

# The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES AND  
IN DEFENSE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.

\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c. Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS.

Associate Editors: T. I. STOCKLEY, ALEXANDER THOMSON, W. GORDON BROWN.

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1:16.

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada

Vol. 9. No. 20.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 2nd, 1930.

Whole No. 437.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"LIGHT IS COME INTO THE WORLD"

A Sermon by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields.

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, September 28th, 1930.

Broadcast from Station CKGW, 690 k.c. 434-8 metres.

(Stenographically reported.)

"And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."—John 3:19.

We have been accustomed to speak of the gospel as "the old, old story of Jesus and his love"; but we are rapidly coming to a day when the old, old story will be the newest story in the world. So far have men departed from the truth as it is in Jesus, turning from the Word of God unto fables, that with multitudes of people the great principles of the gospel of the Lord Jesus are utterly foreign.

This evening I shall deal with some very simple fundamentals of the Christian faith, in the hope that the Spirit of God may bless His Word to the salvation of some, and to the edification of others.

### I.

Our text first of all declares that "LIGHT IS COME INTO THE WORLD." Those of us who believe the word of revelation, and glory in the gospel, are sometimes described as obscurantists. It is said that our minds are static, that we are wanting in intellectuality, that we are not the friends of progress or advancement. The real fact is that the gospel is a religion of light, not of darkness. It never favours darkness—it never did. It is the friend of all true light, for "light is come into the world"; "Whatever doth make manifest is light." The Bible is a book of light. It is the record which God has given to us of Him Who is Himself the Light of the world.

The promises immediately before His coming to earth were partially fulfilled in His incarnation, His death, and resurrection; and will at last completely be fulfilled in His coming again with "power and great glory". But God is light, and "in him is no darkness at all". So I would ask you to turn over that statement of the text first of all, that "light is come into the world".

What is this Light? What does it manifest? In Jesus Christ *we have light first of all respecting man himself, his natural state, his relationship to time and to eternity.* How little we know of ourselves, any of us! How ignorant we are of that which is closest to us! How little a man knows of his own body! How dependent he is upon various aids to discover what is in himself! How men have given themselves to a diligent study of the human frame!—to know whence we came, how life is sustained, and whither we go. Men put themselves under the X-ray; the doctor comes with his instruments; he does his best to discover what is in man, what is out of order in his physical organism. Sometimes a man goes from doctor to doctor. He has about as many opinions of himself as the number of doctors he consults, until by and by he wonders whom they are talking about! How ignorant we are, we who boast of our knowledge, even of our physical frame!

How in the dark men are in respect to their moral nature! How interested men are in the various analyses

of their own mental and moral constitutions. Men have been taken up with new psychology, with explanations of human conduct which refer moral actions to some glandular irregularity of some sort; as though a man were nothing more than an animal, and that all his conduct could be physically explained. So the philosophers, like the doctors, discuss among themselves; and in the end the man does not know very much more than he did in the beginning. How little, I say, we know of ourselves!

What discussions there have been as to our origin, whence we came, whether we came down, or whether we are going up; whether we fell downstairs, or whether we are climbing the golden ladder. What differences of opinion there are! How shall we arrive at the facts of the case? By studying these matters by the light of our dim candles? Is there no greater light? Is there no way of learning what we are, whence we came, and whither we go?

Yes, my friends, there is. "Light is come into the world." There is but one way whereby man may know himself. He may know what he is only in the light which shines from the face of Jesus Christ. There is no other way of knowing human nature. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." No instrument that man can devise, no system of reckoning he can invent, can possibly determine the distance, the measure of man's sin. How far "short" are we of what we might have been, of what we ought to be? Where shall we find light on a subject of such vital interest to every thinking man? How and where shall we measure ourselves? At whose feet shall we sit to learn the constitution of our own nature, to know whether we have drifted from our original state, and what our high destiny may be?

There is only one Standard. In His face we may find light. We must measure ourselves by Him. We must appraise human nature by His standard. We must examine heart and conscience, affections and will. We must turn the searchlight of His revelation upon ourselves, that we may learn what sort of creatures we are. "Light is come into the world." And it is possible for a man to know what he is, how bad he is, how full of sin he is, how deceitful is his heart, how defiled is his conscience, how enslaved is his will, how depraved are his affections—when all these elements of our nature are brought into the light that shines from this Holy Page in the face of Jesus Christ, we may get a true appraisal of human nature, and know exactly where and what we are. There is no other authority that can unerringly describe our state or define our destiny.

In Jesus Christ, the Light of the world, *we may learn, too, what God is, who He is.* Men have not only exercised their minds in analyses of their own constitutions, but they have used their imaginations in order to discover to themselves, if possible, a likeness of God. Who is He? What is He? Is there a God? And if there be, what manner of person is He? Or is He a person at all? Is all that is represented by that term but a force, but an abstraction? Is there any reality in God at all? "Oh that I knew where I might find him! that I might come even to his seat!" "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?"

By what light will you learn of Him? There is but one Light: "God was in Christ"; "No man hath seen

God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

At the close of the service this morning a little girl of about six years of age came to me and said, "Pastor, may I ask you a question?" I said, "Certainly, dear, what would you like to ask me?" "If you please, are there two persons in Heaven or only one?" "What do you mean?" I asked. "Well", she said, "is Jesus Christ one Person, and is God somebody else? Mamma says there is just One, that Jesus and God are one." I tried to tell that little girl that the mystery of godliness is very great, and that we cannot well understand how there can be two persons in one. But that is just exactly what the Bible says, that there is but one God. I said to her, "Jesus is God; and God is Jesus." Was it not lovely to have a little girl of six ask a question like that?

That is a question men have asked all down through the ages, Who is God? Where is He? "Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us", said one. To which our Lord replied, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" We shall never know God apart from Christ. There is no way of knowing God apart from Christ. "Light is come into the world", and He has come to reveal God to us. And what a God He is! ("Amen!")

Jesus Christ *reveals God's attitude toward sin.* I confess to a feeling of impatience when I observe the attitude of some good people. They substitute sentimentality for sense. They say, "Let us love everybody." By all means, love everybody; but remember it is written of Him: "Being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace." "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." There is no peace apart from righteousness—that is, no permanent peace. God's attitude toward sin is one of abhorrence, of intense hatred. It is the abominable thing which He hates.

We shall never understand God without properly appreciating that aspect of the revelation of God in Christ. Jesus Christ did not come to cover up our sins, to condone our sins, to excuse us for our sins. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." "Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Jesus Christ never condoned sin. He never made light of transgression. He dragged it from its hiding place, out into the light of day. He brought it to the cross, and nailed it there. The Scripture says that God sent "his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."

That sentiment which bids us pass over wrongdoing and unrighteousness in the name of love is a libel on God. He abhors unrighteousness, and brings it out into the light always.

The cross is the divine estimate of sin: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." That is God's judgment upon your sin and mine, and when He had come to the place where He, while representing and revealing God, was actually our Representative, and inasmuch as He was made sin for us, He revealed sin at its worst; and when He upon Whom the world's sin was laid, came

to the place called Golgotha, there they crucified Him,—so called because it was the place of a skull.

"The wages of sin is death." That is the testimony of the Light of the world. My dear friends, there is no possibility of our escaping the consequences of wrongdoing, except through the blood. The testimony of Scripture is to the effect that "he that covereth his sins shall not prosper". The lost note in modern preaching and teaching is the note of repentance. The modern pulpit needs to get back to the teaching of God's Word, and call men to repent of their sin; because "God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

There is light, I say, in the person of Christ, in the work of Christ, upon these great problems of human life, and there is light upon *God's method of dealing with our sins*. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men." God never condones sin, but He does forgive the sinner. Our sins were laid upon Christ when He died "the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God".

I wish I had time to discuss with you a principle which I suggest for your own further consideration. A preacher's business is not to tell people everything, but to make them do their own thinking. If your preacher does not make you think all the week long after hearing him, there is something wrong with him, or something wrong with you—or both. But I say, *I doubt whether the truth respecting anything can be known apart from Christ*. In the last analysis of things, this world is in darkness; and apart from the Light of the world, we cannot understand anything.

You say, "Sir, you do not mean to apply that, for example, to the field of natural phenomena? to the workshop of the man of science who works with his test-tube, or his telescope, and surveys the whole created order? You do not mean to tell me that men cannot ascertain the truth there?" Yes; I do. You will call me "unlearned and ignorant", but I pass this principle on to you; and ask you to meditate upon it. It is my own conviction that no man can get at the truth, in the realm of science even, without the light that shines from the face of Jesus Christ. I doubt if any man can be, in the truest sense, a scientist, who is not first of all a Christian. I know he can do wonders; I know he can learn much truth. But it is promised that "when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth". We may have light on these matters only as we see the face of Jesus Christ. Our origin, whence we came, He will tell us; He has put His imprimatur upon this Book which is the record of our family tree.—It does not include the cocoanut tree where the monkeys play.

*As to the future: there is no light on that apart from Christ*. Nobody knows anything about it apart from Christ. There is no light anywhere respecting spiritual matters apart from Him: "Light is come into the world"; "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

## II.

The extraordinary thing that our text declares is that "MEN LOVED DARKNESS RATHER THAN LIGHT"; that even though light is come into the world, they will not use it.

Men love darkness rather than light. If you doubt that, try to tell a man the truth.

