church, as a church, is out of harmony with at least one of the "objects" of the Convention.)

It is deserving of note also that in his speech in First Avenue quoted above, Mr. Linton said: "If you are going to have the co-operation of at least

one hundred Baptist churches—now, I give that as my own judgment, and I think I know these churches—if you want to have the co-operation during the coming year and in other years of one hundred Baptist churches, who, altogether independent of Dr. Shields, are taking a stand on this issue, then you must, brethren, hear us out." If Mr. Linton's estimate is a correct one, in the day that this amending Bill is approved, there would be at least one hundred churches who would become subject to its provision. But if it be remembered that of the something over five hundred churches of the Convention, about two hundred made no contribution to McMaster, it would appear that Mr. Linton's estimate was a very conservative one. If an imp of the pit had set about to devise means for absolutely wrecking the Baptist denomination in Ontario and Quebec, he could not possibly have hit upon a better plan than that represented in this proposed amendment.

The amendment, indeed, would make it possible for a majority to declare the minority out of harmony with the Convention, on almost any issue it chose to raise; and thereafter by a three-fifths vote to expel the protesting church from the Convention.

We need not here go into the question of property rights—personally we care very little about that side of the question—but we do recognize the necessity for co-operative action among Baptists. And so long as our Baptist churches produce men of independent judgment, there will be differences of opinion; but this amendment to the Constitution would make a free and frank discussion of differences of opinion a very dangerous procedure. Anyone disagreeing with any measure would do so at the peril of his membership in the Convention. We have no doubt whatever that if this amendment should be approved by the Convention, it will produce perfect peace and harmony within the Convention ultimately—but it will be the peace and harmony of a graveyard!

The Editor of this paper has no personal concern in this matter at all. Jarvis Street Church is large enough to be a little denomination of itself, and would be able, quite independently of all other Baptist churches, to undertake some missionary work both at home and abroad; but we should be exceedingly sorry to see smaller churches who could not well carry on mission work abroad, or perhaps even at home, independently, but only in co-operation with other churches, excluded from the brotherhood, and their pastors virtually robbed of standing in the Denomination.

The issue, therefore, before the Convention is this, Shall the Constitution-amending Bill be approved by the Convention? We may now cease therefore discussing the "methods" and "spirit" of the opposition of any particular individual or group, to McMaster's Modernism. However good brethren may have disagreed as to the best method of combating Modernism, we venture to believe that all sound Baptists will refuse to allow such reservations as may have made them lukewarm in their contention for the faith, to prevent their uniting in opposition to this amending Bill which would jeopardize free discussion of denomination problems within the Convention for all time to come.

Northern Baptist Convention Members, Attention!

We have received the following communication from Dr. Geo. A. Francis, of Glendale, California. It is a staggering revelation of incompetency, or of something worse. Such an outrageous condition of things would not be tolerated in any secular organization in the world—why should it be tolerated in a religious organization? Modernism is parasitical in all its operations. It is a cancer which nothing but the knife can cure.

Dr. Francis' letter ought to be published in pamphlet form and circulated by the scores of thousands throughout the Northern Baptist Convention. If this information alone could be given to the rank and file of the Baptist church members of the Northern Convention, the doom of its Foreign Mission Board would be sealed. We wish it were financially possible for us to send this number of *The Gospel Witness* without charge to all who desire it; the best we can do is to offer to send single copies at 5c. each postpaid; or in large numbers at the rate of \$3.00 per hundred.

A STAGGERING REVELATION.

Letter from Dr. Geo. A. Francis.

Glendale, Calif.,
April 12, 1927:

My Dear Fellow Baptists:

In the years past our Baptist Missionary Work in foreign fields was conducted on an economical and evangelical plan. The officers were few; salaries moderate, general expense low. The missionaries were kept on the field, as far as possible. Administration, travel, conferences, etc., were all reasonable in cost; excessive expense was non-existent. The missionaries were sound on Bible Truth—if not, were recalled.

But This Has All Been Changed.

