

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 Editor: ALEXANDER THOMSON

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

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada
Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 10. No. 21.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 8, 1931

Whole No. 490

The Test of Religion

It is most gratifying to find an article of this quality on the editorial page of a great city daily. "The Globe" in Toronto, and "The Gazette" in Montreal, render a real service by clear testimony to revealed religion. This article is from "The Gazette" of July 25th last.

A writer in one of our modern magazines recently undertook to tell the world why he is an unbeliever in any form of religion. He tells us that science deals with things concrete and factual and capable of experimental test, whereas religion rests itself in vague wishes and aspirations which do not admit of a similar verification. "Let us be honest." Religion denies reason. It denies the evidences of the case. It introduces elements which come not from the facts, but from the imaginations of mortals. It lacks sound proofs. It is a superstition. All the dogmas of the Christian faith are so much guesswork. They are breathing myths.

These are the writer's own phrases. They are buttressed, as he thinks, by the statement that though the sceptics have no creed and no official spokesman, yet "they exist in all communities and are most numerous where there is most enlightenment." Furthermore, it is urged that in the realm of physics mortals have a solid footing and each discovery brings to the searcher "a vivid joy." But the thing we call religion, this writer avers, is a tissue of cloudy metaphysical abstractions about God and immortality utterly beyond our touch or ken or any such test as a reasonable person can accept.

So runs this screed. One wonders whether its author has ever looked into the teachings of Jesus? To pass over his large assumption that a vast host of the noblest and purest of men and women have been simply credulous dupes, including some of the strongest intellectuals history has ever known, one wonders whether his eye has ever caught a glimpse of the Sermon on the Mount or the passage wherein Jesus speaks about making good the tree so that its fruition may be good? In one or two particulars this critic is correct. He is right in pleading for honesty. He is again right in his conclusion that life is not made up of bloodless abstractions. But when he proceeds to talk as though physical facts are the ultimate reality of the universe, or when he suggests that the Christian consciousness is a myth and disparts from solid and practical grounds, from the experimental method he deems

alone valid, his argument leaves much to be desired. Nor is it greatly amended by the statement that he has taken up this position after having tested it "by much reading and speculation."

Probably this critic has no doubt that he himself is actually alive. He does not doubt his own personality. He seems sure of the sensible touch wherever it may reach. Let us suppose that instead of the questions concerning God and immortality being the special problems he must resolve, he must needs tackle the query: "What is life?" Has any scientist yet found its answer? Have the exponents and devotees of the experimental method ever yet themselves agreed upon any definition of life which thoroughly covers all the facts and satisfies reason? Yet life in its myriad forms, from the common grassblade up to man, is presented and accepted as a reality, spite of the fact that the element of mystery inheres each atom; and Sir Oliver Lodge has stated that we know not as yet why a human hand grasping a stick at one end should cause it to wag at the other. What "concrete" test would this critic apply to the statement of Professor Tyndall, namely, that the color "blue" of the whole sky could be packed in a vest pocket snuff-box? Tyndall wrote his article to emphasize his own thesis that the scientist cannot move a step without the aid of imagination and that the secret of the light which fills our atmosphere is a "metaphysical" inference.

One other example. Some years ago at a meeting of the London Metaphysical Society, whose membership included sixty of the greatest intellectuals in Great Britain—Huxley, Gladstone, Ruskin, Morley, Fitzjames Stephens, Dr. Martineau, Dr. Ward, Father Dalgairns, and men of this calibre—the question ventilated was whether any test or experience could demonstrate to point of full proof the scientific maxim about "uniformity of natural law"? They all agreed such test could not be found. They all agreed it is a "workable hypothesis." When Mr. Huxley, who consented to this verdict, remarked that he would be glad to think that half the so-called "demonstrations" of the metaphysicians were one-tenth part as trustworthy as

the great working hypothesis of science, Dalgairns answered by saying that Huxley and all the rest of them assumed and must assume the trustworthiness of memory, of the mind, a faculty that lies back of all physical phenomena and all the data of science; yet of which there never can be any purely physical test or demonstrative proof beyond its own action. "Why deny the reality of other faculties?" it was asked. "I believe in religion for the same reason as I believe in the uniformity of natural law. I believe in God just as I believe in moral obligations. I believe in God in the sense in which I believe in space and time, pain and pleasure, right and wrong, in myself, in you, in your presence in this room: and by the selfsame instrument as I am made aware we are present and can identify each other at this meeting." So said Father Dalgairns. In other words, the senses act under the prompting of the mind and the report of the senses points back to the mind faculty which is the source of our knowledge, but not subject to any sort of mathematical, mechanic or physical test, although the causal agent of human actions and the central faculty of all human experience. Why should it be hastily assumed that the Christian religion makes severer demands upon human reason than the concepts of science, when as a matter of fact the reasoning faculty itself lies in a region no finger, no sense experiment can touch, and is known only by its inherent properties and its effects?

In whatsoever ways arguments, as such, may twist and turn, the vital processes of life never cease. They uniformly and constantly register their effects. This critic acknowledges that he is impressed by the spectacle of men everywhere putting seed into the ground, tending its increase, and patiently waiting for the harvest. It tallies with the economy of nature. It is consonant with ages of experience. It agrees with the Platonic maxim about the need for looking to the living root of things. But is not this precisely the test that our Saviour applies to the whole of human life in its moral and spiritual developments, fastening our attention, not indeed upon future realms, religious forms, abstruse speculations, etc., but rather upon the essential quality of the personal life and its vital results, just as a tree grows up from the quality of the seed in which its entire structure is coiled? "A good tree bringeth forth good fruit." This is not speculation. It is a living test. What better proof can be demanded or given? The Christian religion is securely founded upon sanctified commonsense.

ON LEARNING TO THINK.

A Lecture by Dr. T. T. Shields.

DELIVERED BEFORE THE STUDENT BODY OF TORONTO
BAPTIST SEMINARY, SEPTEMBER 29th, 1931, AND
PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF THE FACULTY.

(Stenographically reported)

I am going to take father an unfair advantage of you this morning in having Miss Lindsay take down what I say, not for your benefit, but for mine, so that I shall be able to remember it.

I heard of a minister who examined his little boy when he came home from church one Sunday morning. He asked him what the sermon was about, and the little fel-

low could not remember. He asked him what was the text; and he said he could not remember. He tried him from many points of view, then he said, "What do you go to church for?" The little fellow said, "You should not blame me, Dad, you could not remember yourself without having it written down!"