I was coming from Montreal a while ago—from Montreal or Ottawa, but I think it was from Montreal. A couple of men got on the car in evening dress, one of whom was helplessly drunk. He was well dressed, and apparently a prosperous man. His speech was anything but edifying. He was a spectacle at which angels might weep—if angels ever shed tears. The next morning those two men came into the wash-room. The one who had been so very drunk had sobered up a little, but he was still stupid. His friend was trying to tell him how he had behaved the night before, and of some of the things he said. He denied it, and became very angry. He called his friend a liar again and again—but he did not take it very seriously. He laughed and said, "So-and-So, you did so. You did so." The poor fellow did not know what he had been like; nor did he welcome his friend's attempt to lead him into the light.

If you talk to any practising physician, he will tell you that he has offended many of his patients by telling the truth. They do not want to hear the truth. Sometimes they will say, "Doctor, tell me the worst." But the doctor knows very well that they do not want to know the worst!

I was in a barber shop one day some years ago when a man came in whom the barber addressed familiarly and said, "How are you?" He slapped his chest and said, "I am feeling as fit as can be." "I thought you were a little bit off colour?" said the barber. "Yes", he replied, "but I had the wrong doctor." He sat down beside me, and for want of something better to do I asked him a few questions. I said, "What was the trouble with your doctor?" "Oh, he told me my heart was bad—and I do not know what else was bad. He told me I was pretty much of a wreck—but look at my chest"; and he got up and strutted around. "I went to another doctor", he continued, "and he tells me I am all right." How he put out his chest! I do not know whether he was all right or not, but I know that he was anxious to hear something that was flattering and complimentary.

I heard a man tell a story once of a preacher in the South. He was a very eminent preacher. There was another who was almost his equal. At every great Convention this great man must be heard; no meeting was complete without a message from him. My friend told me one day that he preached wonderfully well, and the other man, whom some said was quite his equal, was there. He went up to the preacher, gripped him by the hand and said, "I have never heard you preach that I did not think you surpassed any other preacher I ever heard; but to-night you excelled yourself." The great preacher leaned over and said, "So-and-So, I do not believe a word of it, but let me hear you say it over again."

Why is it that people love to be flattered? Why is it that people do not want to be told the truth? "But now", said Jesus, "ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth." If you would make enemies, tell the truth; expound the Word of God; let the Word that is sharper than any two-edged sword do its work, and see how they will turn on you. People always did. They did in apostolic days. When they are cut to the heart, they will do one of two things: they will either repent or throw stones at the preacher. At Pentecost, they repented; when Stephen preached, they stoned him to death. Why

is it? Because "men love darkness rather than light."

Some men are like their silly wives—because some men have silly wives! The Bible speaks about "silly women". I saw yesterday in a magazine a picture of a house which was described as a "sun-trap", designed by some professor, and put somewhere upon a hill, so that it would catch all the rays of the sun possible through all the hours of the day. How would you like to live in a sun-trap?

What did I mean by speaking of "silly" women? I mean the women who pull down the blinds and shut out the sunlight, and light a candle—and put a shade on top of that—and think that is being up-to-date! They turn daylight into semi-darkness! That is just like their husbands do—for their husbands are as silly as they are. Why? When the Sun of Righteousness shines full-orbed in the face of Jesus Christ, flooding the whole universe with light, they pull down the blinds and say, "I know more than God does." They substitute reason for revelation. They shut the Book, with its glorious revelation of the genesis of things, and dig among the worms to find out who their grandfather was—and they call that being clever.

The basis of all this is in the text: "Men loved darkness rather than light." They do not want to know the truth. Speak to men about salvation through the blood, and they will gnash their teeth. Why is it that men hate that truth? I will not tell you for the moment why, but is it a fact? There is nothing that will make the natural man more angry than to be told he is such a sinner that nothing but the blood that flowed from the heart of Incarnate Deity can possibly purge his sins away. He likes to believe that he has no need of such cleansing,—“men loved darkness rather than light.”

If you try to save people from the precipice, to throw a flood of light upon their pathway, you will see whether they welcome your ministry or not! Not usually but, blessed be God, there are some exceptions. But it is the work of the prophet of God, notwithstanding, to bring these things into the light of His Word.

Men love darkness in everything. I remember years ago there was a woman in this congregation who, as far as I was able to observe, was a woman of at least ordinary intelligence. She may have had more, but she had average sense anyhow. There was a man in this congregation who was far short of being an average man. He was just a piece of a man, just a bit of broken earthenware, a mere fragment. When that woman allowed herself to become interested in that poor—I had almost said, imbecile, a friend who was then my associate went to her and spread before her a record of the past of that man's life as he knew it. He told her exactly what he was, and where he came from; and what she might expect if she entered into a life-partnership with him.

It was amazing to me that she needed anybody to tell her! That is always one of the problems with me, who, as a minister, has many marriages to perform: I wonder how in the world the thing happened! Sometimes on the one side, and sometimes on the other! However, in this particular case there was a record of facts, the man's life history was spread before the woman—and what did she do? Did she turn to my friend and say, "I thank you very much for

saving me from ruin"? No! She turned on him like a tigress from the jungle, and declared that he was prejudiced against this man. There was not enough of him for anybody to be prejudiced against! He was a human nobody. But she married him, and when her life was utterly ruined and blasted she at last awakened to the truth—but she loved darkness rather than light.

### III.

Why is that so characteristic of human nature? The text tells us, "BECAUSE THEIR DEEDS WERE EVIL". Instinctively, my dear friends, every man knows, if he knows anything at all, that if the light is turned upon his motives, his purposes, his aims, if his whole life is brought into the light, he will need something to cleanse it. There never was a man yet, or woman either, who did not.

I asked a man once, who had left our congregation, why he had done so. He said, "Because you make me miserable." I said, "Why is that?" "Well," he said, "there are other churches in town to which I can go Sunday after Sunday, and be quite comfortable. I go to hear you preach, and I cannot sleep at night."—"Men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

Only when by God's grace we are given wisdom to permit Him to reveal to us the hidden sin, that it may be removed by His grace, and we are made new creatures in Christ—only then can we welcome the light. We are like the patient to whom the doctor has come and said, "I have told you what is the matter with you, and you will not believe it; there is no use for me to come any more. There is something within that will destroy you, and unless you submit to the removal of that malignant thing, you will be sending for the undertaker instead of the doctor." Not until that patient is ready to submit, and have that thing removed can anybody do anything for him or for her.

### IV.

"Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil"—is that the whole text? No! "This is the condemnation"—not that Adam sinned. He did, and we are partakers of his sin: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." But that is not the condemnation, for God has made provision by sending a second Adam to the fight. I love that hymn of Newman's:—

"Praise to the Holiest in the height,  
And in the depth be praise;  
In all His works most wonderful,  
Most sure in all His ways.

"O loving wisdom of our God!  
When all was sin and shame,  
A second Adam to the fight,  
And to the rescue came.

"O wisest love! that flesh and blood,  
Which did in Adam fail,  
Should strive afresh against the foe,  
Should strive and should prevail;

"And that a higher gift than grace  
Should flesh and blood refine,—  
God's presence, and His very self,  
And essence all-Divine!

"O generous love! that He, who smote  
In Man, for man, the foe,  
God's presence, and His very self,  
For man should undergo;

"And in the garden secretly,  
And on the cross on high,  
Should teach His brethren, and inspire  
To suffer and to die."

"Praise to the Holiest in the height,  
And in the depth be praise;  
In all His words most wonderful,  
Most sure in all His ways."

And we may appropriate the vice of the first Adam or the victory of the Second; the guilt of the first, or the grace of the Second. The condemnation is not that Adam sinned, and that we fell in him, but "this is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light." In other words, "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." The sin of all sins, the sin that opens the gates of hell to a man, is the sin of shutting out God's light, of refusing to receive Him Who is the "light of the world."

Those of us who believe are the children of light. Let us walk as the children of light, having no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reproving them.

Is there someone here this evening who is not a Christian, someone who has been substituting his own reason for the Word of God, his own wisdom for the wisdom of God, his own way of salvation for the way which God has provided? Will you come to the light, and let the light shine, and receive Him Who is the Light of the world.

**LAST SUNDAY'S BROADCAST.**

We have received a number of letters from friends telling us they were unable to hear last Sunday's broadcast because of another station. There are always a few who speak of the reception fading away; but when the general report informs us that the reception was good we know that these exceptions must be due either to the radio receiver or to local conditions which we cannot control. But last Sunday there seems to have been a general interference. The manager of CKGW informs us that the interfering station was WLW, of Cincinnati. By some means or another they got on our wave length for the greater part of our service time, so that in many quarters, at least, the broadcast was almost a complete failure.

We are informed that this has been reported to the authorities, and this station will be communicated with; and it is hoped there will not be a recurrence of the interference. It made it all the worse, we are told, that what speech was heard was an anti-prohibition speech. We sincerely hope that no one will credit that speech to the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church, who confesses himself a confirmed prohibitionist.

**Broadcast Still Costs Money.**

We remind our readers that our broadcast service still costs money, and we are dependent upon our radio hearers for the support of this ministry. Let us hear from you.

**TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY.**

Dr. and Mrs. T. I. Stockley arrived in Toronto Sunday afternoon last. Both were apparently in good health, and it is a joy to have them back with us. Dr. Stockley assisted in the evening service.

There was a large registration of students on Monday, but it was, of course, incomplete. Others have since come in, and will be coming in during next week. We confidently expect a considerably greater enrolment than last year.

All the Faculty seem to be in the best of fettle, and eager for the season's work.

At this point, we remind our readers again that from this forward our Seminary expenses will be at the rate of twelve or thirteen hundred dollars a month. We shall greatly appreciate the contributions of our friends.

**THE WEEK END IN JARVIS STREET.**

The attendance at School last Sunday was 1,429. There were fine congregations all day; the sermon appearing in this issue was preached in the evening.