We are at present under unreasonable expense and a most careless management. To illustrate this: During the year 1925-26 the salaries of the missionaries while at home on furlough in the regular foreign missionary society amounted to \$184,797.60 for that year. The fares of missionaries to and from the field were \$132,728.63. The cost of administration that year for the foreign work was \$177,335.86. These items added together amount to \$494,912.09, which is \$63,233.05 more than the salaries of the missionaries who were kept on the foreign field that year.

In the Woman's Foreign Society in 1925-26 administration cost \$53,529.16. The salaries of missionaries while on furlough was \$40,608.04. The fares of missionaries on furlough were \$29,741.07. The cost of these three items added is \$123,878.27.

Now add the above figures together for the two societies, representing the cost of administration, missionary travel, and salaries of missionaries while on furlough, and you have \$618,790.36 of expense, apart from the foreign field. These figures reveal a startling position and a condition in our foreign work that the great contributing Baptist host have no knowledge of whatever.

Fully fifty per cent. of the money contributed for our foreign work is used in enabling the other fifty per cent. to do the actual and direct work on the field. But this is not all,—the indirect expense. There is \$5,316.79 used in conferences with missionaries and \$4,000 is used in missionary conferences. (You see it costs to talk to a missionary.) Then there is \$7,400.36 of interest money,—these three items make a total of \$16,717.25 more expense.

Add this to the above \$618,790.36 and you have a grand total of \$635,507.61 spent for other than direct work.

Now you see where the Advisory Committee found \$500,000.00 wastefully squandered in the work of the entire N.B.C. annually.

The entire outfit is a fine living place for an army of needless employees. This top-heavy machine, which is now an enormous bill of expense, should be taken apart and junked at once. The greater number of its employees should be sent out to earn an honest living elsewhere, and the entire work should be turned over to practical Christian men and women who will devote our missionary funds to the purposes for which they were contributed.

Missionaries Should Be Cared For.

We implicitly believe in the proper care of all missionaries when at home or abroad, but such expense, apart from the field of service, as is here displayed, is not sound business. No commercial firm would tolerate it for a moment. No Baptist church would sanction it.

It reveals the unfitness of our present administration in handling our missionary affairs.

But this condition runs through every part of the work.

The Investment Fund Muddle.

The Advisory Committee says, "An example of one respect in which improvement is desirable. They found one of the National Society's investments had 316 mortgagees—maturity date of 22 not known; interest rate of three not known; appraised valuation of 25, no record. In 38 cases, no assessed valuation. In 25 cases, not known when taxes were paid. In 44 cases not known whether property was insured. In two cases expiration of insurance not known. In 25 cases not known how mortgage was acquired. In 18 cases no knowledge of when the interest was last paid. Interest payment overdue in 6 cases. Taxes overdue in 4 cases. Principal overdue in 38 cases. And in 93 cases the amount

of the mortgage was beyond what the Society's by-laws allowed. While in 86 cases the Society did not know whether the property was income-bearing or not.

Wonderful Harmony:

There was one item that had received proper attention. The officers' and employees' salaries were all paid in full. But the Committees say they found the investments of three other national societies in a similar condition, and the evidence was that some of the city mission societies and state conventions were in the same condition.

We do not wonder that the famous "Committee of Nine," appointed to report on "The Advisory Committee's Report" at Washington, even though they had spent \$1,000 of good money in conferences, did not have the courage to make the report, but asked to be dismissed.

False Representation.

Two or three thousand delegates to the annual N.B.C. (one-quarter of whom are convention employees) can not properly represent or act representatively for 1,500,000 Baptists. As it is well known that a small group pre-arranged the convention's propositions, and then with the aid of the employee's vote (the determining bloc) they are adopted. Other propositions are barred from the floor.

Apostate Schools.

That is what our Baptist religious schools are for the most part. They have left both the Baptist and Bible positions in their views of Truth and are no more Baptists than Buddhism is. Their graduates are pushed into the pastorates and the foreign work to be supported by real Baptist gifts.

The Foreign Board and convention leaders play into the hands of the school. These schools are also sending out graduates who discourage evangelistic work and the adoption of teaching instead on the foreign field. These schools are also peddling their false teachings at home and abroad by correspondence. Their entire method is false and hypocritical.

