

RUSSELLISM on The Second Coming and Retribution

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. 6. No. 17.

TORONTO, SEPT. 1st, 1927.

Whole No. 279

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

Russellism's Perversion of the Doctrine of the Second Coming of Christ

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, July 31st, 1927.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not:

"For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.

"Behold, I have told you before.

"Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not.

"For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."—Matthew 24:23-27.



SHALL speak in the open air at the close of this service on, "Russellism's Favourite Slogan, 'To Hell and Back'." That was the title of "Pastor" Russell's famous lecture. Our text for the evening is found in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, twenty-third to twenty-seventh verses: "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth; behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not"—how is He to come?—"For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

I repeat at the outset what I said last Sunday evening, that I have no quarrel whatever with men on this subject. My testimony is not so much against the men who hold the doctrines of Russellism, as against the delusion itself. One of the ushers told me that at the close of the service last Sunday

night a gentleman came to him and said, "I want you to carry a message to your Pastor. Tell him that I came to this city to attend the International Bible Students' Convention, and I came to this service as a Russellite; but I am a Russellite no longer. I do not quite know what I am now: I only know that I am no longer a Russellite." I hope you will pray for that man; for I trust he is representative of a great many more. That, at least, was the object we had in view in speaking on the subject, to try to show people from the Word of God that the doctrines promulgated by the International Bible Students are verily the doctrine of demons, and not the teaching of the Word of God.

And yet it is sometimes necessary to mention names. I have had to do that on other occasions, and I have heard of people saying in our Baptist brotherhood, "If only he would not mention anybody's name! If only he would content himself with denouncing the errors, if he so regards them, but avoid personalities!" But I heard the other day a new thing. A friend who had been all through the downgrade controversy in England, when the Baptist Union passed a vote of censure upon Mr. Spurgeon, told me this: that the brethren there censured Spurgeon because he refused to mention names! I have been censured again and again because I mention them! I have always felt this, that if we generalize and condemn people indiscriminately, we do injustice to a great many people; but if we say of the wrong-doer, or the false teacher, "Thou art the man, your name is—well, for example, Professor L. H. Marshall. That is your name, and you occupy a Chair in McMaster University"—when I say that, I am not talking about a professor in Knox, or Victoria, or Princeton, or somewhere else: I am talking about one particular man, and I do injustice to nobody else; and he has a chance to defend himself.

It is necessary to mention the name of the founder of this cult, Pastor Charles Russell. I do not know of what he was "pastor", but he always so called himself; and his whole system is built upon the allegation that until he arrived, apparently there was no one competent to translate the Scriptures! We had the Authorized Version, but the translators of the Authorized Version were apparently a pack of rogues, and deliberately set themselves so to translate the Scriptures as to bolster up certain erroneous teachings, and to conceal the truth! If that be true, a great multitude of people have been sadly victimized. Even the translators of the Revised Version are dealt with rather harshly too. Here and there Mr. Russell finds that their translations are a little more in accord with his views—perhaps a particular word—but you will find such a phrase as this, "But they were not honest enough to translate such a word in such a way."

There have been great Greek scholars who have been God's gifts to the church, men who have given their lives to the mastery of that language. And there have been great Hebraists too. It would be difficult to over-estimate the church's debt to consecrated scholarship, for through the efforts of such scholars we now have the Bible put into our hands that we might read it in our own language and understand the gospel. But here comes a man who tells us—very modestly—that he is "Christ's representative in the world, the sole steward of the meat in due season". When a man says that, he must not blame us—or his followers who accept that great claim must not blame us, if we examine somewhat closely into that man's credentials and find out whether his claims are just.

Our Lord Himself was subjected to that test. They continually asked Him whence He came, and said, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" "Did he not come out of Nazareth?" Again they said, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" That question might very appropriately have been put to Pastor Russell! He claimed to "know letters", he claimed to be competent to brush aside the work of all the translators, and to set himself up, so far as I am able to see, in opposition to every Greek and Hebrew scholar on earth—and I know of no man of any reputation who would support Pastor Russell's contention.

I recall reading an exposure of Pastor Russell in *The Brooklyn Eagle* some years ago. Pastor Russell was sued by his wife for divorce. A divorce was granted on the ground of a violation of the marriage covenant. That is

a matter of history; and yet this is the man who is the sole custodian of God's truth! A certain Hamilton Pastor gave currency to what *The Brooklyn Eagle* published, and he was charged with criminal libel by Mr. Russell himself. Before the case came to trial the wife of Mr. Russell, who had divorced him, came to Hamilton to give testimony against her former husband; and when Mr. Russell was in the witness-box, under oath, the counsel for the defense handed to Mr. Russell a Greek Testament and requested him to read two or three lines at the top of the page. And with much embarrassment the Pastor gazed at the page, but read nothing. He was compelled to admit he could not read it. When asked to spell out the words he was obliged to acknowledge he did not even know the Greek alphabet. The lawyer then handed Mr. Russell a Hebrew Bible, and requested him to read a few lines, and when he confessed he could not do so, he was asked to spell out the words, but was forced to acknowledge he was as ignorant of the Hebrew alphabet as of the Greek. But the man who did not know the alphabet either of Greek or of Hebrew set himself up as competent to set aside the Authorized and Revised translations of the Bible, and substitute his own! An analytical concordance is very useful; but who would think of appointing a man as a professor of languages in a university whose only qualification was that he had an English dictionary and was able to spell out the words! I should want him to know more than that before I would trust him with that position.

Yet that is the foundation of Russellism. There is something here worth thinking about. How does it come to pass that a man so utterly ignorant of the original Scriptures can propagate a system, a cult, like Russellism, and win for himself all over the world tens of thousands of followers? Surely we have fallen upon days when there is a famine of hearing the Word of the Lord.

I do not want to be unfair, but I think, in view of the fact that the whole system is based upon the teachings of this man's "Studies in the Scriptures", and that all his followers quote the "Studies in the Scriptures" as having authority equal, if not superior, to that of the Bible—when Russell himself clearly and emphatically says that he is the only man on earth—or was in his day—competent to interpret the Scripture; and that he stands even as the Roman Catholic Church professes to stand, between God and the souls of men, I say, it is legitimate to enquire what sort of man this is who dares to set up such claims for himself.

A few years ago Pastor Russell made a trip around the world. It was widely advertised, and then there appeared in certain of the Russellite papers a sermon preached by Pastor Russell—preached at Tokio or somewhere else. He undertook to pass judgment on the work of all the missionary societies because he had been around the world—and investigation proved that he was on a ship that just called at these ports, and did not stay long enough to find out anything! I myself have seen sermons published by Pastor Russell representing him as Pastor of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, London—thus he dared even to appropriate the name and prestige of the greatest gospel preacher of all time. He represented himself as being pastor of this "tabernacle", and that "tabernacle". I need not tell you that he never succeeded Spurgeon—I have preached in Spurgeon's Tabernacle too often myself, and know all about that. I say that was a downright, unmitigated, unvarnished falsehood. But he knew that anything connected with the name of Spurgeon would be read with avidity.

Someone said to me, "A number of people do not know what you mean by Russellism: they know the International Bible Students." A man came here once and wanted to join the church. I asked Mr. Fraser to go around to the address he gave to have an interview with him. Mr. Fraser went to the place and enquired for him, and found there was no such man there. The next Sunday this man appeared again. I said, "You are Mr. So-and-So, and were with us last Sunday?" "Yes." "You wanted to come into the membership of the church?" "Yes, sir." I said, "And you live at such-and-such a number?" "Yes." "Well, I have had that house visited, and there is nobody there by that name." "Oh", said he, "I am not known by that name there; they know me there by such a name." I said, "We have no place in this church for a man who answers to two names." When you meet a man

who is known by one name in one place, and another name somewhere else, you may be sure there is something wrong. What I should like to know is, why Russellism changes its name so often—Russellism, Millennial Dawnism, Watch Tower, International Bible Students." While some "International Bible Students" go so far as to object to the name of "Russellite," they all say that the "Studies in the Scriptures" are the only way to understand God's Word,—just as Christian Science says Mrs. Eddy's "Science and Health" is a "key" to the Scriptures. It is not a commendatory fact, that this thing should be known by so many names.

Pastor Russell tells us that the Lord actually came the second time in October, 1874, that then the millennium began, that we are now in the dawn of the millennium; and that those who cherish "the blessed hope", and still believe that Jesus Christ will some day come again in person, are utterly mistaken, because He has come already—He came in 1874. Pastor Russell found out when He was coming! The angels do not know that, and our gracious Lord said that was the one thing He had put without the circle of His own knowledge, that His coming was known only to the Father in heaven—but somehow Pastor Russell found it out! He knew the Lord would arrive in October, 1874. Other people have speculated as to the time of the Lord's coming, but when He did not come they had to admit they were mistaken. Pastor Russell does not say that he ever saw Him, or that anybody else ever saw Him; but he found out that He was coming—and therefore He must be here!