I shall discuss with you a few general principles of education, principles which apply to the acquisition of knowledge in general, and to the mastery of any particular subject.

I.

And I begin by suggesting WHAT EDUCATION IS NOT. What I say will apply, of course, to homiletics, but equally to every other subject which will engage our attention in this Seminary.

Education is not the mere acquisition of information. It is important that the mind should be thoroughly informed upon particular subjects, and upon matters in general. But one may accumulate a great mass of information, and become only animated directories, and not in any true sense be educated.

It is possible to go to the store and buy many books, build shelves in your house, and put the books on the shelves, and to have available a great mass of knowledge, and yet be utterly uneducated. When you assemble certain facts in your mind, you have done little more than store them away as one would put books on shelves. But they have not become part of you.

Students sometimes "cram" before examination time. They take notes of the lectures they have heard. They become to them as a text-book. And then just before examination time they refresh their memory so that they will have these things before them; they take them from memory's shelf and transfer them to the examination paper, like taking down a book and copying something on paper, and putting the book back. It is first in the book, and then it is on the paper; but it has nothing to do with the person who wrote it. I know not a few who have obtained university degrees, and who pass as educated people, who are not, in any true sense, educated. They have not disciplined their faculties; they have not learned to think.

We are here to learn to think, as I shall presently show you. We want this Seminary to be, in the truest sense, an educational institution; and not a mere printing shop. It is quite possible to convert the mind into a warehouse where goods are stored, and to make the mind very much like the elevators in the Canadian West, crammed to the overflow with wheat, while people roundabout are starving. Or like the gold in the United States. I suppose there never was so much gold accumulated in one country as is now accumulated in the United States. One half of the world's gold supply is stored away in American vaults, but business is paralyzed because it is not in circulation.

I have known many so-called educated people whose minds remind me of my wife's fruit cellar. There is a row of jars—I suppose they are all good, but they are hermetically sealed. There they are! But sometimes it is very difficult even to get the jar unsealed. Somebody said to me of a certain man that he was a man of great learning. I replied, "I-dare say he is. I will accept what you say. I have never seen any evidence of it, I suppose it is stored inside somewhere; but though I have never seen any evidence of his learning, I am prepared to accept your asseveration on faith."

Education, then, is not merely the acquisition of information, *nor is it the mere memorization of principles*. To assemble principles is better than the mere accumulation of unrelated facts. But it is quite possible that principles may be stored away in the mind like other items of knowledge without enriching the mind. In such case, the mind becomes not so much like a warehouse as like a locked tool-chest—the tools are there, but they are all locked up. The man has committed certain principles to memory; but he does not know how to use them: they have no relation whatever to the regular operation of his mind.

As a matter of fact, *education is much more than the development of one faculty of the mind*. It is extremely important that we should discipline our memories. The memory can be developed. The memory, like any other faculty of the mind, or of the body, can be trained; and I hope we shall endeavour to train our memories; we should train the memory to serve the other faculties of the mind as a willing servant. I shall try to show you in a few minutes how that may be done.

But memory is not the only faculty of the mind. I hope you will give careful attention to the subject of Psychology, so that you may know something of your own mental machinery. But while studying books on the subject, be sure to study yourself—analyze your own mind, and study its operation as you do the working of the engine of your car. There are many people who drive a car who do not know how the engine operates. I knew a man—I know him now—with whom I have driven sometimes. He drives a car occasionally, but I have often said of him that if anything were to go wrong with the engine, he would quite likely look for the trouble in the back tire! He has not a mechanical mind. He drives a car, but he does not know the principles by which the motor operates. And there are many people who have never thought of the elements which go to make up this "headpiece" of ours—as Dickens would call it—this thinking machine, if indeed it is a thinking machine, as it ought to be! Hence the value of the subject of Psychology.

One element in our mental constitution is the faculty of memory; but it is not the only one, although it is the only one that some people cultivate—while, of course, some people do not even cultivate that. But some do develop great capacity for memorization: they can remember things which other people have produced; thus they store things away in their memories.

I knew a professor in a certain university. I do not know how many degrees he had. He was a great reader; he read everything in sight. He could always give you the opinions of Professors Dodge and Bounce, and all the rest of them. But he never had any ideas of his own. You never could get him to think out a problem for himself. He had developed his memory, but there was nothing manufactured on the premises. His mind was like a warehouse with rows of shelves on which were piled bales of goods "made in Germany" and elsewhere—a sort of cafeteria, or groceteria, or an "eria" of some sort—I fear I cannot accurately designate it. His mind had no facilities for taking raw materials and manufacturing them into useful ideas. His mind was not a factory; he had but a one-track mind: he had developed one faculty only—memory. Such a mind becomes, not a fountain but a cistern; nothing comes out but what first goes in—and sometimes that is not very much.

By all means let us develop the memory. But let us develop something more than that. Education is not the development of a single faculty of the mind.

What we need is a *symmetrical development*. I remember a man who was all hands and head—no legs. He drove himself about in a wheeled chair. His arms were particularly strong (because he was constantly driving his chair about—but he was only part of a man. He did the best he could with what faculties he could command.

There are many mentally lame and deformed people. They are lop-sided. We used to have a man come to this church who had a peculiarly shaped head. (I would not refer to him if there were any chance of your ever seeing him, because I would not like to make a remark on anyone's personal appearance, but it serves me as an illustration). His head had a great bulge on the right side, almost like a second head. He was deformed. And there is a mental deformity, the development, or rather the overdevelopment, of one faculty and the atrophy of all the others. True education is not that.

Will you remember this? *Education is not effected, or, let me change that word to affected, by any truth which remains strictly objective to the mind*. Until the thing has become more than objective, until that which was objective becomes also subjective and part of the mind itself, objective truth has made no contribution to one's education.

If you want sound Psychology, or sound anything else, you must come to the Book. If you would learn pedagogy, study the Book. I sometimes think the Bible could be used as a text-book for all our studies. There are no sermons in the world comparable to the sermons printed in the Bible. There is revealed the divine art of preaching. But to this principle I direct your attention: in the kindergarten stage the Lord taught the people with a blackboard, so to speak. He wrote His law on tables of stone, just like Dr. Clark and Mr. Brown will write Greek characters on the blackboard. But as long as they are on the blackboard only, they will not make you a Greek scholar.