They are willing that a fundamentalist, WHO STANDS FOR NOTHING, shall be the chairman of the big machine, and that the pious addresses be given by near-fundamentalists. But policies, programmes, and appointments, must be made by men like the present Foreign Board Chairman.

Who Is Responsible?

It is folly to talk of peace in the Baptist ranks while modernists dominate our work. If they were expelled from our midst, real peace, spiritual power, and a succession of victories, would accompany our work. And this would take place at once if all those who claim to be fundamentalists stood firm and true. Otherwise, dissension, strife, defeat, and finally division, will be our lot, for which a compromising fundamentalism and a Godless, vicious, and guilty modernism, will be responsible.

(Signed) GEORGE A. FRANCIS.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 2

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 21.

Lesson 8.

Second Quarter.

May 22, 1927.

PAUL AT THESSALONICA AND ATHENS.

Lesson Text: Acts, chapter 17.

Golden Text.—"For in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28)
I. PAUL AND HIS COMPANIONS AT THESSALONICA.

1. Their route from Philippi to Thessalonica lay through Amphipolis and Apollonia. Paul made it his habit to go to the synagogue where the people gathered, and to reason out of the Scriptures. No book is more interesting than the Scriptures; whoever knows his Bible will never want for an interesting and profitable subject of conversation and discussion. Why talk about the weather, and baseball, and the markets, when the whole field of Scripture is open to us?

2. He found the Scripture full of Christ. We discuss Scripture to no profit as a mere book, as affording matter for argument: only as we get to Christ is such talk useful.

3. The one thing about Christ was His death and resurrection and divine au-

thority. Nothing else is understood in its true light until the Cross, the resurrection of Christ, and His ascension to God's right hand, are received and believed.

4. Such use of the Word of God always results in conversions.

5. While nothing succeeds like success, nothing is surer to engender opposition. The moving cause, as usual, was "envy". Paul's gospel attracted more people and he and his message became the subject of discussion. Oh, the baseness of the human heart!

6. The real opponents hid behind their tools—"the lewd fellows of the baser sort" were used by the more respectable. It is ever so. It is not easy to get at the "higher-ups".

7. The devil is often permitted to advertise the gospel. In this case the enemy "set all the city in an uproar". We must not complain of opposition—it greatly assists.

II. PAUL AND SILAS GO TO BEREА.

1. They did not learn caution by their experience at Thessalonica, but did the same thing in Berea as in Thessalonica. How many change their course because of opposition, and then lose their testimony.

2. There was a more receptive attitude displayed at Berea: they were more independent, they did their own thinking, they searched the Scripture. So ought we to do.

3. Here, too, there were many converts. What does it matter though men oppose, if only some believe?

4. If the devil is lacking in obedient servants in a particular place, he has no difficulty in importing them. If there are no opponents in Berea, some will come from Thessalonica!

5: In this instance, Paul, the chief, and, no doubt, the principal target, is sent away. No invariable rule can be laid down in such cases: sometimes the opposition should be faced; at other times it is wiser to move on—only divine wisdom can direct. Silas and Timothy remained, and doubtless did much to confirm the new believers.

III. PAUL AT ATHENS.

1. Apparently even the great apostle needed companionship, for he sent word back for Silas and Timothy to join him immediately.

2. While he waited, he was moved, his spirit was stirred within him. Much can be done in waiting hours. Are we "moved" at the sight of a godless city? What strikes you in a strange city?

3. Without waiting for reinforcements, he did the same thing which had given him trouble in Thessalonica and Berea.

4. Epicureans and Stoics: "Disciples of Epicurus, the Athenian philosopher, whose 'garden' was the resort of numbers. There he taught that the aim of philosophy should be happiness and pleasure, not absolute truth; experience (the perceptions, general notions, and passions or affections), not reason, the text. Physics he studied, to explain phenomena and dispel superstitious fears; ethics he regarded as man's proper study, since they conduce to supreme and lasting pleasure. The Epicureans and Stoics were the two opposite schools of philosophy prevalent in Athens at Paul's visit (Acts 17:18). Materialism and sensual selfishness was the ultimate tendency of Epicurus's teaching; but his bold criticism of heathen polytheism, the claims of the body, and individual freedom, were the better elements in it. Stoicism taught an absolute fate and the spiritual nature of the soul, which it made part of the general soul of the world. Paul directs against Epicureanism the declaration of creation (ver. 24), providence (26), inspiration (28), the resurrection and judgment (31). Sadduceism was the Jewish representative. Diogenes Laertius (x.) preserves some of Epicurus's letters, and a list of his writings. See also Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, trans. by Creach." (*Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopaedia*).