I heard Dr. Russell Conwell once tell the story of a man who was visited by a lightning-rod agent, and the agent was a very glib talker. He had worked out a theory that if one put metal rods, properly insulated, so many feet apart on a building, it was impossible that that building should burn from lightning. The farmer believed what he said, and had lightning-rods put on every building on the farm. But a little while after that, the barn burned down! So did the house! There was nothing left but the smaller buildings. The farmer went to the lightning-rod agent and said, "I thought you told me if I had rods, properly insulated, put so far apart on my buildings, they could not be struck by lightning?" "Yes, that is a fact"; said the agent, "that has been proved, that is scientifically true." "But," said the farmer, "my barn was struck and is burned down, and so is my house." "But they can't be!" "But they are!" "But they can't be!" "But they are; I tell you my house and barn were both burned." "Well," said the agent, some other thing did it—it could not have been lightning anyway"! His theory must hold, though all facts were against it. Pastor Russell said Christ was to come in October, 1874, and therefore He must have come!

I.

Look for a minute or two at SOME OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SECOND ADVENT AS TAUGHT IN THE SCRIPTURES. You remember the familiar passage in the first chapter of Acts where the angels made promise of the return of the Lord, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?"—What are you gazing up into heaven for—did you see something?—"And a cloud received him out of their sight"—Then 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." Ask any little boy to read that, and tell you what it means, and he will tell you that as Christ disappeared somewhere beyond the clouds—He had been a visible Christ; He had been a Christ having a corporeal nature, a body that could be touched; and He spread those hands abroad in parting benediction, and was received up into heaven, and a cloud received Him out of their sight, and 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." Pastor Russell says that Jesus has no body, that His body was left in the grave, and then by some means removed!—That He became a spirit being, and that no one will ever see Him again. And yet Russell says Christ came the second time in October, 1874! Set over against that plain teaching of Scripture we have just considered, this tenet of Russellism—I will read it to you from his own book, lest you should think I am misrepresenting:

"What, now, is taught by the statement of the angel at the time of our Lord's departure—Acts 1:11—"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'?"

"A careful examination of this text will manifest its harmony with the foregoing. Many seem to think the passage reads, 'As you *see* the Lord ascend into heaven, so, in like manner, you shall *see* him come again. Such should read it again and again, until they note the fact that it does not say that those who saw him go will *see* him come, nor that any one else will *see* him come. What it does say is, that the *manner* of his coming will be *like* the *manner* of his going. What, then, was the manner of his going? Was it with great splendor, and with great demonstration? Was it with trumpet sound and voices and a great shout rending the air, and the Lord's person shining in supernatural glory and brightness? If so, we should expect his coming again to be '*in like manner*'. On the other hand, was it not as quietly and secretly as was possible, consistent with his purpose of having thoroughly convinced witnesses of the fact? None saw him, or knew of the fact, except his faithful followers. His statement (John 14:19), 'Yet a little while and the world seeth me no more', has never yet been disproved; for none but the brethren saw even his manifestations after his resurrection, and no others witnessed his ascension. And in *like manner* as he went away (quietly, secretly, so far as the world was concerned, and unknown except to his followers)"—(Vol. 2, pp. 155, 154).

But the fact is, He did not go into heaven secretly. He went into heaven from the presence of His disciples, and they saw Him go. Whether He comes in great splendour on the clouds of heaven—and other Scriptures teach He will so come—surely if language means anything, it means that when He comes, He will be seen to come, and not that He will come secretly and invisibly—

"so, in this manner, he comes again. And as when he went away he lifted up his hands and blessed them, so, when he comes again, it is that their joy may be full, as he said: 'I will come again, and receive you unto myself'; 'I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.'—Luke 24:50, 51; John 14:3; 16:22."

"Behold"—that means you are summoned to see something, does it not?—"he cometh with clouds." Pastor Russell ingeniously discovers (we shall deal with that a little later) that we have here a mistranslation. Now remember you are listening to a great authority! When Pastor Russell talks about mistranslation, he is thoroughly qualified to speak on this subject—because he does not know the alphabet either of Greek or Hebrew—by his own confession under oath! But every eye shall not see him, says Pastor Russell, but shall discern Him by some kind of spiritual perception as claimed by Charles Russell and his friends. If you could play with language after that fashion, then language would cease to have any value at all.

He is to come *suddenly*—I read it to you this evening: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be"—you remember Pastor Russell is fond of finding himself the special subject of prophecy. Well, if he is referred to in our text at all, I think it is in this verse, "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect"!—if anybody tells you that Christ has already come, do not believe him. Why?—"Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not"—why?—"For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

But Pastor Russell is not at a loss to explain that, and if you will have patience I will read you his explanation:

"Our Lord furnished us a most beautiful illustration of the manner in which his presence will be revealed, when he said, 'As the bright-shining emerges from the east, and illuminates even unto the west, so will be the *presence* of the Son of man.' (Matt. 24:27) That most translations of this

verse are faulty in using the word lightning, where sunlight is meant, is evident; for lightning flashes do not come out of the east and shine into the west. They just as frequently come from other quarters, and rarely, if ever, flash clear across the heaven"—(I am not an expert like Mr. Russell, but I have seen the lightning sometimes when it seemed to come from everywhere)—"The Lord's illustration, and the only one which will comport with his words, is the sun's brightness, which does invariably emerge from the east and shine even unto the west. The Greek word *astrape*, here used, is thus shown to be improperly translated in this text, and also in the account of the same words by Luke (17:24). Another instance of the use of this word *astrape* by our Lord is found in Luke 11:36, where it applies to the brightness of a candle, and in the common version is rendered 'bright-shining'. Incorrect ideas of the manner of our Lord's coming and revealing, firmly fixed in the minds of translators, led them into this error of translating *astrape* by the word 'lightning'. They supposed that he would be revealed suddenly, like a flash of lightning, and not gradually, like the dawning sunlight. But how beautiful is the figure of the sunrise, as illustrating the gradual dawning of truth and blessing in the day of his presence." (Vol. 2, pp 155, 156).

The only difficulty with that is that it is not true! Not lightning, but sunlight! And so the coming of Christ is like the dawning of the day, gradual, the gray streaks of dawn coming up from the east, and at last lighting the earth; and so shall the "presence" of the Son of man be,—just the gradual breaking of the day.

There are a few cases in which the same word is used, as for instance, in Luke 10:18 where the Lord says, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." Did He say He saw Satan as the sun fall from heaven? In Revelation 4:5, let us see the association of this same word: "And out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings and voices: and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God"—"Out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings"—sunlight and thunderings, is it? But it is exactly the same word. In the verse I have read, the word lightning is used surely to tell us that His coming will be so evident everybody will know it, and therefore we are not to be deceived into believing that the coming of Christ is secret. But when Mr. Russell stumbles on a text like that, he is not speaking to those who know Greek, he is speaking to a great multitude of people, like himself, who do not know the alphabet, and therefore he can say what he likes; and when he has filled their minds with prejudice, they will believe that Pastor Russell is true and every man a liar.

Christ is said to come as "a thief in the night", unexpectedly. Surely He meant in *the matter of time*, because He said, "But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would not have suffered his house to be broken up." But Pastor Russell puts that all aside and says that the thief comes quietly, when you are fast asleep; and that the coming of Christ shall be in like manner! There was a man who came into a certain house at Beeton not long since—but it was not very quiet when they got through. Thieves do not always come quietly, but smash their way in, demanding, "Hands up". Christ said, "Watch therefore: for ye know not WHAT HOUR your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the good-man of the house had known IN WHAT WATCH the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up." Pastor Russell pays no attention to that at all. Others have fallen into the error of predicting the time; but I know of no one else who stuck to his prediction when all the facts proved that he had been mistaken. But Russell knew—and therefore he ignores the teaching of the Scripture.

Then Christ's coming will be *audible*. There are several passages in the Word about His audible coming, but these are suggestive: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." What is language for if it is not to express thought? Will you take those three phrases, "Shout", "voice of the archangel", and "the trump of God"—can you make a secret coming of that? If that is not only visible, but audible, what does language mean? That is the great rapture passage. What does Pastor Russell say of that?

"WITH A SHOUT"—The Greek word here translated 'shout' is *keleusma*, which signifies a *shout of encouragement*. A shout implies a public message designed for the ears, not of a few, but of a mixed multitude. It is generally designed either to alarm and terrify or to assist and encourage"—(When you go home, look up 'Young's Analytical Concordance', and you will find out where Pastor Russell got that)—"Or it may have the one effect upon one class, and the reverse effect upon another, according to circumstances and conditions."