What is the difference between the Old Testament and the New? The Lord said, "I will take that law that is on the blackboard and write it in your minds; I will put it within you, into your hearts, so that it will become part of you, and you will do what I want you to do not from compulsion, but from impulsion." When it has become part of you, it will come out from you: "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them." I affirm, therefore, that while any truth remains purely, exclusively, objective, it is no part of my education.

I read a scripture. There it is in the Book. I read it, and forget it; but it is still in the Book. It does me no good. If you want moral and spiritual education you have it here: "Thy word" have I read? No; "Thy word have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against thee." Our minds are developed just in the measure in which this objective truth becomes part of us.

So much for the negative side of it.

II.

EDUCATION, THEN, IN ITS WIDEST SENSE IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WHOLE MAN.

Sometimes we speak of physical education. What do we mean? We do not mean merely the study of a book on how to keep well, the study of principles which govern

the science, or art, or whatever you call it, of swimming. We mean by physical education the development of our bodies, the whole body, that we have a body that will answer to our will, so that we shall be strong and healthy and athletic, able to walk and run and jump, and do whatever a sound body ought to do. In many institutions they have professors of physical education. We are speaking this morning particularly of mental development. All the faculties of the mind have to be brought into play. In physical education, not the feet only, but the hands, the whole body must be exercised. And so in the development of the mind: every mental power must be given its proper work to do so that all the faculties of the mind will be developed.

I was speaking to a man recently who expected to come to the Seminary this fall. He said he had not been at school for ten years, but at work. I said, "You are likely to have rather a hard time in the beginning. You will have to learn how to concentrate upon your tasks. You will be likely to feel sleepy when you read a book." He said, "I not only feel sleepy, but reading is the best way to put me to sleep always. I am so tired at night that I can pick up a book and read a page, say the words to myself, and not know a thing that I have read, and then go to sleep—just tired out." Well, had he come to us—and he will come to us later—he would have had to whip his mental powers into action so that they would be subject to his will, so that he would be able to turn his mind upon a given task and concentrate all his powers upon the problem before him.

That is what you are here for—to learn how to use your minds, not merely to assemble items of information.

Observe, also, that *it is possible to commit things to memory, to make certain truths, or certain principles, a part of your memory, and yet for these things to remain objective to the rest of your mind.* Do you understand what I mean? The memory may be the library in the house, and there may not be a book anywhere else. The door of the library may be locked, and the rest of the house may be without enlightenment at all—the thinking faculties of the mind, with which we shall later deal, may be unrelated because unexercised. Only as these principles of knowledge become a part of our mental furnishings, permanent fixtures in the house, are we educated in the particular principles concerned.

There are some things in this room that do not belong to the room. You can remove this chair, you can remove the piano, you can take down these fixtures: they are not part of the room.

Take the alphabet as an example. What is the alphabet? A—B—C? Did you ever learn it? It is so long ago you have forgotten! But of what value are these letters? Considered apart, singly, they have no value at all. They are of value only as they are related to each other; and they are of value to you only as you know how to relate them to each other. Here are two letters at the beginning of the alphabet, a—c. And there is one farther on in the alphabet. The little child sees the first letter. It is "A". She does not know what it means particularly. And down here there is another, a straight line and a piece across the top of it, and it is "T". And that little child learns the alphabet, a-b-c-d, and so on. But by and by she learns to take the letter "C" and put it before the letter "A", and to take that letter from nearer the end of the alphabet, and say, "Oh, that is my pussy!" c-a-t, cat!

As we progress, the alphabet becomes part of us, and we use it automatically. You never for a moment think of spelling out a word as you write. You wrote your names just now. If it were Smith, you did not say, "Let me see. 'S'. What next? 'M'. Yes. 'T'. I must be careful to dot that 'T'. 'T'. I must cross that 'T'." That is not how you did it. You wrote that name as though it were one letter. All the letters of the alphabet have become so fixed in your mind that automatically they find their place. And so in all your writing you no longer laboriously spell the word out: you write it with ease.

When you have learned thus to use the alphabet, in respect to the alphabet you are educated; you are educated in the alphabet; you know how to use it. You are not educated in the alphabet when it is merely a-b-c-d, and so on, and nothing more than that. Only as that which was first of all objective, became subjective, so that you could shut your eyes and see the alphabet, and you knew that there were a-b-c, and so on, and when you later learned to put all those letters in different relationships, and to spell them, and they began to represent certain ideas—in respect to the alphabet you became the master of it; you were learned in that particular department of knowledge—you were educated.

Education means outleading, the development of the mind; not putting something into the mind, but so training the mind that it can put something out; it can produce things.

Take another illustration, the multiplication table. We all learned it; and it seemed perhaps to be rather a useless exercise just to learn that off by heart; twice one are two, twice two are four, twice three are six, and all the rest of it. And I should not be surprised if I could find an accountant in the city, perhaps someone who has an actuarial degree, or perhaps an astronomer who is accustomed to accumulating staggering figures, were I to say to either of them, "Dr. So-and-So, please repeat the multiplication table", he might stumble before he got through with it. And yet in his regular work he uses every possible combination of figures without an error, as accurately as an adding machine. I have seen—always with the profoundest admiration—bookkeepers at work with long lines of figures. They just go up and down the columns, you know, as I should read a book. They not only know the multiplication table, but long experience has converted their mind into an adding machine, until every possible combination of numbers has passed under review, and six and seven are not thirteen—they do not take the time to say, six and seven are thirteen; somehow or another they run up all those figures, and they all fall together at the bottom of the column in an accurate sum. They have made their own multiplication table; every conceivable combination has come before their mind, and their mind works like a machine. In the matter of numbers they are educated, they know the multiplication table. The multiplication table has been absorbed, and it is part of the mental furnishing.

There is Brother Davies down there. He has just come from Wales. I will tell him something this morning that he does not know. In one respect, I venture to say he is not educated: he is not educated in the matter of dollars! When he goes into a store, and the clerk says something will cost one dollar, he will say, "Let me see. That is four shilling and some-

thing!" Is that not so, Brother Davies? ("Yes, sir.") He has to convert it into pounds, shillings, and pence. I found when I went back to England after some years of absence, and people said to me, "That is a pound", or "Twenty shillings", or whatever it was; or "That is half a crown", or, "One and six", I said, "Let me see! Half a crown! Yes; that is sixty cents!" But I have been back and forth to England so often I can think in pounds, and I can think in dollars,—but that is almost my only relation to those important commodities! Do you see what I mean?