**CONVENTION PROGRAMME.**

The programme published on page 15 is but an outline. The complete programme will be published next week.

**REMEMBER**  
**THE RADIO FUND**  
**THE GOSPEL WITNESS FUND**  
**THE SEMINARY FUND**  
**Three thirsty children**  
**Who always want a "djink".**

**SUBSCRIBE TO-DAY**  
for "The Gospel Witness" for yourself and friends. Sent postpaid for 52 weeks to any place in the world for \$2.00.

Use blank below.

**THE GOSPEL WITNESS,**  
130 Gerrard Street East,  
Toronto, Ont., Can.

For the enclosed \$2.00 please send "The Gospel Witness" for one year to

Name .....

Address .....

.....

# The Plague of Religious Quackery

Addresses delivered in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto, Thursday evening, September 25th, 1930, in connection with Rev. J. C. Kellogg's use of the name of Dr. Mark A. Matthews, of the First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Wash., at a meeting in Toronto Gospel Tabernacle, September 19th, to endorse so-called "Divine Healing". Both addresses were stenographically reported.

DR. SHIELDS: Part of our time each Thursday evening is devoted to a Bible Lecture. It is necessary that we alter our programme a little this evening, but if the lectures are not Bible lectures, they will at least be biblical. Brother Fraser will speak now.

REV. WM. FRASER: It is not my purpose to preach a sermon here to-night, but I should like to commend to this company the consideration and application of the teaching of a certain verse of Scripture found in Proverbs, "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him."

Differences of opinion may be accounted for on many grounds. There is a type of mind which is so strongly prejudiced for or against persons or matters that it is a waste of time and of effort to attempt to change them. They are utterly incapable of weighing evidence. On the other hand, however, there is another type of mind whose view in respect to certain matters is to be accounted for on the ground that their knowledge of the facts is defective. A person who has a knowledge of only fifty per cent. of the facts on any matter can hardly be expected to have the same opinion as a person who knows all the facts. And I am happy to believe to-night that the majority of people are in the second class, that their minds are open to truth, to weigh evidence, and to reach their own conclusions.

My task to-night is simply to present a few facts in connection with the matter which is to be dealt with more particularly by Dr. Shields. I shall not appeal to your prejudices, or attempt to stampede anybody in a certain "cow-boy" fashion by misrepresentation or innuendoes; but shall simply state the facts. I have no desire to injure either Mr. Kellogg or Mr. Smith—or anyone else, for that matter.

I want, first of all, to explain my presence in Toronto on Friday. I had occasion, in the interests of the church which I serve in Windsor, to visit a few places. I reached Toronto Friday morning from Ottawa, and had intended leaving the city by the midnight train for Windsor; which I did, and reached there Saturday morning. But I was talking with a friend on Gerrard Street—I suppose it would be about a quarter to eight—when Rev. Oswald J. Smith, Pastor of the Gospel Tabernacle, came along the street and stopped to speak to me. He greeted me very cordially, and invited me to go into the service, which was about to be held, and hear Mr. Kellogg. He also said he would like me to go up on the platform and take part in the service in prayer. I said I had some business to attend to, and was not sure whether I could get through in time to go in; but that if I were free I might drop in for a few moments. I said that inasmuch as I had to get away

to catch a train I would like to slip out whenever I wanted to go, and preferred not to go on the platform.

I got through with my business, and went into the Tabernacle. Just as I got inside the door Mr. Smith spoke to me a second time. He said, "Come on up, Brother Fraser, to the platform. We should like to have you up here with us, to lead in prayer." I said, "Mr. Smith, I am a preacher, and I very seldom get the opportunity of sitting in the pew. I think you understand what I mean." He said, "I understand." So I took a seat in a pew.

Mr. Kellogg announced that his subject for the evening was "Divine Healing"; and he proposed to give unanswerable arguments which no man in the land had wisdom enough to deny or refute. He said he would produce his arguments from three sources: first, the Scriptures; secondly, the testimony of the church; and, thirdly, the testimony of modern science.

After setting forth an extreme view, to the effect that it was unnecessary for a Christian at any time to be sick; and that such sickness was an evidence of being out of the will of God, he quoted one or two isolated passages carefully ignoring all other scriptures on this particular doctrine.

He then tried to show that his view of divine healing, as already stated, was held and taught by many leaders in all the great denominations. And he attempted to cite the testimony of outstanding men as approving his teaching on this subject. He began by reading an excerpt from the diary of John Wesley, where John Wesley is quoted as saying that there were a great many orthodox people who denied the supernatural and the miraculous, and attacked those who possessed in their ministry that which they themselves were lacking.

Laying down the book from which he was quoting, Mr. Kellogg then said that if John Wesley had lived in this day, and could have stood in this pulpit, he would have gone farther and said that there were orthodox Fundamentalists who denied the supernatural, and attacked all those who had evidences of divine power in their ministry which they themselves lacked.

He then declared that the Presbyterian Church believed what he taught, and cited Dr. Mark Matthews of Seattle, Washington, as endorsing divine healing as preached and practised by Mr. Kellogg. He told of a campaign which he held in the First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, of which Dr. Mark Matthews is Pastor, and of the miraculous healing of a young woman who had been born deaf and dumb; and of a request by her friends that he pray for her. After praying for her recovery, she was instantaneously healed, and while the healing was not immediately completed she

received her hearing and her speech, which gradually improved until she was able to hear and speak perfectly. The last time Mr. Kellogg heard of her she was preaching the gospel on the streets of Seattle.

He also stated that Dr. Mark Matthews, his church officials, and his great church, had endorsed the J. C. Kellogg Campaign, and would always be glad to welcome him back to their church; and that Dr. Matthews, as the outstanding representative of Presbyterianism in America, represented the endorsement of his teaching by the Presbyterian Church."

Then he said, "I had a paper put in my hand today, in which was an article entitled, 'Religious Sprees'. I read it, and it was nothing but ridicule of evangelists and evangelism and those who believe and preach the full gospel. It came from the Jarvis Street religious sewer." I confess that it required a great deal of self-restraint to keep my seat, but I exercised the grace to do it. I did not say anything (applause).

DR. SHIELDS: Just a moment; we are not here for a hand-clapping meeting, but for a quiet consideration of the facts. Please do not applaud.

MR. FRASER: I decided that I would keep my seat and listen, and exercise the wisdom of the text that I have just given you, "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him." So I listened to him to the end of his address: and decided while I was listening to him that I should like to have a talk with him personally. No objection or protest was made to that public charge by a man who knew very little about it—against the Pastor of this church, and against this church, when openly, and without any provocation, on Friday night he referred to this church as a "religious sewer".

An invitation was extended for those who wished to be healed to retire to a room at the back. I went out when the meeting was dismissed, but found my way to the room at the back. I found about eighty or ninety people in line, waiting. They came up one by one. Mr. Kellogg put a little drop of oil on his finger out of a vial, put it on their heads, laid his hands on them, and offered a prayer; one by one all passed him as he laid his hands on them, and prayed for them.

I waited until every one had been prayed over—I did not want anyone to be able to say I was disturbing the meeting. Mr. Kellogg saw me waiting, and came over. I said, "My name is Fraser." He said, "I am glad to meet you, Mr. Fraser." I said, "I heard your sermon to-night in the auditorium. I wonder if I might ask you two questions." He said, "Certainly". I asked him the two questions that I had in mind, and found he was bitterly opposed to this church. He did not give any reasons or proof whatever. I came away feeling that the man was talking about things of which he knew nothing. I proved that in testing him regarding his information about this church and this Pastor; and it led me to wonder whether he knew what he was talking about regarding the First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington. I came to this church after the meeting, and I told Dr. Shields about my visit.

DR. SHIELDS: Before Brother Fraser continues his address, I must say this: when Brother Fraser told me that, I said, "I know Dr. Mark Matthews very well. I have preached in his pulpit. I know the things for

which he stands, and I seriously question the accuracy of Mr. Kellogg's statement. I will send a night-letter to Dr. Matthews to-night, and will obtain information. If I receive the information which I am practically certain will come, because I know Dr. Mark Matthews' position, I will telegraph you, and you will come back, if you can find the time, at my expense, and present Dr. Matthews' reply to the people who have been asked to accept Mr. Kellogg's position partly on the ground that he is endorsed by Dr. Mark Matthews."

If you do not like Mr. Fraser's method, let me say frankly, blame me! Mr. Fraser did on Tuesday night exactly what I asked him to do. And I will anticipate what I have later to say by remarking that I knew perfectly well that any communication sent either to Mr. Kellogg or to Mr. Smith would never see the light, and that it was therefore necessary to drag such deception into the public view. I asked Mr. Fraser to go to the meeting and read Dr. Matthews' communications, saying that if they will not receive it, our duty in the matter is done. So, while Mr. Fraser finishes his speech, I want you, especially any of you Jarvis Street people who may have questioned the wisdom of the "method", to reckon with me. I am responsible! And I will tell you why before I get through. Now, Mr. Fraser, go on.

MR. FRASER: I will begin with a point which I omitted. While I was in that after-meeting where they were praying for the sick, Mr. Smith opened the door and looked around the company; and, seeing me, walked straight over to me and said, "Mr. Fraser, I did not know Mr. Kellogg was going to say what he said to-night." He half apologized for what he himself knew was entirely false and unwarranted. I said to him, "Well, I want to speak to Mr. Kellogg personally." He said, "Go ahead, and have a talk with him."