"The aspect of affairs in the world for the past fifteen years very strikingly corresponds with this symbol, in the outbursts of world-wide encouragement for all men to wake up to a sense of their rights and privileges as men, and to consider their mutual relationships, the principles upon which they are based and the ends which they should accomplish. Where on the face of the earth is the civilized nation that has not heard the shout, and is not influenced by it! The entire civilized world has, in the past few years, been studying political economy, civil rights and social liberties as never before in the annals of history; and men are encouraging each other, and being encouraged, as never before, to probe these subjects to the very foundation. The shout of encouragement started by the increase of knowledge among men has already encircled the earth, and under its influence men are banding themselves together, encouraged and assisted by men of brain and genius, to contend and strive for both real and fancied rights and liberties; and as their organizations increase and multiply, the shout grows louder and longer, and will by and by result as foretold, in the great time of trouble and tumult of angry nations. (Vol. 2, p. 146.

(Could a greater perversion of Scripture be imagined? Or could a depraved imagination produce anything more grotesque?)

"THE VOICE OF THE ARCHANGEL"—is another striking symbol of similar import. The name 'archangel' signifies *chief messenger*; and our anointed Lord himself is Jehovah's Chief Messenger—the 'messenger of the Covenant'. (Mal. 3:1). Daniel refers to the same personage, calling him Michael, which name signifies *who as God*—an appropriate name for him who is 'the express image of the Father's person', and the representative of his authority and power. The voice of the Archangel represents Christ's authority and command".—(Vol. 2, p. 147).

"THE TRUMP OF GOD"—Many seem thoughtlessly to entertain the idea that this trumpet will be a literal sound on the air. But this will be seen to be an unreasonable expectation, when it is noticed that Paul here refers to what the Revelator designates 'The Seventh Trumpet', the 'Last Trump' in a series of symbolic trumpets (Rev. 11:15, I Cor. 15:52). The proof that these references are to the same trumpet is found in the record of the events connected with each. Paul mentions the resurrection, and the establishment of the Lord's kingdom, as connected with 'the trump of God', and the Revelator mentions the same with even greater minuteness. The propriety of calling the 'seventh' or 'last trump', the 'trump of God', is evident, too, when we remember that the events mentioned under the preceding six trumpets of Revelation refer to humanity's doings, while the seventh refers specially to the Lord's work, and covers the 'Day of the Lord'. Since the six preceding trumpets were symbols—and this is generally admitted by commentators and students who make any claim as expositors of Revelation—it would be a violation of reason and common sense to expect the seventh, the last of the series, to be a literal, audible sound on the air."

All that may occur and nobody know anything about it! I confess if I had to treat my Bible after that fashion, it would not be of much use to me. I could deal with these things at much greater length, but I leave them with you.

I intended to speak of Russellism in its relation to the coming of Christ, but I find myself in a very happy situation this evening. I was in Des Moines last week. My good friend, Dr. Ragland, of Lexington, and I, were considering the appointment of professors for our new University, reorganizing that great Institution. Dr. Ragland had had to arrange to be absent on Sunday

in order to be there with us, so I prevailed upon him to come with me to Toronto. I had announced my subject, and said to him, "The only trouble is, I have announced my evening subject. I should love to have you come and preach at both services." So I am going to make him preach now. I told Dr. Ragland this story to-day: Once when Spurgeon was to preach, he was a little late coming, and his grandfather, who was a preacher, went on with the service. He announced his text and had been preaching some time when C. H. Spurgeon arrived. When Spurgeon came in, his grandfather said, "Here he is—Come on, Charles. I have been preaching from such a text, and I have just covered the first point—you go on from there"! So Spurgeon went on with the second point of the text, and preached gloriously. When he came to an experimental aspect of it, the grandfather got up and said, "I know more about this than you do," and resumed the sermon. Coming to another point, he said, "Now, Charles, you may finish the sermon"!

A man cannot be expert in every line, and Dr. Ragland has spent all his life in the study of Greek. For more than twenty years he was a professor of Greek; he took his Doctor's Degree in Philosophy at Johns Hopkins University, the subject of his Thesis being, "The Genitive in Euripides." You cannot write on a subject like that if you study a dictionary only! They say of Manchester that it is a place where it rains nine days a week!—and that is why it is the centre of the cotton industry. It is one thing to try to water your lawn with a hose, but you cannot make green grass such as they have in Lancashire by that method. When a man has been soaked in Greek, half a lifetime, he may be assumed to know what he is talking about. I was going to talk about what Russellism says of the coming of Christ, and I think I could have got through if Dr. Ragland had not been here, but he can do it better than I, for that is his specialty. He will tell you about the "coming" of Stephanas and Titus, the coming of the flood, and so on. You may not be Greek scholars, but Dr. Ragland can combine the Greek and English in such a way that you can understand it. I did not plan his being here, humanly speaking, it was quite accidental; but I believe also divinely ordered.

DR. GEORGE RAGLAND: I will be Charles Spurgeon, and leave the sermon for "Father Spurgeon" to finish!

When I think of Pastor Russell and his parrot, Judge Rutherford, in their dealings with the Greek language, I think of the Irishman who was given as a present an English dictionary. After some time someone asked him how he liked it, and he replied, "Not much; it changes its subject too often"! If we should syllabicate English words as Pastor Russell transliterates Greek words, in order to make them plain in their English transliteration, we should pronounce tooth-ache, as to-ot-hac-he.

Three words occupy the attention of Pastor Russell and his followers (One of them Dr. Shields has referred to), and I have given a little attention to them this afternoon in order to see their bearing. I read here this statement from, "Our Lord's Return," as believed in by the Russellites, "The Greek is a more precise language than the English"—somebody must have told Pastor Russell that!

He says the word "lightning" does not mean the lightning: it means something else. Since it is known that there are several Greek words to indicate various shades of meaning where we must employ one word in English, the translators would not have used the word *astrape* for *sun*, when they had a definite word for *sun*, *helios*.

So as regards the word *parousia*—it means "presence." Pastor Russell says that "presence" means something that you cannot see: the Lord is present here, but we cannot see Him. He says that the word is used twenty-four times in the New Testament, and only two of the twenty-four have the correct translation. He does not say much about what those two say in the correct translation, nor does he say much about some of the other passages in the twenty-two instances. I leave it to Dr. Shields to tell you what Russellism says about *parousia* when it relates to the Lord's coming.

Pastor Russell says the lightning that shineth is not the lightning, but the sun shining in its twilight, and then in full noonday splendour; and, according to his teaching, no man would know that the sun was shining at noonday unless he got up in time to see it in the dawn! What does this word

parousia mean? Pastor Russell says it means "unseen presence." I am speaking of the other occurrences now outside of its use in connection with Christ's coming—he says it refers to Christ's coming as to an unseen presence, that only the enlightened Russellite may observe—how about its meaning in II Corinthians 10:10, "But his bodily presence is weak"? I wonder how they found out Paul was weak in bodily appearance when nobody could see it! Again in Philippians 2:12, "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence"—I wonder why he should write of either his presence or absence if nobody would know he was present? It is the very same word upon which so much stress is laid in connection with Christ's coming. According to Russell, Christ came in 1874—but only the enlightened know He has come because the word means "unseen presence"!

Let us look at I Corinthians 16:17, "I am glad of the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaïous: for that which was lacking on your part they have supplied." I wonder why Paul was glad of their coming if theirs was an "unseen presence"? Again in II Corinthians 7:6: "Nevertheless God, that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus." I wonder how he knew he was coming? He was glad that Titus was coming—could that be unseen? He knew he was coming, and was glad, his coming gave Paul joy,—not by his presence only, but by the consolation he brought. Once more in Philippians 1:26, "That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me by coming to you again." Why say "coming again"?

Many other things might be said. It is real fun to follow Pastor Russell in his treatment of Greek words. We shall have to revise the terminology of science, our scientific terms will have to be revised, when Russell speaks of Christ being seen by the disciples for forty days, and their not knowing Him by the physical sight! The word used there is the root-word which gives us our optics and opticians. The opticians, therefore, according to Pastor Russell's terminology, will be those who look, not after your physical eyes, but deceivers who tell you you can see whether you can see or not.

I will let "Father Spurgeon" deal with the balance.

DR. SHIELDS: The absurdity of the whole contention is surely abundantly apparent. Only in these instances to which Dr. Ragland has referred in the New Testament is the word *parousia* translated "presence." In the other instances it is translated "coming"—the coming of the Lord. In the instances in which it is translated "presence," Paul says he was glad of the coming of Stephanas,—not an invisible presence, but a real man who came, and whom he saw. He had been comforted by the coming of Titus—not by a telepathic influence, but by the personal and corporeal presence of one he loved.

Had I time, I would go on and tell you what Russell says about the flood. The Word says, "They knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be"—and Russell dares to tell his readers that the coming of the Lord shall be as it was in the ways of Noe's 'presence'—

"Not before his days, nor after his days, but in (during) his days, the world will be eating, drinking, marrying, buying, selling, planting and building. These Scriptures, then, clearly teach that our Lord will be present in the end of this age, entirely unknown to the world, and unseen by them."