You are not the master of a thing until it has become so much a part of you that it enters into your thinking. You will be studying Greek. Now who in the world wants to think Greek? Ah, but some of the greatest thinkers the world ever knew thought in nothing but Greek. While the principles of that language are not a part of you, or while they are stored in your memory only, so that you must make an effort to recall those principles, as when you take your New Testament, and you read something, and you say, "Let me see now! What does that mean?" and you turn to your lexicon to find it—you are not a Greek scholar while you have to do that. You are not really learned in any science, linguistic or otherwise, until it becomes a part of you. I suppose there are men—and I dare say women too—who think Greek. I hope you will be able to do so. But until you do, you will not be the master of that, or by the same principle, of any language.

Principles become part of our mental equipment—no, the word "equipment" is not strong enough. That is a picture on the wall, that is a chair, that is a table, that is an electric light fixture. These principles must become, not part of our mental *equipment*, but part of our mental *constitution*—they must enter into the very fibre of our beings, until they are part of our personalities. That is education.

Apply that to Homiletics, if you like. If the principles of orderly and logical thought govern, and we learn to think in an orderly fashion; if the reasoning faculties are brought into play, and we learn to relate things one to another, and to think logically, when we begin here and reason to a conclusion, when we preach we shall preach after the same fashion.

Somebody said to me a while ago that he went to hear a certain preacher. He was asked how he liked the preacher. The man was merely supplying; the church had no Pastor. I do not know whether he was supposed to be what is sometimes called "a candidate" or not. I hope you will never be candidates in that sense. But somebody said, "Did you like the preacher?" "Well", he said, "if that poor fellow wants a job, I am not going to stand in his way." That was a terrible criticism, was it not? He did not tell them, but he told me this: "When I went to college, our professor of Homiletics used to tell us that a sermon must have at least three things: it must have *order*, it must have *progress*, and it must have *unity*." That is not bad, is it?

If we have learned to think in an orderly fashion, and if we have learned to make progress in our thought, there will be a glorious unity in the assembling of our material, and it will all march toward one end. When a man preaches after that fashion he will not need many notes, because his mind will be trained

to logical thinking, and that which went in—or which he thought out—will come out again. Then we shall be able to preach spontaneously: like Tennyson's brook, we shall just "go on"—but I hope not "for ever"! I would rather have you preach like a flowing stream, which bubbles up and over, than like a—how shall I describe it? "Firstly"; and then the formal A-B-C, making the effort more like a wheezing pump, pumping out: "firstly, secondly, thirdly." That is not preaching. I have no objection to the "One, two, and three", or the "A-B-C"—or "X-Y-Z", if you like. But be sure you have your material arranged in an orderly fashion. And let it be spontaneous, both in its thought and expression. And it will be only as we learn to think. Do not let your mind be like one of those butter-machines. Did you ever see one in a restaurant? I thought of it only this minute. They put the butter in in bulk, and then jerk it out in little patties.

There are some sermons that are like cement blocks: one—two—three—four—five—and six; and you know exactly what is coming next. There are some preachers who are homiletically orthodox—they are all trinitarians in this, that they believe in one—two—and three! No sermon is complete without it!

III.

What I am insisting upon is that we should train ourselves to think. How are we to do that? Well, nothing can be truly learned except by thinking. You may take something from a page that you do not understand—a word, which means very little to you except that it is an assembly of vowels and consonants representing a certain sound, and that it is supposed to mean something, but really it does not mean much to you. You take that word, or that collection of words, and you force it upon your mind; just as you would press a rubber stamp until it leaves an impression. And you say, "Now I have it!" You have not! It is not yet a part of you. You have learned nothing until you understand it, until you know the why of it.

A man told me the other day that in talking to a business man who had been very successful, he had asked him, "To what do you attribute your success in business, Mr. So-an-So?" He replied, "I do not know that I can tell you in a few words; but I will tell you one principle: I always have a reason for what I do. I understand why I do it. If anything succeeds which I do spontaneously, without thought, I subject that to a critical examination to discover why it succeeded, and why it should be repeated." As a business man he was educating himself in the principles of business; he was learning the philosophy of business, to be not merely an empiricist, but a scientist, to know why certain things were so.

We learn only by thinking. What is thinking? Can anyone tell me? What do you mean by thinking? It is more than reverie. It is more than allowing your mind to drift along a stream of consciousness amid a flotsam of unrelated ideas.

I must refer again to our little friend Mush. Mush sometimes sits down on the curb, and cups his chin in his hands, and says, "I am just going to think with my own brain."

How do you think? With your own brain? What is it to think? It is more than mental recitation. I could recite, for instance, a passage of Scripture; I

have committed it to memory, and then I mentally recite it. I repeat it mentally again and again. But that is not thinking: that is only reciting it mentally. That is not thinking. Nor is meditation necessarily thinking, although it comes nearer to it.

Now how shall we learn to think? Many people think they are thinking, when they are not! Thinking is more than reviewing the pictures on memory's wall, the picture of a book, or of any other thing.

Thinking involves perception; thinking means seeing things mentally, hearing things mentally, recognizing things mentally, for what they are. I think I may go farther than that, and say that thinking involves a differentiating perception, a perception that will distinguish between things that differ.

Let us see if we can make it objective. Here is a Bible, there is a red book, and here is a brown one. Suppose these to be mental objects in my memory, I see three things. But that is all I see. Well, numerically I have perceived that there are more than one: there are three. And then I wonder what they are. One is black, one is red, and one is brown. Yes. Now I have differentiated between them; I see they are not one, there are three. And then I distinguish between their colours. One is black, one red, and one brown. Then I wonder what they are. I subject them to further mental scrutiny. Oh, yes, I see now! I have another idea! One is a Bible. And what are the others? Why, they are both hymn books; one is brown and one is red; the only difference between them in that they are different in colour, they are not different in any other respect. I have learned to distinguish between these objects that are in my mind, and to relate them one to the other.

There is a great difference between a clear mental perception which distinguishes between various ideas, while relating them to one another, and the mere groping along through a maze of indistinguishable mental nonentities like a blind man on a foggy night. But that is how some people think. Some preachers are so hazy in their thinking that I do not wonder they need notes. I do not know how they could ever remember such a tangled skein of ideas if they did not have it written down. In some cases there is no logical relation between the various elements of their discourse.

All this suggests the place of ideas in our thinking. What is an idea? A mental concept. There is something that I have in my mind, a mental picture. I examine it, and bring to bear upon it all my perceptive powers that I may identify and designate it. But how can I have an idea without a word with which to clothe it? That is a moot point, as to whether one can think without words, and if so, what relation the idea has to the word. Is an idea an invisible spirit in a verbal tabernacle? Is it a hazy something that becomes visible only as it is clothed with a word? Or is it really a form in itself that requires a word for its expression?