5. Paul's subject was Jesus and the resurrection. Whatever his text, his subject was always the same. So ought ours to be.

6. Athens was the centre of Grecian culture; but with all her culture there was no satisfaction—her people had no satisfaction, but were always seeking some new thing. How like to modern cities!

IV. PAUL'S ADDRESS ON MARS' HILL.

1. All men are worshippers. Paul beheld the gods they worshipped—and among their altars one was dedicated to the "unknown god". So while men

have many objects of worship, the God of all the earth is unknown.

2. The Christian revelation is a revelation of the God who remains unknown apart from a revelation: "Canst thou by searching find out God" etc.

3. Here Paul speaks of God as revealed in Christ: (a) He is the Maker of heaven and earth; (b) He is a spirit dwelling not in material temples; (c) He is sovereignly independent—is not worshipped with men's hands; (d) He is the Creator of all men; (e) the end of human existence is that they should seek after God; (f) God is not to be thought of as though He were made by men, for we are really His offspring; (g) Paul proclaimed a day of judgment with Christ as the Judge; (h) yet there was little fruit from this mission (vs. 22-34). In our next lesson we shall see that from Athens, Paul went to Corinth, and in his epistle to the Corinthians he says, "When I came to you . . . I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified". Some expositors have thought that Paul endeavoured to meet the philosophers in Athens on their own ground, and was less simple and direct in his preaching, and therefore had smaller results, and that he left Athens somewhat disappointed, resolving that in the next place he would know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. We offer this suggestion for what it may be worth.

INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON

May 22nd, 1927.

Comments by the Editor.

PETER HEALS THE LAME MAN.

Acts 3: 1 to 4: 31.

GOLDEN TEXT: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven among men whereby we must be saved."—Acts 4:12.

I. THE FIRST APOSTOLIC MIRACLE. Vs. 1-11.

1. It is significant that it should be associated with the hour of prayer. The believer's chief concern is to maintain unbroken communication with divine resources. 2. The lame man had been a cripple from birth. God is able to correct the faults of nature. We are all sinners by birth as well as by choice. 3. It was a true instinct which led this man to expect help from those who went up to the temple to pray. Men of the world are often critical of the church, but in the hour of their trouble it is to praying men they come. 4. It is ever so that men care more for their bodies than their souls, and would measure the ministry of an individual or an institution to the community by the material good it accomplishes. 5. The apostles were without money, but they were not without power to minister. The church's ministry is never crippled primarily by its poverty. God has accomplished his greatest work through the poor. 6. Every true believer may, if he will, render to needy men a greater service than mere almsgiving. It is not the want of money, but the want of that mysterious, intangible, "such as I have" that cripples the church and the individual. 7. This miracle was the fulfillment of the Master's promise to his disciples. It was a sign of their apostleship, even as His miracles had been signs of His Messiahship. 8. It may be doubted whether anyone has power to confer blessing, even in a material way, without spiritual power. 9. It was fitting that the healed man should use his new found strength to walk, and leap, and praise God. 10. The genuineness of the miracle was patent to all. 11. There is a peculiar affection between those who receive spiritual benefit and those through whom it is conveyed (v. 11).