I wonder did the people know anything about the coming of the flood? Was that an invisible presence? Did they really know it had come? What the Scripture says is that they refused to believe the divine warning, they refused to believe; and the very day Noah entered the ark, the flood came and took them all away. Men will not know of His coming, but when He comes, "Every eye shall see him," it will be like the lightning, it will be in no dark corner at all, it will be a public, a universal, appearance known wherever man is found, when He comes down the skies with all His holy angels with Him.

I do not know whether I should say what I was about to remark, yet I think I shall. If you are a Russellite, it is because you do not know your Bible, it is because you have looked at Scripture through the eyes of Russell, you have accepted his statement, and you have read into the Word of God what Pastor Russell has told you to see. But I venture to say after thirty years of careful study of the Book, and having read a few books beside, I have never read anything so utterly, so absolutely, so manifestly, untrue, and so patently a delusion of the devil himself, as the doctrines promulgated by the International Bible Students. This doctrine which says there is no day of retribution, that the only punishment is annihilation, is but a modern echo of the ancient lie told in Eden, "Ye shall not surely die." May God help us to get back to His Book, and abide by the teaching of His Holy Word.

After the benediction I shall continue this discussion in the open air service, the subject being, "The Unscripturalness of Russellism's Favourite Slogan, 'To Hell and Back.'"

THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF RUSSELLISM'S FAVOURITE SLOGAN

"TO HELL AND BACK"

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached From the Open Air Pulpit of Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday
Evening, July 31st, 1927.

(Stenographically Reported)

"There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day:

"And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores.

"And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.

"And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried;

"And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

"And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.

"But Abraham said; Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.

"And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you, cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come thence.

"Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house:

"For I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.

"Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.

"And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.

"And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."—Luke 16:19-31.



HAVE been speaking indoors this evening about Russellism's perversion of the doctrine of the Second Advent of our Lord.

The pet theory of Russell is that there is no future retribution.

I remember Pastor Russell's coming to a city where I was pastor years ago, and plastering the city with advertisements that he would preach on a certain night on, "To hell and back". I should like you, first of all, before I examine the Scripture in this connection to consider where that doctrine logically leads. If it be so that the sins of this world are not to be punished, that a man may make earth's rivers flow with blood, for example, like the war-lords of Germany, that he may oppress the widow and the orphan, and be guilty of every kind of iniquity, and that at his death he simply goes to sleep, his body crumbles, his soul lapses into unconsciousness, and that at some future time he will be awakened and extinguished—annihilated rather, his only punishment the extinction of

being—teach men that, that there is no judge upon the throne, that there is no day of reckoning to come, and that the worst any man need fear will be to cease to exist,—to perish, says Russell, is to cease to exist—and there are multitudes of people without the fear of God before their eyes who will have their fling in this life in the belief that there is no reckoning in the life to come.

During the war the International Bible Students were recognized as the enemies of the belligerent states. They were the enemies of the United States, they were the enemies of Britain—and they have been the enemies of both ever since. And, indeed, their system is the enemy of all organized society. It is nothing more than a religious expression of anarchy, and I will prove it to you. Pacifism, or pacificism as I prefer to call it, logically leads to anarchy. Men talk about arbitration courts, and the settlement of disputes by discussion. Suppose the case of two litigants who argue their case in a certain court. Mr. "A" loses his case, Mr. "B" wins it. But "A"'s lawyer immediately appeals, and the case is taken to a higher court. It is tried in the next court, and again Mr. "A" loses and "B" wins. But the lawyer appeals the case, and it is taken to a higher court. So they go on until the last court to which that case may be taken, tries the case; and the judge gives decision just as was given in the first place. The man has lost his case in every court right up to the time of his last appeal. When he loses there, supposing a sum of money is involved, what does he do? He pays the money, he accepts the verdict of the court. You say, "That is how civilized men ought to settle their differences." But I should like to ask you why "A" pays his money? Why does he accept the verdict of the highest court when he refused to accept the decision of the lower court? Is it because he thinks that court has superior judgment? No! It is because behind that final decision there is physical force to compel him to accept the decision of the court, to pay the money involved; he knows if he does not obey that last decision, there are policemen, jails, and penitentiaries; he knows that behind that decision there is power to compel obedience. And there is not a law written on any statute book in the world that is worth the paper it is written on, unless behind that law there is an adequate power to enforce its requirements.

Very well then, pacifism means anarchy, it means the destruction of society, it means the destruction of the home—and the founder of this cult did the best he could in these directions. This thing is the enemy of every city, the enemy of every state, it is the enemy of the souls of men, because it is the enemy of God, and because it comes from the nethermost hell—that is Russellism.

"Pastor" Russell was wont to speak of the souls of men going to hell and back, by which he meant to the grave and back; and he laboured to tell us that *sheol* in the Old Testament—and *hades* in the New mean the grave. But when he has thus tried to explain away passages which promise future retribution, he comes upon this passage which I have read, and he gives an interpretation of it.

Russellism teaches soul-sleeping, that when a man dies his soul passes into a state of unconsciousness. Let us examine a few Scriptures. When Christ went to the Mount of Transfiguration there appeared unto him Moses and Elias, talking with him, speaking with him of the decease, of the exodus which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. Moses had been buried as to his body, but his spirit was still in a state of consciousness. Elias also had gone home to glory, (a type, perhaps, of the rapture of the saints,) taking his body with him, but he too appeared in a state of consciousness. Our Lord Jesus was Himself a Type and Prophecy of all who believe; He is described as "the first fruits of them that sleep"; and when Jesus Christ was raised from the dead, He appeared to His disciples, He was recognized by them, He talked with them, and "shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs."

The Apostle Paul claimed to speak by special revelation from God, and he spoke of departing "to be with Christ, which is far better". Can you conceive of a man who had lived the active life that Paul had lived, and, in spite of all his persecution, had rejoiced in every minute of it, looking upon the sleep of the soul as being something "far better" than being in this life. Moreover, it is "to be with Christ"—with Christ, and the Lord Jesus Christ is

not sleeping. He was raised from the dead and ascended into heaven; and, as Dr. Ragland told us this morning so splendidly, when John had that vision on Patmos, he saw Christ in the glory. And when Stephen was stoned to death, before he died, when the radiance of the open heavens fell upon his countenance, he said, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Christ was not in a state of unconsciousness. He had gone back to the Father, as He said, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." Those who die are said to be "with Christ", and it is said that they are "far better" off than here.

Again we read, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Paul also said that to be "absent from the body" is to be "present with the Lord."

I could multiply Scriptures which teach that the souls of the departed are in a state of consciousness, but let us come to this sixteenth chapter of Luke. I have not time to read all the elaborate and absurd explanations of Russellism respecting this scripture, but let me give you a little of it. First, there is a grotesque interpretation of what he calls the "parable", which assumes that orthodoxy teaches that because Dives is called a rich man, he therefore went to hell, and that it is a bad thing to be rich! He says that the ecclesiastics insist upon such teaching. I never heard any sane man say it in my life. Of course he has his favourite fling. Here is what he says:

"If the possession of such is sufficient reason to send one to eternal torture, then fully ninety per cent. of the clergymen of our day are in danger of eternal torment."—(Will all the rich preachers in this audience please stand up? (laughter) And then he says,—"If torment in flames of fire is the penalty to be suffered by man because he possesses such things, what then could we expect to befall the ultra rich, such as Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Henry Ford?"

He tries to make his readers believe that sane interpreters of Scripture teach that hell is reserved for the rich! There is nothing in the story to say so, nor did I ever hear of anyone so interpreting that passage. I have heard some people say that money is the root of all evil—and I have heard some people say that they would be willing to run the risk of having a little more of the "root"! The Bible does not say any such thing, it says, "The love of money is the root of all evil", and a man may have one dollar and hug it to his heart, and put the dollar between himself and God just as easily as a man may put a million dollars between himself and God. It is the love of it that is the root of evil.

Then Mr. Russell goes on to argue that ecclesiastics say it was the poverty of the beggar that opened heaven to him, that ministers contend such is the teaching of Scripture. I never heard any preacher say that. Blessed be God! a good many people who are poor are going to heaven. Poverty will shut a man out from a great many places on earth, but it will not shut him out of heaven; but when you begin to play with Scripture in that way, and put interpretations upon it that have been brought out of one's own evil imagination, and thus build up a man of straw that no man ever conceived outside of Russellism itself, it is very easy to make a burlesque out of the whole thing. What does Russell say? He says it is a parable, he tells us that it has to do with the Jew—and when you do not know anything else, talk about the Jew! When you cannot interpret the plain statement of Scripture, then push it forward a few thousand years and use your imagination, and say that is what it means! Nobody can contradict you, because nobody is likely to live long enough! But he dismisses this whole matter as having no relation to the individual soul's future, but that it is a parable relating to the Jew and the Gentile.