As we think these things through, I am sure which ever may be correct, we shall learn the importance of correct speech. We shall learn the necessity of distinguishing between things that differ. We shall feel the

need of words of varying and delicate shades of meaning to express our varying ideas. Careless speech always implies indifferent thinking.

Now let me take an illustration. Just now I said that principles become part of our mental equipment, then I changed that and said, "No, not mental equipment. I need a stronger word." Equipment is external, superficial, it is not part of the thing itself. So I changed it and said "Principles become part of our mental constitution." Why did I change from "equipment" to "constitution"? Because they are two different concepts. The word "equipment" did not fit my idea; I needed a stronger word, expressive of that which is essential, of the essence of a thing, hence I chose the word "constitution".

As we thus train ourselves to think, every faculty of the mind will be brought into exercise.

I will leave the subject of Psychology—the science which deals with the elements that make up our mental constitution—to Dr. Clark to discuss with you. I have tried in a simple and almost impromptu lecture to show you that we become educated in the measure in which we learn to bring all the faculties of the mind into play, and make them all subject to our will; so that just as I can lift my hand, or put it down; as I can walk, or stand, or sit down, or go east or west, because my members are subject to my will, so I am able to bring all my faculties to bear upon a particular subject, to the exclusion of everything unrelated to it, and so think my way through my problems to a solution.

The world needs thinkers, not mere animated gramophones of varying designated "degrees" of uselessness.

I have discussed with you some general principles of education, which apply not only to Homiletics, but also to Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Biblical Theology, Systematic Theology, and every other subject. May we all learn to think.

BOOKS

By

DR. SHIELDS

"CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT."

A series of Thursday evening Bible Lectures
from Genesis to II. Samuel.

"THE MOST FAMOUS TRIAL OF HISTORY."

A series of sermons preached in Jarvis Street
Church, on "The Trial of Jesus."

Price Fifty cents a volume postpaid.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

AN INCOMPARABLE LOVE.

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Canada, Sunday Evening, October 4, 1931.

(Stenographically Reported.)

"Thy love to me was wonderful."—II. Samuel 1:26.

Most of you are familiar with the general outline of the story of the immortal love of David and Jonathan. Jonathan was the son of Israel's first king, and heir-apparent to the throne. David was brought into prominence from the sheepfold. Miraculously he had been enabled to slay the giant. He was anointed to be king over Israel in Saul's stead. Thus he became, without his choice, Saul's rival. So great was his popularity that Saul became jealous of him, and when Israel's maidens sang, "Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands", Saul complained, "They have ascribed unto David ten thousands, and to me they have ascribed but thousands: and what can he have more but the kingdom?"

Notwithstanding, Jonathan, the crown prince, as we should call him, fell in love with him. The soul of each was knit to the other, and each loved the other as his own soul.

David's early career was a very stormy one, and his experiences were made the more painful because of Saul's unreasoning jealousy. But Jonathan, in the midst of it all, remained true to his friend. He proposed that they should enter into a covenant with each other. The covenant was made and ratified, and David swore by the Lord that he would not cut off his kindness from Jonathan's house for ever.

Then you recall that Saul and Jonathan fell together on Gilboa's mount, and the first chapter of second Samuel contains that marvellous, that matchless, eulogy pronounced by Israel's bard, over his greatest foe and his greatest friend. Of Jonathan he said, "Very pleasant hast thou been unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women."

There are no illustrations of the great principles of redemption to be found anywhere which are comparable to the illustrations with which this inspired book abounds. I take this story of the love of Jonathan this evening to illustrate a greater love than his. We may perhaps learn something of the love of God to us in Christ as we view Jonathan in comparison and contrast with great David's greater Son.

I.

I begin with this observation, that the love of Jonathan was really A NATURAL RESPONSE TO THE COMELINESS AND UNUSUAL CHARM OF THE SON OF JESSE.

It is not difficult to like some people, because *they are naturally likeable*. Some people come into the world with a special advantage. They are people of gracious carriage, of fine natural deportment, and of attractive disposition. There are some people to whom you find yourself drawn on your first meeting. You cannot help saying, "I rather like that man." Or of some lady to

whom you are introduced you say, "What a charming personality she has!" There are people who are like magnets: they draw others to themselves. There are others of rough exteriors who are anything but lovely or lovable. They may be well furnished within, there may be some gold beneath the rugged surface; but, externally, there is nothing to commend them.

David was ruddy, and the Bible says of a "beautiful countenance". Sometimes people speak of "little David". I suppose, in contrast with Goliath of Gath, he may have been small; but there is nothing in Scripture to indicate that David was little of stature. He may have been, and probably was, of lesser physique than Saul. When he put on Saul's armour he found himself uncomfortable, but perhaps not so much because it was of the wrong size, as because he was unaccustomed to it. I rather think David was a man of splendid physique, of very attractive appearance. The Bible never uses superlatives carelessly, and since it describes him as a man of "beautiful countenance", I am inclined to think he must have been a man of unusual charm. And when he came back from the field, holding the head of Goliath in his hand, while the acclamations of Israel's multitudes made the welkin ring with his praises, I should not wonder if Jonathan said to himself, "What a splendid fellow he is! I love him."

People who are outwardly attractive have a great advantage over some of the rest of us who need to be known for half a century before anybody will see anything worthwhile in us. Some of us might have a chance if we could live to be as old as Methuselah!

Anyone who is thus handicapped has a great deal to overcome. Fortunate are the Davids who are of such attractive appearance that everybody falls in love with them the first time they meet.

But how different is the love which God has for us in Christ! What is there attractive morally and spiritually about any of us? What is there in which a holy God could find pleasure? What qualities have we that would lead God to delight in us? It is said that Jonathan "delighted" in David. He loved to think of him. It was a kind of spiritual exhilaration to him to recall the countenance of his friend, and to pass his splendid record in review. What is there about us—I say not about our doing, but about our being, what we are in ourselves essentially,—that could be pleasing to the omnivident gaze of God? And yet; notwithstanding our native ugliness, notwithstanding that sin has so marred the glorious image in which we were made as utterly to deface the last line of resemblance to Him Who is our Creator, notwithstanding the wreck and ruin, the Bible says that God loves us. How wonderful indeed is the love of God!