I came back to Toronto on the advice of Dr. Shields' wire. We had the telegrams copied, in duplicate form. In fact, I said to Dr. Shields, "The chances are that when I get to the heart of the matter someone will grab them out of my hand and tear them up, so I had better have another set in order to carry on."

When I got to the church the lights were out; pictures of Spain were being shown. I did what I would have done if the lights had been on—I went up to the front. I looked for a place while going down the aisle, but there were no vacancies until I got to the front, and I sat down. Just as I sat down the lights came on—and I was seated beside Mr. Kellogg and his wife.

Mr. Smith, in making the announcements, said something to the effect that the people here were so delighted with the ministry of Mr. Kellogg that whereas his engagement was to have finished on Sunday night, he had been asked to stay another week. I had been willing to accept Mr. Smith's statement as being sincere when he said he did not know what Mr. Kellogg was going to say Friday night, half apologizing for him. It is quite possible that the man said something Mr. Smith did not know he was going to say. But when he announced that they were so pleased with his campaign that they were going to continue for another week, I began to question the sincerity of Mr. Smith's statement, when he said that

he did not know what Mr. Kellogg was going to say, and that he was sorry for it. Then he announced that the offering would be taken.

I saw there was only one event before Mr. Kellogg would speak, and I thought that was the opportune moment for me to rise. I said, "Mr. Smith"—I addressed the Chair—"I have a message that I think would be of interest to this company of people, especially to those who were here on Friday night when we heard Mr. Kellogg bring his message on divine healing." I am quite sure if I had gone on to read a complimentary message saying some church, or some person, was praying for them, and rejoicing in their work, it would have been all right. The reading of the telegram, in itself, was not wrong, and would not have been considered wrong, if it had contained congratulations or a compliment from some other church. I have seen that in campaigns when someone, hearing of the blessing in the meeting, sent a message by wire to be read in the meeting. But when Mr. Kellogg, who was now sitting on the platform, recognized what was coming—for I had got as far in my reading of the telegram where it said that Mr. Kellogg and his wife had joined the First Presbyterian Church as lay members—when I got as far as that Mr. Kellogg and Mr. Smith both made a protest, and an usher came over to me, and asked me to sit down; but I went right on reading my telegram. I did not make any fuss or noise: it was the people there who did that. One of the ushers afterward actually swore at me. I said, "What! You swearing? You, one of the ushers and officers of this church! You had better go inside, and go up to the penitent form and repent of your swearing." The bedlam that broke loose there was the result of the public refutation of the statement that had been publicly made on Friday night; and I think when a false statement is made publicly to a company of people, the denial of that statement, if untrue, ought also to be given publicly.

Dr. Shields will tell you the rest.

DR. SHIELDS: Let me read you a letter that was sent last evening, by special delivery, to Rev. J. C. Kellogg, Crown Hotel, Corner Jarvis and Gerrard Streets:

"Rev. J. C. Kellogg,  
Crown Hotel, Toronto, Canada,  
Corner Jarvis and Gerrard Sts., Sept. 24th, 1930.  
Toronto, Canada.

"Dear Mr. Kellogg:

"To-morrow evening, Thursday, at eight o'clock, I intend to reply to your address of Wednesday evening in the Gospel Tabernacle. Three separate reports of your speech were taken by three stenographers to ensure accuracy, so that I shall have a verbatim report of your address before me.

"I write to say that if you should attend the meeting at Jarvis Street, and desire to ask any questions or to offer any remarks, either before or after my address, you will be afforded ample opportunity to do so.

"I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) T. T. Shields.

P.S. I enclose a copy of a letter I have sent to Rev. Oswald J. Smith, in which I enclose a copy of this letter to you.  
T. T. S."

The letter to Mr. Smith read:

"Rev. Oswald J. Smith,  
22 Kendal Ave.,  
Toronto, Canada.

"Toronto Canada,  
September 24th, 1930

"Dear Mr. Smith:

"I enclose a copy of a letter I have sent to Rev. J. C. Kellogg at the Crown Hotel, Jarvis Street.

"I am sending you this letter to say that if you should attend the meeting at Jarvis Street, and desire to ask any questions or to offer any remarks, either before or after my address, you will be afforded ample opportunity of doing so.

"A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr. Kellogg.

I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) T. T. Shields."

That letter to Mr. Kellogg was returned to me marked: "Not interested in either the sender or contents of this letter. Therefore am returning letter unopened." But as Mr. Kellogg had the opportunity of reading the same letter which I sent to Mr. Smith—and which did not come back—it is not so heroic as would appear. I read it merely to let you know that Mr. Kellogg and Mr. Smith have both been advised of this meeting, and have been told they would be given opportunity either to ask questions or to offer any remarks, for, as a good friend of mine once said, "Truth is never injured by discussion"—"He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God."

I am not interested in personalities in this matter. The gentleman concerned is an entire stranger to me. I have never seen him, and although I have a fairly wide acquaintance with the ministerial life of this continent, both in Canada and the United States, I have entirely escaped hearing Mr. Kellogg's name before. I did not know there was such a man. I never heard of him, and naturally had nothing whatever against him.

#### The Principle of "Divine Healing."

Now let me say a few words, first of all, about the subject in hand, the question of divine healing. This church has always stood for the supernaturalism of Christianity. We hold uncompromisingly to the doctrine of the divine inspiration, infallibility, and consequent authority, of the Bible as the word of God. Surely anyone at all conversant with our recent history must know that this church does not deny the supernaturalism of Christianity.

Furthermore, for eight and a half years I have published in *The Gospel Witness* every week a sermon printed from a stenographic report. My sermons are reported, and are printed as delivered; sometimes with scarcely a verbal change. The sermons have gone out in *The Gospel Witness* to more than fifty different countries. We have on our mailing list nearly three thousand ministers alone, of all denominations. The sermons are very often copied in other papers, particularly in *The Christian Herald*, of London, England, which has more than a quarter of a million circulation, and which goes to every corner of the earth.

Eight and a half years of publication ought surely to be sufficient to show whether this Pastor had anywhere, at any time, displayed a tendency toward the denial of the supernatural. If there is one thing for



which we stand, have stood, and shall continue to stand, it is the supernaturalism of the Bible, and of Him of Whom the Bible speaks, the Incarnate God, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

We believe in the supernatural character of the whole work of grace, that such as are saved are quickened by the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost; and that nobody is saved who has not been born again by the power of the Holy Ghost. We believe that the Christian religion is supernatural from beginning to end. That is why we meet here to pray: We believe that the Lord Who made us, can heal us. We never meet for prayer, I think, or, let me say, very seldom do we meet for prayer that we do not have before us requests to pray for the sick. Is that not so, Mr. Greenway?

MR. GREENWAY: That is so, Pastor.

DR. SHIELDS: Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday evenings, and many other meetings between, we pray for the sick. And I say to God's praise that we have every reason to believe that God has answered us many times. Not a few whom medical science said could not live, have recovered and returned to us, to praise the Lord.

In that kind of divine healing, we most certainly believe. Indeed, we believe that, in the last analysis, all healing is divine; and that our lives are in the hands of the God Whom we serve. But, dear friends, there is a type of divine healing—so-called—a doctrine of divine healing, which this church does not believe, against which this church protests, and utterly repudiates. We do not believe that it is always the privilege of every believer to have a perfectly whole body. We believe that God heals the sick when it is His will to do so, but that sometimes a higher Wisdom than ours denies our petition. We believe that it is of the very essence of faith to leave that whole matter in the hands of Him Who loves us, and Who sees the end from the beginning; we take from His hands whatever He sends us with gratitude and thanksgiving.

But the idea that healing is in the Atonement in the sense that we may have it at any time, we utterly repudiate. And yet, be it understood, so far as I am concerned; I believe that every blessing we receive is in the Atonement; and I believe it is in the plan of God that through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ I shall some day have a body, not only that will be healed, but that will not be subject to disease: "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." It would be just as logical to pray for the resurrection of the dead—to demand it—and to say that it is in the Atonement for this day and dispensation, as to say that healing is always to be had for the asking.

Furthermore, we believe it is contrary to Scripture. We believe that these divine-healing campaigns are not of God; that there lies at the basis of the movement that which is opposed to every principle of Scripture.

Again: such a man as the Apostle Paul had a thorn in the flesh—nobody knows what it was, but it was a

physical infirmity from which the Lord refused to deliver him. He said, "My grace is sufficient for thee." Moreover, Paul the Apostle, than whom the world has never seen a closer approximation to the life of Jesus Christ, left Trophimus sick at Miletus; he came without him—and did not heal him.

I will go farther and say that I have been in this city, and in this pulpit, for more than twenty years—I am not afraid of Mr. Kellogg, or of anybody like Mr. Kellogg. I have seen a great company of people come and go, and we are still here—and we expect to be here after Mr. Kellogg has departed. And, for Mr. Kellogg's information, let me tell him that I have met not a few men, in the duty that, as I believe, has been laid upon me to contend for the faith, who were at least the equal of Mr. Kellogg in natural ability, in educational equipment, and in ministerial position; and I have never lost a night's sleep about them. Nor for his own sake, should I trouble whatever Mr. Kellogg might say. I am not interested particularly in him, except as a man who is either deluded or worse, as I shall show you later—but I am interested in the people who may be led astray by this false teaching. And I say that in the twenty years which I have been here, I have seen the Bosworth Brothers' Campaign, Dr. Price's Campaign, and a great many lesser lights. I have seen people go up and be healed over and over again. My Bible says that "whatsoever God doeth it shall be for ever." I have never been able to understand why these people who talk so lightly about being healed, should need to be anointed every time a divine-healer comes to town!