What are the facts? Go back into that parable for a moment. There is a man who was the Lord's steward, who was accused of wasting his goods; and because he did not acknowledge his wrong, and get right with his lord, he said, "What shall I do? for my Lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do—I will make friends of my lord's debtors." And he went to all his lord's debtors

and said, "How much owest thou to my lord?" One said, "An hundred measures of oil"; and another, "An hundred measures of wheat." And he said to the first, sit down quickly, and write fifth—I will give you fifty per cent. discount"; to the second he said, "Take thy bill, and write fourscore—I will give you twenty per cent. discount. Now hurry up, pay your bills." Why did he do it? In order that when he was put out of his stewardship, they, his lord's debtors, might receive him into their houses! Then the Lord Jesus said this, "The lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light."

That is a passage that is frequently misinterpreted, I venture to believe. Is it true that the children of this world are wiser than the children of light? Did not the Lord Jesus say, "I am the light of the world"? Did he not say, "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life"? Did he not say He would send the Spirit of truth to "guide you into all truth"? And do you mean to tell me that the net result of all that God has done for a man or a woman is to leave him seven-eighths of a fool at last, so that the children of light who know God are simpletons? and if you want wisdom you must go to the children of the world? That passage is to be interpreted ironically, it is one of the most terrible things that Jesus Christ ever said. And He followed it with this, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations—make your choice now. If you are going to court the favour of the world, the flesh, and the devil, then do it; but when you fail, do not come knocking at my door expecting to receive admission."

He then went on to tell the Pharisees that He was talking to them. They were, indeed, the Russellites and the Modernists and the errorists of that day, who were making the Word of God of none effect by their traditions, changing the Word of God, telling a man that if he handed over his property to the temple saying, "It is corban"—like some men, feigning bankruptcy, hand over everything to their wives, and then plead that they haven't anything, they should be free.—Christ said to the Pharisees, "But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free. And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother: making the word of God of none effect through your tradition." And then he said this, "No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." "When he had thus spoken the Pharisees who were present, heard all these things; and they derided him." (Interruption from the audience, to which Dr. Shields replied, "You can always tell who it hit by the people who answer. I thought I heard a voice somewhere.") Well, Christ was preaching, and the Pharisees derided him; and He said, "You are the very people I have been talking about. Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts,—You lower the standards, you tell men that they will not have to pay, you promise them twenty per cent. and fifty per cent. discount on My bills, and you justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God. The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Then our Lord referred to the marriage relation, and to the question of divorce, and said that that was a violation of the divine law—take that, you Russellites—a violation of the divine law, and said, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail."

Christ then draws the veil and gives us a picture of life beyond the grave. When you read about the rich man and Lazarus, you must join it up with the first part of the chapter, it is all part of the same discourse; and the story of the rich man and Lazarus was an illustration of the awful truths which Jesus Christ had been propounding.

I.

Let me say this to you: **THEY BOTH DIED**, rich and poor—they both died. "It is appointed unto man once to die." No money can bribe the death angel,

no skill of science can for ever keep him from your door. You may discuss social conditions, and promise better living conditions here, but I tell you the one thing that is coming to every one of you, rich and poor, old and young, wise and ignorant, all nations, all peoples, all colours, is this, like the rich man and the poor man, they both died; and unless the Lord should come before, every man and woman, every boy and girl, here to-night, will some time reach the end of life's journey, and will die. If you doubt it, go around these streets to-morrow and see the hearses as they pass, go yonder to the cemetery and remember the earth is hollow to our tread because of the graves of the bodies of men and women who have been laid away. Do not charge me with being a pessimist, I am simply stating that all men must die, "The living know that they must die." And the question is, What lies beyond the grave? The worst enemy of your soul and mine, is the man who will deceive us with respect to that matter.

II.

Now I want to ask, WHO KNOWS ABOUT IT? Tell me that, WHO KNOWS WHAT LIES BEYOND THE GRAVE? Did Pastor Russell know? Does Judge Rutherford know? Do all or any of the International Bible Students, so-called, of themselves and out of their own experience, know what lies beyond? No one of them. Do all the philosophers, all the professors, all the men of learning, of this day and all other days? If you could gather together the combined wisdom of all the ages, and gather up all the accrued wisdom of all time, you still would know nothing of the life beyond the grave. There is only One Who knows anything of what happens beyond the grave, and that One is Jesus Christ. He knows, and I would rather have His word than a hundred thousand million Pastor Russells; His unsupported word is the final authority in respect to this matter. And He said that *beyond the grave they both entered into a state of consciousness*: Lazarus was in Abraham's bosom—and he was Lazarus; and Dives was in hell, in a place of torment, and he was able to think, he was able to remember, he was able to talk, and able to pray that Lazarus yonder in heaven might be sent to him.

There is no "soul-sleeping" there—and remember this is not a post-resurrection scene, because this man still had five brethren on the earth. It had to do with what men describe as "the intermediate state", the state of departed spirits. Both of them were conscious,—separated, but both conscious. Abraham said that their separation beyond the grave was final. He said that there is not another chance—"Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, and nobody can bridge it, not even from the heavenward side"—as though the Lord God himself by means of redemption had exhausted all the resources of grace, and that even from the heavenward side there was no bridge that could span that gulf.

That is the teaching of Scripture. I defy you with the Word of God open and Pastor Russell's books closed, to find me one solitary passage to support the idea that a man who deliberately rejects Christ here will have a chance hereafter. Our Lord Jesus is the sole Authority, and He declares that beyond the grave there is no changing of that state.

III.

And furthermore, He says that **THE STATE OF THESE TWO BEYOND THE GRAVE HAS SOME RELATION TO WHAT THEY WERE ON THIS SIDE OF THE GRAVE.** One man lived for the world and the things of the world, for time and sense, and had what is called "his good time". The other man had little of this world's goods, but his heart was in the heavenlies, and his affections were centred upon things above; and when these two died, the future revealed what they really were at heart: one man was fitted for heaven, and the other fitted for hell—whatever that may be, we shall think of that in a moment.

Now then, this man requested that Lazarus be sent to dip his finger in water and cool his tongue, for he was tormented in the flame. Somebody says, "But that is only symbolic language." What if it is? For the sake of argument, for the moment, let us assume that it is symbolic language—what then? It teaches that the state of the impenitent beyond the grave is a state of conscious suffering, does it not? The man suffered, and he was conscious of it, and longed for relief from it. And Abraham said, "God has done all that is necessary to do, he cannot do any more." "Well then", said this man, "if

Lazarus cannot come to me, send him to my five brethren." That is a problem. Let us be frank. Are we to suppose that there is compassion in hell? Here is a man who says, "I have heard High Heaven's verdict that I am lost, that there is no hope for me; but will you not send Lazarus to my five brethren, that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." I cannot help wondering why he was afraid of it—and I am not going to be dogmatic here—but I venture this opinion: this parable is directed against false teaching, it is directed against unfaithful stewards, it is a warning against those who offer God's debtors a discount on their bill, it is a warning to every preacher, and to everyone who attempts to open that Word of God to men, and I believe that if there is one place in hell hotter than another, it will be reserved for false teachers who have helped to bring men down to destruction. (Voice from the audience: "Shut up!" Dr. Shields: "I know I am hitting somewhere when you talk like that. I always like to know that the people for whom the sermon is designed are present").

Abraham said a remarkable thing. He said, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." The rich man answered, "But if you would give them something in addition to Moses and the prophets! Send them a man raised from the dead, and they will believe." Abraham answered, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." I have never known a man yet who refused to believe Genesis, who did not, ultimately, refuse to believe Jesus Christ. The man who rejects the Old Testament, at last, inevitably, rejects the New; the man who makes light of the law, refuses to accept authority of the gospel; the man who will not listen to Moses, will not listen to Christ—though He goes to him from the dead.

If this story teaches anything at all, it teaches this, *the adequacy of divine revelation*. Abraham did not say, "They have Moses and the prophets—and Pastor Russell's 'Studies in the Scriptures'!" He did not say, "They have Moses and the prophets—and Mrs. Eddy's 'Science and Health'!" He did not say, "They have Moses and the prophets—and the book of Mormon!" He did not say, "They have Moses and the prophets—and the interpretation of the Church!"—he said, in effect, "They have the Word of God, and by that Word they will be judged." That is the teaching of God's Word. By what sort of ingenuity can any sane man take that story out of its connection, and explain it away by saying it has nothing to do with your personal relation to God, but is a question of relation between Jew and Gentile? That doctrine of Russellism is nothing in the world but a revised edition of the lie told in Eden, "Ye shall not surely die."

IV.