Furthermore, *David had done nothing to incur Jonathan's personal displeasure.* There was nothing in his record that could incite Jonathan to anger. He had never been his enemy in thought, much less in word or deed. There was nothing in his record that was out of harmony with his attractive appearance. There was nothing about David that made it hard for Jonathan to love him. It seems to me that, in many respects, his was a perfectly natural love.

But "God is angry with the wicked every day." There never has been a day that you and I have not broken God's law. We have defied Him to His face. Even our thoughts have been contrary to Him. The whole set and bias of our nature is against Him. The carnal mind, not only in its expression, but in its nature and constitution, in its very warp and woof, is enmity against God, antagonism toward God, alien to everything God is. And yet He has set His love upon sinners. How marvellous that is!

On the positive side of it *there was much in David's record to inspire a spirit of gratitude* in Jonathan toward the son of Jesse, for at a time of national crisis when all Israel was filled with fear, David had stepped into the breach, he had been God's instrument for the accomplishment of a great task and a glorious victory. When Jonathan appeared before the king as David's advocate he said, "His works have been to thee-ward very good. He has never done thee any evil. He has been thy servant and thy friend. His whole life has been at the king's disposal. Why should the king hate him?"

Have our works to Godward been good? Have we any good works to our credit? I am aware that people are beginning to talk about God. We read articles in the newspapers now as though, after all, perhaps God has something to do with this world. The Premier recently said that nothing but the grace of God can save the world. Coming from one in such an exalted position, that remark has special value, I grant you. But it is nothing new.

Men have treated God as an absentee God. Many here have done so—as though He had nothing to do with this world, as though He had no right to interfere with human affairs. Men by nature are enemies in their minds by wicked works. That is the attitude of the natural mind toward God. Never was it more apparent than it is to-day. The general attitude is not merely anti-Christian, but it is anti-God. Atheism, both practical and theoretical, is becoming increasingly rampant. And yet, though this world, a colony of that vast and immeasurable empire of which He is the King and the sovereign Ruler—though this world has ever been in arms against its rightful Lord, in spite of our sins, it is written, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son." Verily His love to us is wonderful, far more wonderful than Jonathan's love to David.

Then I would remind you further on the positive side, that *Jonathan's love for David was abundantly reciprocated*, for David loved Jonathan just as much as Jonathan loved him; and love begets love. I should not desire the closer acquaintance of any man who is not moved by the affection of his dog. You cannot help feeling tender toward anybody who loves you, whether you want them to love you or not. Whether there be any sort of affinity on natural grounds between you or not, if you know that a man or woman entertains a high regard for you, thinks of you with respect, and perhaps some

measure of Christian affection, you cannot help reciprocating it. But it is hard work loving anybody when you know that every breath he draws is one of envy, hatred, and malice. When one breathes out threatening, as did Saul of Tarsus, it takes the grace of God to love such an one, does it not? Jesus Christ said, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." Why did He say that? Because He was Himself the supreme Exemplification of the principle He expounded, and which He would inculcate in the lives of His people. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." His love to us is wonderful. It is the outstanding wonder, the most stupendous miracle, of all the mighty manifestations of what God is. Your sin and mine could not extinguish His love for us. Wonder of wonders, God loves us still,—

"I am so glad that our Father in heaven
Tells of His love in the Book He has given:
Wonderful things in the Bible I see;
This is the dearest, that Jesus loves me.

"Though I forget Him, and wander away,
Still He doth love me wherever I stray;
Back to His dear loving arms do I flee,
When I remember that Jesus loves me."

II.

Let us now approach this subject from another angle for a moment, for you will always find both contrast and comparison when you turn to the record of a human life to find an illustration of the Lord Jesus. A human life can parallel His only so far. He always transcends us. There is always a contrast as well as a comparison. I have spoken of the contrast; let us look for a moment at THE COMPARISON.

The love of Jonathan impressed David as being wonderful *because it was utterly selfless, utterly unselfish.* He gave his heart without reserve to his friend. And David, in his modesty, could discover nothing in himself to elicit, to deserve that extraordinary affection. As he thought of it he said, "It is wonderful that the son of a king should love me."

Why does God love us? You might just as well ask why the sun shines. The earth does not attract the sun. The sun does not shine because of the earth: it shines because it is of its very nature to shine. It is itself light, and the source of light. The fact that God loves you is not to be accounted for by any worthiness in you, by anything in human nature that calls forth the love of God. He loves because God is love, as the sun is light. He loves because He cannot help loving.

How God has been libelled! How the devil has lied about our gracious God! From the beginning, when God put a hedge about that which He, in His wisdom, knew would ruin the creature He had made, as a father or mother would keep a sharp knife away from a child, the devil said, "God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. He is a jealous God. He wants all this to Himself. Were I in your place I would not obey Him. I would have my own way." He lied about God, and has been lying about God ever since.

His first lie was so successful that he has been making new clothes for it ever since; for every heresy that ever cursed the church has been some new expression of that ancient misrepresentation of God.

If you and I could only believe the love that God has for us, if every man and woman could, without reserve, come to believe in the love of God, it would revolutionize our lives; it would effect a change in us as we receive this truth: God's love is unselfish. He loves because He is God, and it is His nature so to do.

I remind you also that *it cost Jonathan a kingdom to love David*. Saul was amazed at it, and one day he said to him, "Thou son of the perverse rebellious woman, do not I know that thou hast chosen the son of Jesse to thine own confusion . . . For as long as the son of Jesse liveth upon the ground, thou shalt not be established, nor thy kingdom. Wherefore now send and fetch him unto me, for he shall surely die. Do you not know that he is standing in your way? that if you go on loving him, you will lose your kingdom?" We sing sometimes, especially at Christmas time,—

"Thou didst leave Thy throne and Thy kingly crown
When Thou camest to earth for me;
But in Bethlehem's home there was found no room
For Thy holy nativity."

Apart from the Cross altogether, have you ever considered what it cost God to be "made in the likeness of men"? Oh, the infinite stoop of Deity, not to humanity made in the likeness of God, but to humanity made in the likeness of the devil; for Jesus came in the likeness—of what? "The darkness of sinful flesh". The Holy One choosing the tabernacle of these depraved natures. Why? Because He loved us. While He was Himself absolutely sinless He identified Himself with a sinful race. This was love indeed.