I have been told again and again that, for myself, I shall never know the blessing of God until I have been very ill and miraculously restored. I am grateful to God that He has been pleased to interest, not only the members of this church, but a great many other people who pray for me daily. I have letters from all parts of the world, some of them in languages that I cannot read, which I have to have interpreted, telling me that people are praying for me. I am thankful for that, and I say that it is just as great a miracle—and to me a far greater miracle—to be kept in health, than to be raised from a bed of sickness. While the other brethren go for a holiday in the summer I take on a few extra services for my vacation! I have had one vacation in the last ten years—and I am quite well, thank you! And I give all glory to God for it, that He preserves me in health. While we are well, dear friends, let us value this priceless boon of physical health, and thank God that we have it, lest we lose it, and be brought to a sick bed in order to appreciate the benefit that is lost.

I say that to let you know that while we here believe that God heals the body, we have no sympathy whatever with divine-healing campaigns.

And furthermore, in all that twenty years, I have yet to discover, even by searching, one solitary *bona fide* case, of so-called divine healing! Speaking in Massey Hall, I challenged Dr. Price to produce one solitary case—not in Vancouver, not in Los Angeles, but in Toronto. "That indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem; and we cannot deny it." That is the

kind of miracle that was wrought in the New Testament. People were healed, and when the preachers were brought to account in the courts, "beholding the man which was healed standing with them, they could say nothing against it." If Mr. Kellogg, or any one of them, will bring me one solitary case where a person has unmistakably and thoroughly been healed by this kind of thing, I will join them tomorrow. I will invite them to preach in this church. I say to you that these divine-healing campaigns, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, without one solitary exception, are one of the most colossal frauds that were ever foisted on the religious world. (Loud applause.) I thank you for your approval of that, but I want you to weigh the facts that I shall give you. Do not excite yourselves by clapping. Say Amen if you want to. (Chorus of Amens.) That is better.

Now, is it clear that in this place we neither deny the supernatural in general, nor deny the possibility of healing in answer to prayer in particular; but that we do say it is a matter for the wisdom of God to decide?

This other word. I have seen cases where people have been taught: Now, you may be healed, and if you are not healed, there is something wrong. I am not here to tell coarse stories like those told last night at the Tabernacle. I shall present to you arguments from Scripture, and indisputable facts from human experience. I have seen people tortured upon their sick-beds. I have seen men and women driven all but insane (I speak deliberately, but in the light of the teaching of God's Word and of my own experience) by that doctrine which I stigmatize as being not a doctrine of the Bible at all, and not taught by the Spirit of God, but is one of the doctrines of demons of these last days. It is not of God; it never was of God! ("Amen!") That God heals is gloriously true, but not after that fashion.

Now then, to the particular case in hand: I am not interested in what Mr. Kellogg may say about *The Gospel Witness*. Nor shall I answer the man who describes this place, where many of us have realized the presence of God so often, and where to His praise we say we have seen hundreds and thousands, not in a week or two, but over years together, yield themselves to Christ as their Saviour—I say, the man who describes this place as a "religious sewer" is not worth answering.

#### Dr. Mark A. Matthews.

I sent a telegram to Dr. Matthews—and let me say a word about Dr. Matthews. Why did Mr. Kellogg quote Dr. Matthews as approving his campaigns? Why should Mr. Kellogg cite a case nearly three thousand miles away, for his authority? Why should he tell us of somebody who was preaching the gospel on the streets of Seattle, who was healed following his prayer? Is there no place nearer than that where Mr. Kellogg has ministered? Why did he quote Dr. Mark Matthews? Well, I will tell you why.

There is no name in the Presbyterian Church of America that is more highly honoured than that of Dr. Mark A. Matthews. They call him "the lonesome pine of the Pacific". I feel a little uncomfortable in

his presence, because I have to look up to him. He towers above everybody else, like Saul above the people. I do not know whether he is six feet six inches, or six feet eight inches. But his physical form is of little consequence, for "from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people", higher in every respect.

Dr. Mark Matthews is not a travelling evangelist, although he is an evangelist: he is a man who has stood in one pulpit, and has built up the largest Presbyterian church in the world. He has an enormous auditorium. It was my privilege to preach for him one Sunday evening while he presided at the meeting, and he invited me at the close of the service—to use his phraseology—to "open the doors of the church". He meant to invite people to come forward and unite with the church. But all Seattle knows Dr. Mark Matthews. He is an ex-Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. I think Mr. Kellogg showed excellent judgment when he selected Dr. Matthews as the outstanding and representative Presbyterian of America. And he knew Dr. Matthews was all that when he said Dr. Matthews endorsed his healing campaigns.

I, too, am grateful to the press, although I pay them no such fulsome compliments as did Mr. Kellogg. When people do that, they are expecting some favour. I never ask favours of the press nor of anybody else; because it is as necessary that a prophet of the Lord be independent of the press as that he should be independent of anyone else. But I say this, that I really think they state the case fairly when they have the facts put before them. I am a little sorry that some of the papers did not publish Dr. Matthews' telegrams.

I think, in the interest of fairness, it would be right to allow Dr. Mark Matthews to speak in his own language to the people of Toronto. That is all I ask. I do not care whether the papers print a word that I have to say. If they will only print Dr. Mark Matthews' statement in respect to this matter, I shall be quite willing to leave the verdict to the minds of reasonable people.

Lest you should think that my first telegram to Dr. Matthews was prejudiced, I will read it:

First Presbyterian Church,  
Seattle, Washington.

Sept. 19th, 1930.

"Dr. Mark A. Matthews,

Toronto, Canada,

"Kindly advise night letter collect whether one, J. C. Kellogg, held evangelistic and divine-healing campaign in your church, and whether during campaign young woman deaf mute, following Kellogg's prayer, received hearing and speech immediately; and whether said Kellogg was endorsed by you and your elders. Shall greatly appreciate reply.

(Signed) T. T. Shields."

I have a copy of Mr. Kellogg's address before me, so do not think I speak without knowledge. I know more about what Mr. Kellogg said than he does, for I have it—and he cannot remember all that he said. I know all that was said last night. I have a complete report of it. Mr. Kellogg spoke of the *alleged* telegrams. There they are (holding up the telegrams of Dr. Matthews as received on the official telegraph forms of the Canadian National Railway). I am willing for you to come and have a look at them if you have any doubt.

This was the first telegram I received from Dr. Matthews:

"Dr. T. T. Shields, Seattle, Washington,  
Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Sept. 20th, 1930.  
Toronto, Canada.

"J. C. Kellogg and his wife joined our church as a layman. We afterward found that he claimed to be a minister under one of the groups like the Holy Rollers or Missionary Alliance. We never recognized him as an ordained minister. He was a member of this church simply as a layman. He never held evangelistic meetings in our church. We did organize a gospel tent campaign in one section of the city, where he preached a week, but when he began talking about divine healing and other foolishness he was told that the teaching could not be carried on.

"After leaving us I believe he joined a Baptist Church in Tacoma and held meetings at other places, but he was in no way connected with this church when he was preaching his divine healing stuff. He was never endorsed by us, nor by our Session, in such practices and teachings. We have never heard of any girl being cured of deafness and dumbness by his preaching. He has not been a member of this church for some five or six years.

(Signed) M. A. Matthews."

Then I replied:

"Dr. Mark A. Matthews, Toronto, Sept. 21st, 1930.  
First Presbyterian Church,  
Seattle, Washington.

"Thanks for your wire. Kellogg publicly declared last Friday evening that alleged healing deaf mute girl took place in your church, and in proof of his contention that so-called divine healing has been endorsed by the church, named your session and church as representing Presbyterian endorsement. Was personally confident you would be unwilling your name should be used to credential such vagaries.

"Kellogg also declared former deaf girl now preaching gospel in streets of Seattle. Trust you will permit me use your telegram to dissociate your name from such extravagances. Kindly wire me collect.

(Signed) T. T. Shields."

I thought I ought to have Dr. Matthews' consent before making any public use of his telegram. To that wire I received the following reply:

"Dr. T. T. Shields, Seattle, Washington,  
Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Sept. 21st, 1930.  
Toronto, Canada.

"No endorsement of divine healing was ever given by the pastor, session or congregation of the First Presbyterian Church. Session and pastor are sane, sound, orthodox and fundamental. We never allow such vagaries. No deaf mute was ever healed in our church. Please correct the impression.

(Signed) M. A. Matthews."

Dr. Matthews desired, therefore, that these telegrams should be used publicly.

Last night Mr. Kellogg made a speech (laughter). I have the stenographic report of it here. "I am not going to give it to you—for very many reasons. It does not fit me very well. But the burden of his speech was to the effect that Mr. Kellogg, in proof of the alleged endorsement by Dr. Matthews, read from certain bulletins, and read also a copy of a letter which he said he was going to send to Dr. Matthews. These bulletins are here set out. Let us suppose, for the moment, that they are all *bona fide*, I hope they are; in fact, we shall not question them. Now listen carefully, not in the excitement of last night's meeting, but carefully. I find there are no dates given.

"Evangelistic meetings conducted by Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Kellogg were a great blessing to that community. Thirty-six confessed Christ, twenty-six or more have promised to join the church. Mr. and Mrs. Kellogg are now at——."

"Revival meetings conducted by Mr. and Mrs. Kellogg at Fernwood were most successful meetings. Members of the session went down there last Sunday night, and I received fourteen into the church on profession of faith. Mr. and Mrs. Kellogg are now conducting meetings at Boulevard Park. Pray earnestly for this work this week."

"Rev. J. C. Kellogg and wife are conducting a meeting at Boulevard Park.