I should like to say this before I close: so far from the doctrine of future retribution being unreasonable, it is the most reasonable thing in the world. I do not suppose if some foul murder should be committed in Toronto to-night, and someone were cut down in cold blood, that the murderer's sympathizers would get many signatures if they went around pleading for clemency for the murderer. You would all admit that wrong-doing ought to be punished, and I defy you to show me anywhere—in the home, in the state, in the international relationship—anywhere a condition where men live wholesomely, honestly, uprightly, without law. It is true that when the grace of God comes into a man's heart and he is made a new creature in Christ, and his debts are paid by the Sacrifice of the Cross, and he stands not in his own merits, but in the merits of Christ, I say, it is perfectly true that that man has the law of God taken from the objective tables of stone, and written on the fleshy tables of the heart, and he is made to do from impulse what others do from compulsion; but show me the place anywhere where men are free from the compulsion of the law where women are safe, and children are cared for.

Our friends have talked a great deal about the war—and I am not going to place responsibility for it beyond saying that we British are confident we did not start it—but whoever started it, it was begun; and it issued in the death of uncounted millions, in the maiming of millions more, in the orphaning of uncounted millions of children, made widows of millions of women, destroyed the future fathers and leaders of the nations. Wherever the responsibility lies, it must lie somewhere, and there ought to be somebody who knows where

that responsibility lies, and there ought to be somebody to call that person who is responsible to account; and when that man is found, be he the German Kaiser or whoever he be, I say, if there were not a hell, if there were not a place where men will suffer for what they have done in the body, I could not believe this world is under the governance of a God at all. There ought to be a place of assize—there will be a place of assize.

"But", you say, "eternal punishment?" Well, sin is eternal, is it not? A friend told me he was walking through the Sick Children's Hospital one day, and he saw a man sitting with bowed head at the bedside of a little child. The little lad's eyes were bandaged, and the father was sitting there dumb with grief and sorrow. As my friend passed he said to the nurse, "What is the matter with that boy?" "He is going blind, he will never see again." "But what is the cause of it?" he asked. The nurse replied, "His father's sin, that is what is the cause of it." And my friend said to me, "I saw a man in hell." Oh, it is the beginning of hell; but I should like you to remember that one evil thought, issuing in one evil action, may go on and on through countless generations until that one individual has polluted the bloodstream of uncounted thousands, and has brought some kind of a hell on earth. And if there were not a just God to call that man to account, then we were at the mercy of an almighty devil. There ought to be a hell, there must be a hell,—the Bible says there is a hell! God "hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

But Pastor Russell tells us that Christ died a fleshly death, as a fleshly being, physically; that He was not a spirit being; and that by His physical death He made atonement for sin—just the death of a man. No bigger lie was ever told since the Devil first went into the business. I tell you Jesus Christ is not man only: He is God; and, being God, He is infinite in every quality of His being. He is Infinity incarnate, God manifest in the flesh, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Upon Him was laid the iniquity of us all; and when He died, He endured the torment of hell, infinitely He suffered "the just for the unjust to bring us to God". Not as a man, a man could not have done it. Imagine a man convicted in a military court and sentenced to forty-nine lashes, imagine a thousand men similarly convicted and similarly sentenced—forty-nine thousand lashes; and then imagine one man stepping out and saying, "I will receive and endure the punishment due the thousand." You would say, "That would be impossible." Of course it would. He would die ere half the penalty was paid. The Lord Jesus sweat great drops of blood; His soul was exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death; He suffered not in the body only. Many men have suffered more physically than Jesus Christ did, many a martyr in the flames suffered more physical torture than did Jesus Christ; but the soul of God was in Him: it was Deity that suffered, it was Eternity that groaned, it was the Blood of the Maker of heaven and earth that oozed through His pores, it was the very life of God that flowed from His side when He bowed His head and gave up the ghost—it was the wealth of the universe in solution with which He paid your debt. And the man who rejects that, who turns his back upon what God has done to save the sinner, is condemned already—not for Adam's sin, but because he believes not on the name of the only begotten Son of God.

Supposing I am wrong, and you trust in Christ in response to my appeal, and beyond the grave you find there is no hell—what then? Well, it would be all to the good for you, would it not? Supposing Russellism is wrong, and its testimony is a lie, and you believe what man has said instead of what God has said, and, like this rich man, wake up in hell—what then? I would be free from the blood of all men, I call you to the faith of Christ; and as you and I shall answer before that great judgment seat, I warn you that this delusion is from the pit, it is contrary to Scripture, it is not the truth, it is a lie; and the truth is that you must believe in Christ in order to be saved.

Will you trust Him? Will you believe Him? Will you put your trust in Him? God's Word for it if you do, you "shall never perish, but have everlasting life." Is there anybody here to-night who will say, "I will trust Him, I will put my dependence in Christ, and I will presume upon His mercy no longer"? If there are such, will you lift your hand? Yes, I see one, two, three,

four. How many more are there who will say, "I will trust Him here and now"? If I have not seen any of you, and even if you did not raise your hand, I shall be glad to talk with you at the close of the service. I will do anything I possibly can to get you to trust the Word of God. I beg of you, in His name, to trust Christ.

I leave you with this story—I think I have told it before in the church—of a father who gave to each of his three sons a peach, and then called them to him at a later date and asked them what they had done with them. The first said he had eaten his, and enjoyed it very much; the second replied that he had eaten his also, and found it so good that he planted the stone so that he might have more. The third answered, "You remember Johnnie So-and-So, the little cripple lad? Well, he has been very sick, and has been in bed for several weeks. I went to see him and offered him my peach. I said, "Johnnie, is not that a beautiful peach?" He said, "It is." "Well", I said, "I want you to have it." "Is it the only one you have? Because if it is, I could not take it. I would not take the only one you have." The father said, "What did you say then?" "Oh, I just changed the subject; I talked about other things for a while, then slipped the peach on a chair and came away and left it with him." I cannot tell you how it was that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." I only know it is true. I have brought Him to you; and in His name, I leave Him with you.

THE WILLOWDALE MARTYR CHURCH

By Mr. Thomas Urquhart.

Willowdale Baptist Church is situated about three miles outside the northern limit of the City of Toronto, very close to Yonge Street. This Church was organized about three years ago and worked with the York Mills Baptist Church under one pastor. Before the church was organized the Home Mission superintendent visited the field and a site for a church was suggested, and we believe, at the request of the Home Mission superintendent a family who were members of York Mills Church agreed to purchase the lot, the value of which was \$1,500.00, one-half to be paid by the family who were purchasing the lot and the other half to be paid by the church when the church would be organized.

In a letter from a member of the family who purchased the lot, he states as follows, regarding the deed: "It will be as well to have the deed made in my name until there is some organization and trustees appointed to take it over. I am not charging interest on the money I am advancing." Shortly after this the church was organized and the Home Mission Board purchased a portable church building for the sum of \$2,579.49, and placed it upon the lot as a temporary home for the church until a permanent structure would be erected, and for this church building the Willowdale church has been paying \$16.00 per month rent to the Home Mission Board.

Some little time after the organization of the church the church began to pay for one-half of the lot for the purpose of assuming responsibility, and have paid over to the member of the family who had purchased the lot and in whose name the title was taken, altogether the sum of \$350.00, receiving receipts for the payment in which the receiver acknowledged that it was a payment on the church lot, one receipt being in the following form:

"Received from Treasurer Willowdale Baptist Church, One hundred and

forty dollars. Payment on church lot. Received with thanks," and others in a similar form.

When the controversy respecting the teaching of Professor Marshall in McMaster University arose, the pastor of Willowdale Church, Rev. J. H. Peer, took a strong public stand against the teaching of McMaster University. The parsonage in which Mr. Peer lived belonged to the York Mills Church. York Mills declined to support Mr. Peer in his testimony for the truth, and this necessitated his vacating the parsonage, and seeking another place in which to live. The Willowdale Church, however, sustained the pastor by a large majority, and he was requested to give his full time to Willowdale. Thus it will be seen that his stand meant the loss of the support of the York Mills Church, and the loss of the parsonage.

This was followed by the virtual withdrawal of the grant of the Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec, so that the Willowdale church suffered a three-fold loss: the share of pastoral support coming from York Mills, the parsonage, and the grant of the Home Mission Board. But this little band of only sixty-seven members undertook to shoulder the load. Under these circumstances the Regular Baptist Missionary and Educational Society of Canada went to the Willowdale Church's assistance by making them a grant approximately the same as that which had been virtually withdrawn by the Home Mission Board.

But the Willowdale Church troubles were not at an end. The York Mills member refused to accept the balance of the money (\$400.00) due on the lot, and which the Willowdale Church had in hand and was ready to pay, and refused to convey the property to the church unless the Home Mission Board consented thereto. The Home Mission Board would not consent thereto and apparently did not feel under obligation to carry out the arrangement regarding the purchase of the lot.

The only crime the Willowdale Church committed was to protest against what they believed to be unscriptural and unbaptistic teaching of McMaster University.