Jonathan stood in David's place. David said once to Jonathan, "I am afraid to go and stand before the king. I know his displeasure." And Jonathan replied, "You stay in the field. I will go and take your place. Thou shalt be missed, for thy place will be empty; but I will be there." Saul was not troubled by David's absence the first day, but when he came not to meat the second day he asked Jonathan the cause of his absence. Jonathan said, "David earnestly asked leave of me to go to Bethlehem." Then it was that Saul said, "Thou hast chosen the son of Jesse to thine own confusion." And when Jonathan pleaded in David's behalf, the king took the javelin that was at his side, reserved for David, and in a fit of anger he hurled it at his son.

No one need be afraid of unrighteous anger. No brave man is afraid of a bandit, of unlawful anger; but it is a terrible thing to be under the law: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God", to have outraged every law of God, and to deserve the wrath of the Holy Ruler of the universe,—this is a truly terrible plight.

That is our position. Our case is lost before we begin to plead. We have no defence, nothing to say but, "Guilty". Yet this Friend of ours, because He loved us so much, undertook to plead the cause of those whom He knew were deserving of death. He did it by standing in our room and stead before a holy God. Jonathan said to the king, "David is innocent. Why shed innocent blood?" And David said, "Jonathan's was a wonderful love." But our Jonathan, as our Advocate, in our behalf,

pleaded guilty; He knew we were not innocent. He bared His bosom to the shaft of divine justice,—

"Jehovah bade His sword awake,
O Christ, it woke 'gainst Thee;
Thy blood the flaming blade must slake,
Thy heart its sheath must be.
All for my sake, my peace to make;
Now sleeps that sword for me."

Verily, His is a wonderful love.

Just *once or twice did Jonathan intercede in his friend's behalf*, but our Jonathan has taken His place before the King to be our Advocate for ever. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our's only, but also for the sins of the whole world"; "Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Eternal Love is on the throne, and intercedes with the infinite holiness of God in behalf of us poor sinners. What wonderful love is that!

III.

This word, and I have done. There came A DAY WHEN DAVID WROTE ALL THE BLESSINGS OF HIS FRIENDSHIP WITH JONATHAN IN THE PAST TENSE. The news came of the death of Saul and Jonathan together at Gilboa, and David turned back the pages of his history, saying, "Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided: they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions. Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul, who clothed you in scarlet, with other delights, who put on ornaments of gold upon your apparel. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle! O Jonathan, thou wast slain in thine high places. I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan; very pleasant art thou unto me?" Oh, no! He has gone out of his life now—"very pleasant *hast thou been* unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women. How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished."

Blessed be God, we shall never have to write the love of our Jonathan in the past tense. His love to us is wonderful. And it never was more wonderful than it is at this moment. In spite of all the storms and conflicts of life, no matter what may come to us, He loves us with an everlasting love. And when we have been ten million years in heaven we shall still be saying, "His love to me is wonderful."

I am glad there is one bright spot in the present outlook. I cannot find very much round about us to cheer me, can you? I do not know anybody who can just now. Terribly perplexed are we all. But I point you to a place where the sun is shining. God is on the throne, and in the end all will be well. Our gracious Lover is seated "on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Meanwhile, He is the Lover of our souls who will never cease to love us.

What better can we do than sing,

"Jesus, Lover of my soul,
Let me to Thy bosom fly."

(Ten came forward in response to the invitation.)

Baptist Bible Union Lesson Leaf

Vol. 6

No. 4

REV. ALEX. THOMSON, EDITOR

Lesson 43 October 25th, 1931
FOURTH QUARTER

THE BROKEN LAW

Lesson Text: Exodus, chapter 32.

Golden Text: "Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him." Exodus 32:26.

Daily Bible Readings.

Monday—Deut. 9:7-21.

Tuesday—Deut. 32:35-43.

Wednesday—Is. 46:1-13.

Thursday—Acts 7:37-43.

Friday—I Cor. 10:6-20.

Saturday—Ps. 29:1-11.

I. THE GOLDEN CALF, (vs. 1-6).

In this lesson there is recorded a very sad event in the history of Israel, in the falling into idolatry of practically the whole nation. It seems almost incredible that such an event should take place, but to those who know human nature the possibility of it is quite understood. The old nature is ever open to suggestions of evil, and always ready to carry them out. The sin here recorded was committed in a sacred place, and by a people occupying an exclusive position, and we learn therefrom that in no place or position are we secure from the possibility of sin. The desire in this direction comes from an evil heart, (Jer. 17:9; Matt. 15:19). It is only as God has full control of the life that the old nature is overcome, (Rom. 6:12-14), and watchfulness is needed at all times to this end. The sin was committed at Mount Sinai, during the giving of the law by God, in the absence of Moses in the mount to receive the law, and while Aaron, the older brother, (7:7), was in charge. The people having grown tired of waiting for the return of Moses, came to Aaron and said unto him, "Up, make us gods, which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him", (v. 1). Disrespect for their leader is shown in this request, also forgetfulness of their God. Aaron complied with their request, and directed them to break off their earrings and give them to him. And he received them at their hand, and from them made a golden calf, (vs. 2-4). And he built an altar before it, and proclaimed a feast to the Lord, (v. 5). "And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." (v. 6).

In this description there is a combination of worship and pleasure, of Jehovah's commands and Egypt's customs. The ox was the god of Egypt, the offerings were made in the name of the Lord, and both, here, were an abomination unto God. There must be no admixture of the world in His worship. The Israelites sinned grievously in thus uniting them. Added to that they exhibited heathenish conduct (v. 25). Many persons are willing to be religious if they can gratify their sensuous desires at the same time. Note the worldliness in many churches, and the corruption of the services, until there is but an apology for spirituality left. In their conduct the Israelites manifested rebellion against God, the influence of Egypt, a type of the world, loss of faith, and a desire to walk by sight, a backslidden condition of heart, loss of their distinct and distinctive separated pilgrim character, the victory of the flesh over the spirit, and a fearful and dangerous example. Explanation should be made of the right way in which to worship God, (John 4:23), and of the necessity and blessedness of real separation unto Him, (2 Cor. 6:13-7:1).