"Rev. Kellogg and wife are removed from Rosehill to Greenwood Park, to begin revival services about May 1st. Please pray and work for that meeting."

"Revival meetings began at Pleasant Valley last Sunday at 8 o'clock, and are being conducted by Mr. Kellogg, and are to continue for two weeks. Everyone who can, please assist."

"Lake City Revival: Lake City revival meetings will begin next Tuesday night, under the direction of Rev. George Crawford, and Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Kellogg."

"We have been conducting meetings under the leadership of Mr. and Mrs. Kellogg, at the corner of Alaska and California Avenues, and they have been a great blessing to the people who have attended the meetings, and it resulted in . . . . The tent will be moved this week to another part of the city. Mr. Kellogg is doing a fine work."

"The great meeting attended at the north end of Tremont is growing in great interest. We want your sympathy, prayer and assistance. We hope to hold meetings in other branches in November. See next Sunday's bulletin for the schedule. Mr. Kellogg will conduct the meeting."

"Tent revival campaign in . . . The tent has been removed to a beautiful location. Mr. Dresbrook is General Director. We have Kellogg as evangelist and he is doing fine work. The meeting resulted in great good."

"Tremont campaign will last the next three weeks. We want your assistance and prayers. Please come and help this meeting. Pastor M. A. Matthews will preach at the tent Monday night."

"A big revival . . . is the lot adjacent to the public school. The meeting was opened last night; the Pastor preached the sermon. Dr. Dresbrook is doing fine work. Mr. Fowler is to render every assistance possible. Mr. Kellogg is preaching. He has had good services. Mrs. Kellogg is doing personal work. Pray mightily for it."

#### Divine Healing Not Mentioned.

Will you carefully observe that from beginning to end there is not the remotest allusion to the question at issue, namely, divine healing, and Dr. Matthews' endorsement of it. Not a word! That does not come within the range of these bulletins at all. They announce evangelistic meetings in the various missions connected with the First Presbyterian Church, and not a word about a meeting in the First Presbyterian Church conducted by Mr. Kellogg. Nor is there a reference in any of the bulletins—Mr. Kellogg himself making the selection, for this is the report of what he said—to the subject of divine healing.

### The Issue is Mr. Kellogg's Veracity.

Now mark: Mr. Kellogg quoted Dr. Matthews as approving of his divine healing teaching. That is the point; that is the issue, nothing else. He put Dr. Matthews' great name to that which he taught. Now then, what follows?

I will go farther,—for I have another telegram from Dr. Matthews which I will read to you in a few moments. I am not going to give you Mr. Kellogg's speech, because I tell you frankly no man has ever spoken in this pulpit in the terms used by the speaker last night; and while I am Pastor no man will utter a second sentence couched in such language. If any man ever gets in here and begins that kind of business he will not go on to the end. The gospel cannot possibly be served by such vulgarity.

Mr. Kellogg said:

"The Session of the First Presbyterian Church unanimously endorsed the J. C. Kellogg meetings."

That is what he said. And my whole point is—and I will prove it up to the hilt—that Mr. Kellogg publicly stated what is absolutely untrue, and used the name of one of the greatest preachers in America in endorsement of that which Dr. Matthews repudiates. If you want to listen to a man of that sort you may do it. Let me repeat what Mr. Kellogg said:

"The session of the First Presbyterian Church unanimously endorsed the J. C. Kellogg meetings."

Then Mr. Kellogg goes on to say:

"Why should I spend money and time sending telegrams trying to prove these things? I am under no obligation to do that whatever"; "I could send telegrams"—He could send telegrams and enquire about me! Let me tell my dear friend what I have said a hundred times all over America. For my purpose I borrow a figure from the great Spurgeon who once said, "You may write my life across the skies. I have nothing to conceal." I challenge Mr. Kellogg, or anybody else, and I have done it a hundred times, to bring forth anything they like, I do not care. I have stood in the white light of publicity, not all of it friendly, for a good many years—and have had to contend with much bigger men than Mr. Kellogg. The fact is, when a man says, "I might have sent telegrams"; "I could have done this, but did not do it", one wonders why he did not. I DID! And you shall hear them presently.

Hear this from Mr. Kellogg:

"I have a number of clippings from Seattle newspapers, copies of which I am sending back to Dr. Matthews, that repudiate everything he has said in that telegram. If I would write a telegram to a number of workers in that church sending copies of these telegrams, it would put the old doctor in a very embarrassing position."

Oh, I wish you could see Dr. Mark Matthews! I wish you could see that cedar in Lebanon walk on the platform before that great church! He is a king, not only among his own people, but in the whole city of Seattle. And to think of Mr. Kellogg's embarrassing Dr. Mark Matthews! It reminds one of Big Bill Thompson's strictures on His Majesty, King George!

Mr. Kellogg said:

"I did not see any policemen around here last night."

That was when he was paying compliments to *The Toronto Globe!* All I know is that Mr. Smith said they were sent for. That is all I know about it—and that was reported.

Now listen to another gem:

"I believe that God has greatly blessed him, but for some reason or other, Dr. Matthews got bitter against the truth of the supernatural power of the gospel, against the healing of the sick."

"I believe that God *has* greatly blessed him"! Dr. Matthews ought to be very grateful for that acknowledgment! A man known the world around! And this inconsequential, nameless, almost reputationless, unknown gentleman condescends to admit that Dr. Matthews *has done* a great work—"but for some reason"—now mark, these are not my words; they are the words of Rev. J. C. Kellogg—"for some reason or other Dr. Matthews got bitter against the truth of the supernatural power of the gospel, against the healing of the sick."

Dr. Matthews bitter against the supernatural power of the gospel! Why, he has spent his whole life proclaiming it, and is proclaiming it still. If there is a man in America who has proved by his long ministry that he believes the gospel is the "power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth", it is Dr. Mark A. Matthews, of Seattle. And because a man does not believe in the fanaticism of a man like Mr. Kellogg, he is represented as denying the supernatural power of the gospel.

On Mr. Kellogg's own confession he had no communication with Dr. Mark Matthews between last Friday night and Wednesday night. On Wednesday night Mr. Kellogg said, "Dr. Matthews got bitter against . . . the healing of the sick"—or his brand of it. If he knew that, why did he quote Dr. Matthews the previous Friday night as approving of it? Why, the man is proved—out of his own mouth—to be a charlatan, and utterly destitute of truth. The man whom he cited as his great authority for the thing he was practising Friday night, he now confesses is opposed to that very thing. What more do you want?

### Is It a Matter of Importance?

You ask, Is it a serious matter? Well, here is a man who has no money, but he wants some. Another man has plenty of money in the bank. The man who has no money knows very well that if he writes a cheque on that bank for a thousand dollars, or two thousand dollars; signed by himself, the bank will not honour it. And so he appropriates the other man's name. He signs the other man's name to a cheque. It passes the bank, and he gets the money—but after a while he is discovered. Do you know what the law calls that man? The law calls him a forger, and puts him in the penitentiary.

Here is a religious quack of no reputation, of no standing in the world, and he has some fad that he thinks will appeal to the ignorant and emotional. He wants to get them to accept that fad—and he offers it to them in the name of some great man whose stand-

ing is beyond question in the religious world. He asks his dupes to accept that vagary on the ground of that man's endorsement of it. In effect, he signs that man's name without his consent, in order that he may profit by that man's reputation. What is that? It is forgery in the religious realm. It is just as immoral, it is just as criminal as it is in the world of finance. And I say, the man who is guilty of that kind of humbug is not fit to be on any Christian platform, or to be endorsed by any Christian assembly.

If I do Mr. Kellogg an injustice, the courts are open. Let him have recourse to law. But there is one man in Toronto who will not allow the public to be humbugged by these religious charlatans. If you want it, have it. But you will have it in the face of the warning I give you, with full knowledge of the facts.

Oh, I wish—no; it would not be worth while. I was going to say if I analyzed his speech it would show you that the man is an utterly unschooled, uneducated adventurer.

Then he confesses that Dr. Matthews said to him (I quote from the stenographic report of his speech): "Kellogg, it is not in the Atonement;"—going on to say:

"I could see it in the Atonement, and he could not. He could only see it in the realm of faith, but when he got down to the facts, he had to admit that faith was in the Atonement. I proved to him that faith was in the Atonement—if it was kept up in the realm of faith, it would be in the Atonement."

If I were a school teacher I would pluck a boy in the first form who wrote such drivel as that. But in an atmosphere that is electric with excitement, clapping of hands and shouting, people do not know what they are clapping about, nor what the speaker is saying,—and neither does Mr. Kellogg, which is perfectly evident.

I leave the rest of the speech. I have only this to say at that point, and it is what I have said in *The Gospel Witness*, that I would not defile the pages of *The Gospel Witness*, nor pollute the minds of my readers, by repeating the gross vulgarities which characterized the service of last night. The gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ requires no such advocacy. Some of us stand for separation. We teach our young people that they are better away from the theatres, from all kinds of shows. But I say it advisedly: from the report of Mr. Kellogg's speech, it would be difficult to find in the vilest theatre anything that was more debasing than the speech delivered from the platform of the Gospel Tabernacle last night. People who want to get the worst there is in the theatre under a religious name, will no doubt be attracted by that kind of vaudeville performance. But surely people who have been made partakers of the grace of life, and who know something about the joy of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and who have experienced something of His refining power; must be offended and nauseated by such grossness.

#### Another Telegram.

Following Mr. Kellogg's address I wired Dr. Matthews last night, and received this telegram in reply. You see it (holding it up)? It is a Canadian National telegram—not "alleged." I have no agent in Seattle.