The Church applied to the Home Mission Board for the purpose of taking over the lot and the Board declined to consent to their having the lot, but made to them the following proposal:

That we would pay back what you had given to Mr. _____ on the lot, with an extra consideration, the total not to exceed the amount of \$600.00, or that we would sell you the building for what it cost us, namely, \$2,579.49. This does not of course take into consideration what will be owing Mr. _____ on the lot."

That is to say, the Home Mission Board offered to pay the Willowdale Church, after its three years' occupancy of the building and lot, \$250.00 to get out—which means the repayment of the \$350.00 they had paid on the lot and "an extra consideration" of \$250.00. Or, otherwise, this little band of sixty-seven members were told they must buy outright the building at its original price, and pay for the lot beside. We are advised that the price of these portable buildings has declined considerably in the three years, and that the same building could be placed upon the lot now for approximately \$2,000.00.

No consideration was given to the fact that the frame structure was now

three years old, nor to the further fact that the Willowdale Church had been paying rent to the Home Mission Board at the rate of \$16.00 a month, or approximately \$600.00 in all.

The Willowdale Church then proposed to the Board that they should remove the building and allow the church to erect their own structure. This the Home Mission Board Committee refused to consider.

A second offer has since been made to the Willowdale Church which they have now before them, namely, the church was to raise the balance due on the lot, \$1,204.00 (instead of \$400.00 according to the solemn promise made by the York Mills member), and must purchase the building for the sum of \$2,000.00, or a total of \$3,204.00.

This little band of sixty-seven people in Willowdale Church, none of whom are rich people, cannot possibly meet the present emergency and pay both for their lot and for their building. The Board of the Regular Baptist Missionary and Educational Society of Canada therefore proposed to the Willowdale Church that if they would endeavor to provide the balance due on the lot, the Board would endeavour to raise the \$2,000.00 for the building. At a meeting held with the church last week, this self-sacrificing band of people gave in a few minutes, in pledges, the sum of \$607.00, which has since reached the sum of \$733.50, this to be paid within a year. Already they have \$463.00 in the bank which they had collected for the purpose of paying the \$400.00 due on the lot which, as we have said above, the original owner of the lot refused to accept. It will thus be seen the Willowdale Church have practically provided for the purchase price of the lot, which will include an amount of \$700.00 or \$800.00 which they would never have had to pay had not a sacred promise been broken.

Editorial

THE "SPIRIT" AND "METHOD" OF THE CONVENTION HOME MISSION BOARD.

What do our readers think of the "spirit" and "method" of the Baptist Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec as exemplified in the story of Willowdale Church published in this issue? Who are the Home Mission Board? What funds do they disperse? Are they a company of rich men giving money out of their own pockets? Or are they merely trustees dispersing other people's funds? We cannot speak for other churches, but with the audited reports before us, this is the record of Jarvis Street Church: During the church year ending March 31, 1923, when it was just recovering from a great upheaval on account of this same Modernism, Jarvis Street's contributions to the Home Mission Board were, \$1,702.78; for the church year ending 1924, \$2,863.00; 1925, \$2,034.57; 1926, \$1,820.47; and for five months of year 1926-27, \$400.28 (not including Mission Circle's giving). Thus for the four and a half years Jarvis Street contributed to the funds of the Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec, \$8,821.10. Other churches which have since withdrawn their support from the Home Mission Board on account of its endorsement of McMaster University during the period under review also

made their regular contributions. Into their statistics we have not now time to enter. It is enough to point out that the contributions of Jarvis Street Church alone far more than covered the total expenditure of the Home Mission Board on Willowdale Church. When this money was given to the Home Mission Board, it was given for the support of Home Mission Churches that were preaching the gospel of the grace of God. It was never intended that the Home Mission Board should thereby be enabled to put any church under a perpetual obligation to that Board as an organization, or to its changing personnel, to acquiesce in anything and everything the Home Mission Board might in future do, under pain of being required to repay whatever the Board had invested in that church. In other words, the Home Mission Board has no more right to demand repayment on the part of Willowdale Baptist Church, than Jarvis Street Church would have the right to demand the repayment of contributions to Home Missions from the Home Mission Board. The proposal of the Home Mission Board is utterly unjust and vindictive to the last degree, and is as destitute of the Spirit of Christ and as alien to the principles of the gospel as anything could possibly be. The Home Mission Board has become animated by a spirit of bitterness and vindictiveness that seems to be ready to persecute as far as the law will permit.

Ought such a Board to be trusted with another dollar of consecrated Baptist money? Has it not shown itself to be utterly unworthy of the confidence of any true believer? The last published report of its deficit was \$9,000.00. We predict it will be much more than that by the end of the Convention year.

An Appeal to Ontario and Quebec Baptists.

We now make an appeal to Ontario and Quebec Baptists for the \$2,000.00 necessary to pay for the Willowdale portable church building. We ask every Ontario and Quebec reader of *The Gospel Witness* to make a really sacrificial gift toward this object. Let us suggest how it might be done. We will not ask for very large gifts, for there are many interests; but if the Ontario and Quebec readers of *The Gospel Witness* alone, without any outside help, would respond to this appeal, the money can easily be in hand within a week or ten days. Surely there are five of our readers who, without breaking their backs or their bank accounts, could give \$100.00 each to this worthy cause; 10 others could give \$50.00 each; 10 could give \$25.00; 25 could give \$10.00; 100 could give \$5.00 each. Thus 155 people would raise the \$2,000.00. But there may be some hundreds of *Gospel Witness* readers who may not be able to give \$5.00, but could give \$2.00. Do not give \$2.00 if you can give \$5.00; and do not give \$5.00 if you can give \$10.00; do not give \$10.00 if you can give \$25.00; do not give \$25.00 if you can give \$50.00, and do not give \$50.00 if you can give \$100.00; but if you can give only \$2.00, send it along—indeed, there might be some hundreds of *Gospel Witness* readers who could give only \$1.00. Please do not send a dollar as conscience money, if you could give more; but if you cannot give more, have a part in this great work, and enable us to announce within a week or so that the whole amount has been paid.

Send all contributions to Rev. W. E. Atkinson, Secretary-Treasurer, Regular Baptist Missionary and Educational Society of Canada, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto. It will be enough to enclose the amount of money and mark, "Special offering for the Willowdale Baptist Church". If there are any who prefer to withhold their names, send the money by registered mail anonymously, but let us all rally to the support of this little band of heroic believers at Willowdale.

A BRAVE MAN HAS FALLEN.

Baptists of the Continent, and particularly of the Southern Convention, have suffered a great loss in the home-going of Dr. George McDaniel, who, until last May, had been for three or four years President of the Southern Convention.

Dr. McDaniel was a strong preacher and an able presiding officer. At the last Southern Convention meeting he threw a bomb-shell into the camp

by the radical cures he suggested for Southern Convention ills in his presidential speech. Until then he seemed to be regarded by the great hosts of Southern Baptists as an embodiment of Southern Baptist principles—this was shown by his successive election for three or four years to the highest office within the Denomination's gift—but the moment he dared to point out the weaknesses and superfluous wheels in the denominational machinery, he was mercilessly attacked by certain ecclesiastical politicians, as though he had suddenly become disloyal to Baptist interests. It seems to be the lot of religious conservators to be subjected to the most bitter attacks when they insist on the removal of the barnacles from the hull of the denominational ship.

Perhaps the best monument that Southern Baptists could erect to the memory of this great ex-President would be to unite in carrying out the reforms he suggested.

"Father" and "Son" Exchange Greetings

The following letter will be read with interest by the whole *Gospel Witness* family. We suggest that every reader of *The Witness* send "Father" Murrow a post card of greeting. We receive many interesting letters, but we believe "Father" Murrow is the oldest of our correspondents. Mr. Murrow is a veteran missionary to the Indians, who loves the Word of God and the souls of men. If this veteran of the Cross of very limited income can send a cheque for \$26.00 to Des Moines University, what could not others do if they would?

"FATHER'S" LETTER.

Drawer "A,"
Atoka, Oklahoma,
August 26th, 1927.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
President, Bible Union.

My Dear Son:

I was very glad a few days ago to enclose to the Secretary, Des Moines University, a cheque for twenty-six dollars to help a little bit on the debt due by the Union.

You did right in purchasing that school for the Bible Union, which means for "the faith once delivered to the saints." And our Heavenly Father will certainly bless you with all needed blessings.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Old Father Murrow—92 plus.

Assuming our readers would be interested, we publish the reply to "Father" Murrow from his "son."

THE "SON'S" REPLY.

Toronto, Canada,
August 29th, 1927.

Mr. J. S. Murrow,
Drawer "A,"
Atoka, Okla.

My dear "Father" Murrow:

I am in receipt of your letter of August 26th telling me of your having forwarded to Des Moines a cheque for \$26.00, for which I thank you heartily.

I am going to take the liberty of publishing your letter in *The Witness*.