II. PETER'S EXPLANATION OF THE MIRACLE.

1. He disclaims all credit for the accomplishment. It is vitally important that Christian workers should first get themselves out of the way. The Holy Spirit does not engage to glorify any man or institution, but only to glorify Christ. 2. Peter connects the Lord Jesus with the worthy names of those in whom they believed, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. There is a spiritual factfulness which is divinely taught. 3. He identifies the despised and crucified Jesus as the Son of God, now divinely glorified, and contrasts the action of God in glorifying Christ with that of men. 4. He does not hesitate to charge them with the responsibility of the murder of the Prince of Life (vs. 13-15). Peter speaks very directly and personally. The most important part of any sermon is its application. Nathan's parable becomes effective only when it

reaches the climax "Thou art the man". So teachers should remember that when they have held up the truth of the lesson before their scholars, they should prayerfully make a personal application of it to those whom they teach. 5. Peter declares himself to be a witness of the resurrection of Christ, thus fulfilling the mission upon which he had been divinely sent (v. 15). 6. Such blessing as the lame man received through their ministry had come to him through faith in the name of Christ, and there is no other way to establish connection with heaven. 7. There is significance in Peter's charge that the religious leaders of the day had crucified Christ "through ignorance": a charge doubtless which would cut them more deeply than any other complaint could do. But the antagonism of men toward Christ is always to be attributed to ignorance; "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." 8. This preacher still keeps to his Book, and insists that that which was spoken by the mouth of the prophets was something which God had shown.

III. PETER'S EXHORTATION.

1. He calls them to repentance as a condition of forgiveness. There can be no forgiveness without repentance (v. 19). 2. He refers to the second coming of our Lord as an event which must inevitably come to pass that all the scriptures might be fulfilled. How this preacher magnifies the scriptures! 3. He not only refers to scripture, but actually quotes it (vs. 22, 23). 4. This Spirit-filled man declares that all scripture is related to Christ, and that the prophets, who have gone before, were but preparing the way for Him who at last comes as the Word of God (vs. 22-25). 5. Christ came into the world, not to save men in their sins, but from their sins (v. 26).

IV. RELIGIOUS OPPOSITION TO THE GOSPEL.

1. The devil has always presented his strongest opposition to the work of God in the guise of religion. 2. The doctrine to which they especially objected was the resurrection of Christ. The resurrection was the climax of a supernatural life, and the crowning attestation of the claims of Christ. 3. Persecution never hinders the progress of truth: although the preachers were put in jail, about five thousand of their hearers believed. 4. The unreasonableness of the carnal mind in its attitude toward the work of God is illustrated in the attitude of these religious leaders (vss. 6 and 7). They asked for a knowledge of this power only that they might oppose it.

V. OPPOSITION ONLY PROVIDES FURTHER OPPORTUNITY FOR SERVICE.

1. Peter makes his defence an aggressive testimony to the power of Jesus Christ. 2. Fellowship with Christ transmutes cowardice into courage (vs. 13). The chief characteristic they observed about these preachers was their boldness: it was not by their pliability, or amiability, or gentle conciliatory attitude, but by their boldness, they were convinced of the disciples' fellowship with Christ. 3. The genuineness of the miracle stopped the mouths of the gainsayers (vs. 14). Men are ever anxious to say something against the Gospel, but while preachers are surrounded with people whose lives attest the power of the Gospel, they can say nothing against it. 4. Acknowledging the genuineness of the miracle, and that it was a good deed, they endeavored notwithstanding to prevent its repetition. 5. Threatening has ever been a favorite weapon of the enemy: the devil endeavors always to intimidate the witnesses of the Gospel. 6. The witness for Christ must ever choose between the Word of God and the word of man, the favor of God and the favor of man.

VI. HOW CHRISTIANS OBEY THE LAW OF THEIR NEW NATURE.

1. They went to their own company (vs. 23). They went straight from jail to the assembly of the saints. 2. It was a law of their nature to pour out their hearts to God (vs. 24). 3. They found their comfort in the Word of God (vss. 25, 26). 4. They found the Scripture fulfilled in their own experience: and notwithstanding the suffering involved, they rejoiced to find they were on the right road. 5. Opposition only strengthened their determination to be bolder than ever (vs. 29). 6. They depended upon the power of God to vindicate their course (vs. 30). 7. God answered from Heaven (vs. 31). 8. They witnessed to the resurrection with greater power than before. 9. Great grace was upon them all.

The Jarvis Street Annual Meeting will be held Friday evening, April 29th, beginning at 7.30.