I addressed it to Dr. Mark A. Matthews, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington—and I presume the telegraph company found him. And from that address I received this reply. I assume that it must have reached Dr. Mark A. Matthews, and that he must have replied. I do not know who else would do it. But this is what he said:

"Dr. T. T. Shields,  
Toronto, Ont.

"Seattle, Washington,  
September 25th, 1930.

"Mr. J. C. Kellogg joined this church as a layman, January fourteenth, nineteen hundred twenty-three. He was dismissed to the Kay Street Baptist Church, Tacoma, Washington, April, nineteen hundred twenty-six. He was never a minister in this church. He never conducted meetings in the First Presbyterian Church. As a layman willing to do evangelistic work, we put him in the tent at West Seattle. When he began talking his divine healing fake stuff we stopped him. I think he helped some worker who had charge of our Sunday School at Inter-Bay after that. When he again began talking his divine healing fake stuff, we ordered him to stop. The Inter-Bay work, however, was independent, under the auspices of some one of the lay-workers. We did everything we could to help him in the tent meeting until he began his divine healing talk. All Christian people pray for the healing of the sick, but we do not allow anyone connected with any of our schools to talk divine healing stuff, for it is unscriptural. We never in any way, shape, form, or manner, endorsed Mr. Kellogg's divine healing stuff. We never heard of the young lady being cured of deafness and dumbness. Never heard even her name until we saw it in your telegram. If such a person ever worked in slums of Seattle, it was without our knowledge. We had no criticism to offer to Mr. Kellogg as a private lay-member of our church, but when he went into this fake divine healing stuff we stopped it. He has not in any way been connected with this church for four years.

(Signed) M. A. Matthews."

Do you think that is likely to be true? (Chorus of, Yes.) Do you?

All these bulletins quoted by Mr. Kellogg may have been written, I suppose they were, while these campaigns were going on. Dr. Matthews says that Mr. Kellogg worked as a lay-helper, but that when he began talking his "divine healing fake stuff", as he calls it, they stopped him. Then he began somewhere else—and they stopped him a second time. Mr. Kellogg knew that he had twice been forbidden under the auspices of the First Presbyterian Church to preach this thing, and yet, in the face of that fact, he quoted Dr. Matthews as endorsing the very thing which Dr. Mark Matthews and his session had forbidden. What do you think of a man like that?

I hold in my hand a paper published by the Gospel Tabernacle, edited by Rev. Oswald J. Smith himself, in which is an advance notice of Mr. Kellogg's coming in the following terms:

"For three years he was associated with Dr. M. A. Matthews, Pastor of the largest Presbyterian Church in the world."

"Three years associated with Dr. M. A. Matthews"! What impression would you get from that? That he had some official connection, that he was in the position of associate-minister, or assistant, or something of that sort? We have the signature of Dr. M. A. Matthews to a statement which says that he never was anything but a lay-helper; that he never had an official position; that he never did preach in the First

Presbyterian Church; and that he never was endorsed by the session of the First Presbyterian Church. What Mr. Kellogg says is absolutely untrue.

Now, dear friends, let me read a card used in the Kellogg meeting last Friday night:

"Before Mr. Kellogg will pray the prayer of faith for you, you should fulfill the following requirements. Take this card home with you, follow instructions and bring back. Read carefully and prayerfully the following Bible references every day: Isaiah 53:3-5; Matt. 8:16, 17; Mark 16:15-20; 1st Peter 2:24; James 5:13-18; Heb. 11:6; Heb. 11.

"Do you want to be healed for the glory of God?—Are you willing to give up anything that might be a hindrance or prevent your healing?—Pray and meditate much. Ask God to search your heart.

"I have prayed much that the Lord will heal me when Mr. Kellogg offers the prayer of faith according to James 5:14-16.

Name \_\_\_\_\_."

"Before Mr. Kellogg will pray the prayer of faith for you"! "I have prayed much that the Lord will heal me when Mr. Kellogg offers the prayer of faith according to James 5:14-16"—not when my great Intercessor, Who appears before the throne of God, prays for me, but "when Mr. Kellogg offers for me the prayer of faith".

#### For Jarvis St. Members.

My brethren, let me say a strong thing. This church utterly repudiates that kind of thing. We have absolutely no sympathy with it. Mr. Kellogg speaks of certain members of Jarvis Street Church going to the Gospel Tabernacle. I have tried to entertain a better opinion of the Pastor of the Gospel Tabernacle than he has now forced upon me. Once I was caught in this pulpit. A man, during war-time, was recommended to preach for me. He did so one Sunday morning, and preached the doctrine of salvation by the supreme sacrifice. He said at one point, "I will take my chances for the future of the man who dies for his country." When he sat down, and before the congregation left, I rose and said, "I must publicly dissociate myself from everything that the speaker has said this morning. I do not believe a word of it, and we will sing for our closing hymn,—

"There is a fountain filled with blood,

Drawn from Immanuel's veins,

And sinners plunged beneath that flood

Lose all their guilty stains."

On two other occasions elsewhere I have found myself on the platform with men who committed themselves to positions that were diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Word of God. And in each instance I have publicly said, "I have no sympathy with it. I disclaim all connection with this sort of thing." It was the only thing I could do. Had Mr. Smith dissociated himself from Mr. Kellogg, and declared publicly what privately he said to Mr. Fraser in half-apology, we might have entertained some semblance of respect for his sincerity. But Mr. Smith stands committed to that which Mr. Kellogg has given to the congregation of the Gospel Tabernacle.

#### Dr. Shields "Jealous"!

Mr. Kellogg talks about the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church being jealous! Reading the speech I found

nothing in it to covet whatever! And I say very emphatically to the members of Jarvis Street Church—attention, please—I will have nothing to do with the kind of thing that is served up to the public in the Gospel Tabernacle, I mean as it is being given the people this week. I conceive it to be as injurious to men, and as dishonoring to God, as any Modernism in the world. This Pastor will have nothing whatever to do with it. And if there are any members of Jarvis Street Baptist Church—will you kindly give attention—if there are any members of Jarvis Street Church who want that kind of thing, who have an appetite for it, who have that conception of what it means to prosecute the Lord's work, then I respectfully invite you to pack your bag and baggage, and go where you belong. We do not want you. I care not how many there are, you will never have that from this pulpit; nor will it ever be permitted while I am Pastor of this church. We stand, as does Dr. Mark A. Matthews, for a sane, sound, fundamental interpretation of Christianity. We will pray for the sick, and pray for the conversion of men; but we will not let people be imposed upon by such charlatans as Rev. J. C. Kellogg.

You may tell Mr. Kellogg I called him a charlatan. You may tell him all I have said to-night. It is his own fault that he is not here to hear it. He would have been given opportunity to speak or to ask any question. And we should not have objected to his reading any telegram he may have received, as they objected to Mr. Fraser's reading them the other evening.

#### REV. OSWALD J. SMITH.

In this issue of *The Gospel Witness* we print a report of the proceedings at Jarvis Street Church, Thursday, September 25th. We are not particularly concerned about the ravings of Rev. J. C. Kellogg. He is a type of religious mountebank that has been all too common the last few years. His name a month or so hence will be as little remembered as it was little known before he came. Many editors of religious papers the world over receive *The Gospel Witness*, so that they may be in a position to save people from being victimized by his quackery.

The serious part of this whole matter, to us, is that Rev. Oswald J. Smith, Pastor of the Toronto Gospel Tabernacle, should permit himself to be made a party to this fraud. Mr. Smith is a short-termed man always. He did well in his management of the Alliance Tabernacle on Christie Street, some years ago, and, by arranging some new "feature" every week or so, managed to secure a large attendance. He withdrew from that Tabernacle, and went to California and carried on in Los Angeles for a short time. Returning to Toronto, he held services for a few months in Massey Hall, calling the company of people who there assembled, the "Cosmopolitan Tabernacle." There he failed to secure any large hearing, and the attendance dwindled to such small proportions that we judge he found it impossible to carry on.

Mr. Smith then decided to go to visit certain foreign mission fields. We understand he intended to go to Borneo, but was persuaded to change his plans,

and go to Europe instead. Returning from Europe, for a little while he went from place to place pleading the interests of the Worldwide Christian Couriers, an organization composed principally of Paul Rader and himself.

During Mr. Smith's absence a company of people who had broken off from another body took the old St. James Square Presbyterian Church, and started to hold religious services there. After a while Mr. Smith identified himself with them. Like David, he became captain of a company of Adullamites, made up of disgruntled folks from several quarters, who apparently could not find excitement enough elsewhere, and had to start a centre of their own.

Mr. Kellogg said we were jealous of this aggregation. So far as we know, there was not a member of Jarvis Street Church associated with the movement. If there was, so far from being jealous, we should be rather grateful; for, as we have said in effect elsewhere, if any member of Jarvis Street had an appetite for that sort of pabulum, his or her membership in Jarvis Street was a mistake.

Still there was hope that Mr. Smith would manage to control the company, and keep them within bounds; for, truth to tell, a religious refuge of that sort is almost indispensable to a city like Toronto. If Mr. Smith had proved himself a wise and strong superintendent he would thereby have earned the gratitude of all churches and ministers in the city.

Of course people must be fed on good food, and any and every pulpit is under obligation to give the people the truth; but any one of us may be deceived, and discover that he has admitted someone to his pulpit who is unworthy of trust. But there is always a way out of such difficulty, namely, frankly to acknowledge the mistake, and disassociate one's self from the fraud. We put into Mr. Smith's hands copies of telegrams bearing the signature of Dr. Mark Matthews. Mr. Smith, we are certain, would not have called them "alleged" telegrams. He knew very well they had come from Dr. Matthews; and if he did, he must have known also that certain things which Mr. Kellogg had stated were untrue to fact. Had Mr. Smith, on this discovery, immediately repudiated Mr. Kellogg, he would have saved himself from any wilful complicity in the deception. Instead of that, in order to show his approval of Mr. Kellogg, he invited him to prolong his stay by another week.