Strictly speaking, we did not purchase Des Moines University: we assumed its liabilities, and the auditors' report shows clear assets over liabilities of nearly \$700,000.00, so that instead of purchasing the University, we really accepted it as a gift, agreeing only to pay off its indebtedness.

I believe the publishing of your letter will do great good; it will inspire others to help us.

I wish very much it were possible for me to meet you.

The clear, bold hand you write at ninety-two is marvellous to me.

With warmest Christian love, I am,

Your grateful "son,"

(Signed) T. T. Shields.

TWO SERMONS ON RUSSELLISM.

The two sermons on Russellism appearing in this issue should have been published some weeks ago. Their publication has been delayed partly because our space has been taken with other matters, and partly because the Editor has been almost continuously away from home since they were preached. The first sermon, published in our issue of August 4th, was so much in demand that that issue is practically exhausted. We publish the remaining two sermons together for convenience of distribution. Incidentally, these two sermons will give our readers who have never attended a service in Jarvis Street some idea of what a summer Sunday evening service in Jarvis Street means to the preacher. These addresses were delivered the same evening: one to a packed church inside, and the other to an enormous congregation outside. It is difficult to form an adequate estimate of the number of persons present, but an aggregate of certainly not less than four thousand, and we think more probably five thousand listened to these addresses. The three sermons on Russellism will be published together in booklet form. Single copies of this tract containing the three sermons will be mailed for 10c; in packages of twenty-five and over, this booklet will be supplied at 6c per copy. Please send in your orders at once. This will give us an approximate idea of what size edition to print.

REV. W. M. ROBERTSON.

Rev. W. M. Robertson, late of Toxteth Tabernacle, Liverpool, England, and pastor-elect of Mount Pleasant Baptist Church, Vancouver, B.C., visited Toronto, with his family, on the way to the Pacific Coast; and occupied the Jarvis Street pulpit Sundays, August 21st and 28th, and gave several week-evening addresses. Mr. Robertson's ministry was richly enjoyed by the Jarvis Street congregation, and proved a blessing to many.

The forces of Fundamentalism have been greatly augmented by the coming of this great preacher to this Continent. We congratulate British Columbia Baptists in general, and the Mount Pleasant Baptist Church in particular, on having secured such an outstanding preacher for the premier city of the West. Baptists on the Pacific Coast south of the Canadian border, we have no doubt, will soon feel the strength of Mr. Robertson's ministry. Mr. Robertson unequivocally committed himself to the evangelical position long before he came to Canada. In England he was regarded as one of the chief leaders of Fundamentalism, and we are sure he will prove a force with which Modernists will have to reckon on the Pacific Coast. It has been delightful to hear the volume of prayer ascending in all our prayer meetings in Jarvis Street for the last two or three weeks in Mr. Robertson's behalf, and in behalf of the church whose pastor he is to become. The Mount Pleasant Church, Vancouver, is made up of many stalwart souls who have suffered much on account of their loyalty to the truth. We predict that under Mr. Robertson's leadership Mount Pleasant Church will readily become the premier church of British Columbia, and at least one of the principal Baptist churches on the Pacific Coast. *The Gospel Witness* desires the fullest measure of blessing for both Pastor and people.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. II.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 3.

Lesson 12.

Third Quarter.

September 18th, 1927.

PEACE WITH GOD.

LESSON TEXT: Romans, Chapter 5.

GOLDEN TEXT.—"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1).

This lesson deals with the great results of justification by faith in Jesus Christ. The first of these mentioned is "peace with God". That means that all enmity and distance between God and the sinner is removed, and it is now the privilege of the justified person to live in fellowship and friendship with God. Justification is the term attached to a court of law. The accused person may be acquitted for lack of evidence, or through a judge's leniency, or through some powerful influence that may be brought to bear on those responsible for pronouncing judgment. Justification goes far further than any of these things. It means that every charge is met, answered, and withdrawn, and that the person is dealt with as one against whom no charge can be made. He becomes guiltless in the sight of God and against him no other charge can be brought, since Christ has taken responsibility for him to the law, and perfectly met the law's demands, making the justification of the man complete, and perfect, and eternal. This justification may be distinguished from forgiveness. Forgiveness is a more personal than a legal matter. To forgive is to pass over some personal wrong and to receive back to affection and fellowship the wrongdoer, upon his acknowledgment and confession. Justification is the being discharged as guiltless by the representative of the law. All charges against the sinner believing in Christ have been met by Christ, and therefore the justified person can come into God's presence as one against whom no past, present, or future charge can be made. There is no charge now brought against him by God: he has the relationship to God of a person who is perfect in Jesus Christ, and therefore has judicial standing which brings peace with God.

Now this is to be distinguished from "the peace of God, which passeth all understanding". Many believers have peace with God who have not the enjoyment of the peace of God. We distinguish between these, lest we make the peace of God which passeth understanding, that which brings us confidence and assurance of salvation. Both kinds of peace come to us through justification; one is a permanent, unchangeable possession; the other will vary with the adjustment of our walk in life to the will of God, and our sense of His approval upon our daily thoughts and actions.

Another great result of justification by faith is said to be "this grace wherein we stand". Previous to accepting Jesus Christ, we stood in a relationship to the first Adam, in the place of sin and condemnation. Now we stand in a relationship to the last Adam, to Jesus Christ. We are clad in His righteousness: by Him we have been made sons of God; we have an unchangeable relationship to God the Father, and in this grace we stand.

Paul gives the second half of this chapter beginning with verse 15 to the description of our standing under condemnation brought about by the offences of one, and our new place and position into which the obedience and sufferings of Jesus Christ has brought us. Standing first under the judgment of the law in the position of the sinner with the sentence of death upon us, and our members the servants of sin, we are now standing in Christ Jesus in the abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness: "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord". Thus we have a standing before God, and free access to God, which is our eternal possession and place.

Following this there is a new destiny opening before us, making us to "rejoice in hope of the glory of God". That hope is elsewhere described as "the blessed hope", the looking for the Return of Jesus Christ: the hope that

causes us to purify ourselves; the hope that will bring salvation to our bodies as well as to our spirits. Phil. 3: 20, 21. Then we have what is to us a supernatural thing, namely, we are enabled to glory in our tribulations here upon earth. Although our standing before God is that of perfect acceptance and free access, yet there are conflicts, suffering and tribulation for us in this present life. One of the wonderful results of this justification is that instead of being distressed and cast down by these conflicts and difficulties, we are enabled to glory in them. We now understand the purpose of these things. We see the meaning of them; we anticipate the results that will follow. They produce patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, rising upon them through our new relationship to God, and through our understanding of the ways of God, we do what to us apart from God would be impossible to accomplish, we glory in tribulations also. Another of the results of this justification is the great gift of the Holy Spirit Who comes to dwell in our hearts to be our constant guide, our teacher, and leader into all truth, Who will continually open to us the things of Jesus Christ and His salvation, and Who will shed abroad within us the love of God. He will make very distinct and clear to us how great that love is which led Jesus Christ to die for us when we were still ungodly, without strength, and full of enmity toward Him. He will make us clearly to understand the ground of justification; "being now justified by His Blood". Faith was the condition, but this is the ground of justification, and He will also make clear to us that we are now, through justification, being saved by the intercession of Jesus Christ in heaven; "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life. And not only so, but we also joy (exulting) in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement".

These are all present results of justification. Justification secures our absolute salvation here and hereafter; pardon of sin, and future glory. We have this standing in grace through justification, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God. All that grace gives us, and all that glory will mean to us, is the result of our justification by the precious Blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

NEXT SUNDAY IN JARVIS STREET.

The usual Monthly Communion and Reception Service will be postponed until the second Sunday in September. The Pastor will teach his class in the morning, and preach at eleven; and again at seven indoors, and at nine from the open-air pulpit.

TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY.

Our correspondence indicates that we shall have a very gratifying attendance of students when the Seminary opens October 3rd. We would remind our friends of the need of financial support for our Seminary work. We have no capital other than the promises of God, and we are looking to Him to supply our needs through the gifts of His people. For a month or so *The Gospel Witness* has been occupied with the affairs of Des Moines University, and has done its best to plead for the financial support of that great Institution. We feel sure that our friends will not allow the smaller, but not less important work of our Seminary to be overlooked.

ADVERTISEMENT.

To all new subscribers for THE GOSPEL WITNESS (\$2.00 per year) the publishers will send free a copy of Dr. Shields' new book, "Christ in the Old Testament," 160 pages, containing ten lectures on "How To Study the Bible." The book is a suggestive study of the Bible from Genesis to II Samuel. Ministers will find this book will so "prime the pump," as Mr. Spurgeon used to say, as to suggest hundreds of sermons. Send a subscription for THE GOSPEL WITNESS to a preacher friend. To present subscribers the book will be sent postpaid for fifty-five cents. Address THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.