Mr. Smith, therefore, must be held accountable for Mr. Kellogg's teaching. He permitted it from his platform, and allowed Mr. Kellogg to make untruthful statements, without any word of rebuke. We sincerely hope Mr. Smith will see the seriousness of his position, and will hasten to put himself right with the public, even at this late hour, by acknowledging his error in thus endorsing Mr. Kellogg. A copy of this issue of *The Gospel Witness* will be sent to Mr. Smith, and he is hereby informed that the columns of *The Gospel Witness* are open to him to reply in any way he may choose.

### THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE UNION OF REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCHES OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC,

October 21st to 24th, 1930,  
CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH, LONDON, ONT.

#### PROGRAMME.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21st.

##### Morning:

10.00—Meeting of Executive Board.

##### Afternoon:

2.30—Pastors' Fellowship Meeting.

##### Evening:

7.30—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

8.00—FIRST CONVENTION SESSION:

Address of Welcome.

Appointment of Committees:

1. Committee on Scrutineers.
2. Committee on Nominations.
3. Committee on Arrangements.
4. Committee on Enrolment.
5. Committee on Budget.
6. Committee on Resolutions.

Introduction of new pastors and recently ordained ministers.

9.00—Presidential Address.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22nd.

##### Morning:

9.30—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

10.00—SECOND CONVENTION SESSION:

Executive Committee's and Treasurer's Report.

Moved by..... Seconded by.....

General Discussion.

##### Afternoon:

2.00—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

2.30—THIRD CONVENTION SESSION:

Consideration of Tentative Constitution.

4.30—Inspirational Address.

##### Evening:

7.30—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

8.00—FOURTH CONVENTION SESSION:

Home Missions—Two Addresses.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23rd.

##### Morning:

9.30—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

10.00—FIFTH CONVENTION SESSION:

Resumption of the Consideration of the Tentative Constitution.

Discussion.

Report on French Evangelization.

Report on "Union Baptist Witness".

##### Afternoon:

2.00—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

2.30—SIXTH CONVENTION SESSION:

Home Missions.

Foreign Missions.

Election of Officers and Board Members.

Inspirational Address.

##### Evening:

7.30—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

8.00—SEVENTH CONVENTION SESSION.

Foreign Mission—Two Addresses.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24th.

##### Morning:

9.30—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

10.00—EIGHTH CONVENTION SESSION:

Report of Enrolment Committee.

Report of Budget Committee.

Report of Committee on Resolutions.

##### Afternoon:

2.00—Prayer and Praise Meeting.

2.30—NINTH CONVENTION SESSION:

TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY.

Unfinished Business.

Inspirational Address.

##### Evening:

7.30—Devotional Service.

8.00—TENTH CONVENTION SESSION:

Two Addresses on Education.

## Baptist Bible Union Lesson Leaf

Vol. 5

No. 4

REV. ALEX. THOMSON, EDITOR.

Lesson 42 October 19th, 1930  
Fourth Quarter.

### ABRAM AND ABRAHAM AND SARAH.

Lesson Text: Genesis, chapter 17.

Golden Text: "Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee." Genesis 17:5.

#### I. RENEWING THE COVENANT, (vs. 1-8).

The appearances of the Lord in the Old Testament are both interesting and significant. To Abram the Lord appeared on several occasions. We are not informed as to the manner of His appearance on this occasion; there may have been some special manifestation of divine glory. But at least there was the distinct sense of His presence. The time of this visitation is stated: it occurred when Abram was "ninety years old and nine", just thirteen years after the birth of Ishmael. During these years there was evidently no special divine manifestation. Did Abram's failure concerning Hagar have anything to do with this? or was it simply part of the divine plan? Attention may be drawn to the times of special divine visitation these days; the times when God draws very near to His own, or they are conscious of His blessed presence.

Several things are worthy of note in relation to this incident. First, the salutation, "I am the Almighty God: walk before me and be thou perfect". God's promises require almighty power to fulfil them. Abram must have realized this in reference to the covenant. He is assured of the fact that the one who promised is the Almighty One. There is blessed assurance in the knowledge of this fact. There is nothing too hard for Him, (18:14). There is a distinct incentive also to trust Him more implicitly and fully, to expect greater things from Him, and to attempt greater things for Him. A direction is also given concerning the life, in the statement, "walk before me" implying the true standard of life, and man's highest attainment in life, and declaring the purpose of God concerning His children.

The second thing of note is the promise relating to the covenant, "I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly", (v. 2). This indicates a renewal of the covenant, for the same had been promised before, (15:5). The nature of the promise implied the manifestation of miraculous power. The attitude of Abram is then declared; he "fell on his face; and God talked with him", (v. 3). Such an attitude denotes reverence and submission to the divine will. The same may be emphasized as necessary in these days when so much irreverence is being manifested toward holy things.

Abram's change of name is not with-

out its due significance, (v. 5). "In eastern countries a change of name is an advertisement of some new circumstance in the history, rank, or religion of the individual who bears it." God therefore was pleased to conform to this understood custom, and to indicate Abram's changed position in relation to the covenant by a change in his name. Instead of Abram, "high father", he was to be called Abraham, "father of a multitude". The promise was still one of faith, but this incident was a further evidence of its fulfilment. Abram was receiving encouragement by the way, although his faith was being tested. Such is God's method in these days. It glorifies Him when we stand the test of faith, (1. Pet. 1:7), but while undergoing the test we are not without the divine encouragement.

The duration of the covenant is said to be everlasting, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee", (v. 7). The covenant therefore is still in force. Then follows the promise concerning the land, "I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." The land of Canaan therefore belongs unto Israel by divine gift of its Creator. The descendants of Israel came into possession of that land, but they were warned if they disobeyed their Lord they would be scattered throughout the world, (Deut. 28:64) which in process of time came to pass, (2 Kings 25:11), but some day they will again possess the land nationally, and will serve their God faithfully, (Ezek. 37). Emphasis may be laid upon the nature and certainty of God's promises.

#### II. THE TOKEN OF THE COVENANT, vs. (9-14).

After the renewal of the covenant the command is given concerning obedience thereto, and the rite of circumcision is instituted. This rite was obligatory upon all males, and disobedience in relation to it was punished by the cutting off of the disobedient one from his people. Circumcision was the outward sign of the covenant, and marked the individual as belonging to God's chosen people. It was significant therefore of relationship to God, and reminded of the covenant. It distinguished the people of God from the world. Throughout the time of man's sojourn upon this earth God has sought to have a people peculiarly His own who would be known as such by obedience to His will, and in this gospel age this is still His purpose. He is calling out a people for His name, (Acts 15:14) when He desires to be distinguished from the world, not by any mere cutting off of a part of the flesh, but by a putting off of the whole of the old man through a circumcision unseen yet real. Such a circumcision is stated to be "made without hands", the "putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh", and "of Christ", (Col. 2:11-13). In this teaching there is implied a vital union with Christ, and a changed life. The saint is united with Christ in death and resurrection.

As a testimony to and a witness of this vital union with Christ in death and resurrection, our Lord instituted baptism as an ordinance in His church. The symbolism of baptism therefore is that of death and resurrection, (Rom. 6:3, 4), and the mode, immersion. This latter is denoted in the name baptism, which means immersion, and in the examples given in Scripture, (Matt. 3:16; Acts 8:38, 39) as well as in the symbolical teaching. The persons who were baptized were those in whom the blessed change of regeneration had been wrought. There is no warrant in Scripture either for infant immersion, or infant sprinkling. There is but one baptism in Scripture, that of believers, whether old or young, by immersion in water, and it is the duty as well as the privilege of each child of God faithfully to obey such teaching.

#### III. THE PROMISED SEED, (vs. 15-27).

Abraham had been instructed concerning the coming of seed, but full particulars concerning the manner of the fulfilment of the promise had not been given Him. He knew that the seed was to come out of his own loins; and he may have come to the conclusion that in some way Sarai would be used to this purpose, but his mind is set at rest by the positive statement of God that his wife was to be the mother of that seed. In recognition of this her name is changed, (v. 15), and she becomes known as a princess. Several things are stated concerning her, (v. 16).

Sarah was ninety years old and Abraham in his hundredth year. The patriarch's faith was tested by such a promise, and while we are not told that he exhibited unbelief in relation to it, yet he wondered as to its possibility. We are informed he "laughed and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old bear?" And he "said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee", (vs. 17, 18). We cannot wonder at Abraham's attitude, although it should be noted that throughout the interview he was reverent; he was upon his face before God. The evidence of sight was against the fulfilment of such a promise, but Abraham had continually to learn. And we need to be taught that with God nothing is impossible. He can bring life out of death. History bears witness to the faithfulness of God in fulfilling His word concerning Sarah, for in process of time Isaac was born, and through him nations and kings have come into being. Isaac was the one through whom the covenant was to be fulfilled, but God heard and answered Abraham's prayer concerning Ishmael. In relation to him the Lord states, "I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation", (v. 20). Again history bears witness to God's faithfulness.

God went up from talking with Abraham, after setting the time for the birth of Isaac, (vs. 21, 22). The patriarch immediately set about obeying his Lord in carrying out the command concerning circumcision, an example of the proper combination of faith and works, (James 2:14-16).