II. THE RETURN FROM THE MOUNT, (vs. 7-18).

While such awful conduct was being manifested on the plain, a different scene was taking place in the mountain. There Moses, accompanied by Joshua, was in communion with Jehovah, receiving from Him the law for the governing of the nation. On the commission of the sin of idolatry by Israel, Moses received the command to descend from the mount, and he is informed of the turning aside of his people, (vs. 7, 8). The Lord also makes known His anger against them, terming them a "stiff-necked people"; expresses His intention of venting His wrath against them, and intimates that He will make of Moses a great nation, (vs. 9, 10). The response of Moses is a prayer for the restraining of the divine wrath on the basis of God's glory, and it receives a favourable answer, (vs. 11-14). Following this, Moses turned "and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand; written on both their sides"; by the hand of God, (vs. 15, 16). Coming within hearing of the camp, the noise of the people ascends to their ears, interpreted by Joshua as the noise of war, and by Moses more rightly as the "noise of them that sing", (vs. 17, 18). Several things are worthy of note in this section. Among these are: the omniscience of God, manifested in His announcement of Israel's sin, His hatred of idolatry, shown in His anger, and in His threat to put Israel aside, in favour of Moses, the humility of the latter, his sincerity, wisdom, and regard for God's glory, and the heinousness of Israel's sin from the divine standpoint. Note also the nature of Moses' prayer, with its supplicating spirit, and its consideration of matters from the divine side, its appeal on behalf of the guilty, and its use of the promises of God.

III. THE CHALLENGE, (vs. 19-35).

There are some good people who are very much opposed to a preacher or

other Christian worker manifesting anger—they themselves never do, at least publicly! Wrong doing never stirs their spirit; sin may flaunt itself openly and go unrebuked as far as they are concerned; they believe it wrong to show anger. It is no doubt wrong to exhibit temper: that is of the old nature. But there is such a thing as righteous anger. Our Lord manifested it, (Mark 3:5). Moses here gives an example of it, and the person who lacks the capacity for it is labouring under a grave defect of character. In the manifestation of anger, however, be sure it is of the righteous variety and not a counterfeit using a cloak. A real lover of God is a hater of sin, and such an one will uncompromisingly oppose sin, while loving the soul of the sinner.

The sight of the calf and the people dancing around it aroused the anger of Moses, and stirred him to action. It was not the time for gentle expostulation—swift and severe measures were necessary for the salvation of the people. In his wrath he broke the tables of stone, (v. 19). "And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt it in the fire, and ground it to powder, and strawed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink of it", (v. 20). He brought their god to naught, and manifested fierce judgment upon it. Such an action was necessary to make clear the heinousness of their sin to the people, and to show the divine attitude toward it. Moses next expostulates with Aaron (v. 21). Such a question implies responsibility on the part of Aaron as the leader in the absence of Moses. Every leader has a measure of responsibility, and to God he must give an account some day for the way in which he has discharged his duties. The two main classes of leaders are seen in these two brothers—Moses the fearless and faithful, Aaron, the fearful, weak, and unfaithful. Note his very weak answer to Moses' question (vs. 22-24).

The challenge of Moses and the judgment which followed came as a conclusion to the sad event. The people were in a shameful condition (v. 25), and Moses standing in the gate of the camp called for those who were on the Lord's side to come unto him. Note the difference between being on the Lord's side, and expecting the Lord to be on our side; also the nature of this challenging appeal, its public and general application, its significance, the reason underlying it, its consequences, the necessity for action on the part of those desirous of responding, and the gospel application.

The children of Levi, having responded to the call, were given the command to execute judgment upon their sinning brethren (vs. 27-29), after which Moses betook himself to the mount to pray unto God (vs. 30-32). The nature of this prayer is worthy of consideration. In it there is manifested a definite consciousness of sin, a definite object in its presentation, a love for the people, and a real unity with them. Note further the earnestness of Moses, his entire unselfishness, and his zeal, also the answer of God to the petition of His servant (vs. 33-35).

The Union Baptist Witness

Is the Official Publication of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec. Send all communications to the Office Secretary, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto 2, Canada.

A GREAT MEETING.

Prayer meetings are always great meetings, but such was the one held in the Runnymede Road Baptist Church, Toronto, on the evening of September 30th, that it must be shared. It was indeed a meeting that will be recorded in the hearts of many as one of the great meetings ever attended.

Somewhere in the neighborhood of one hundred people gathered for prayer and fellowship and the privilege of intercession; the joy of making requests unto a loving Heavenly Father and the sweet peace which pervaded the meeting could only be found in an assembly of blood-bought people gathered in the presence of the Most High.

Pastor P. B. Loney presided, and the first part of the meeting included the reading of the Word and prayer by the President of the Women's Missionary fellowship of the church, a co-operative helpful organization with the church's missionary programme their interest. Notes of praise, based on the briefs of the "Missionary Bulletin", had a place, the missionaries at home and in Liberia were faithfully remembered, and the Lord gave a special blessing for His people.

Even as Miss Maude Nelson sang, her sweet rich voice vibrating with the earnestness of the appeal—

"Oh, won't somebody tell them,
Tell them of Calvary's tree,
Tell them the story of Jesus,
What a great Saviour is He!"

there was a new sense of responsibility borne in the hearts of the listeners.

The Toronto Baptist Seminary.

Mr. W. S. Whitcombe, Professor at the Toronto Baptist Seminary, was introduced, and speaking to such a prayer-bathed meeting, he had the liberty of a most sympathetic audience.

It would indeed be difficult to report such a review of the work of the Seminary as given by Mr. Whitcombe, but graduates and others who had received their training at the Seminary, were visited in their fields of labour, Central America, Liberia, Palestine, Jamaica, China and throughout the Provinces of Canada. What a record for a school but a few years old! Those who have not realized the ministry of the Seminary heretofore will be faithful in interceding for it in coming days.

An Address by the President.

During Mr. Whitcombe's address, the President of the Convention, Rev. Clifford J. Loney, came into the meeting. It was indeed a surprise visit and the clock was almost at the hour of ten when he was called upon to say a few words, but who would have missed that message? Throughout the years when it has been our privilege from time to time to listen to Mr. Loney, we have heard worth while and striking messages, but on Wednesday evening that challenging, rousing and quickening word of counsel, with its presentation

of our common interest and purpose, bound hearts together in the cause of Christ and called forth many expressions of joy that He had called us into a Union, into a work and into a church, standing solidly for the ideals of a great commission and determined, at all costs, to bear aloft the "Blood-stained Banner of the Cross".

As tears freely flowed, as hands were clasped and words failed to be found to express the inmost feelings of the heart, there must have been a great pean of praise ascend, for thanksgiving and praise and honour could but be the outcome of such a meeting where the Lord was glorified and His people strengthened.

BAPTISMS AT ST. PAUL'S.

St. Paul's Bilingual Baptist Church, Montreal, reports a splendid time on September 27th. Mr. St. James, the Pastor, writes: "Although it is harder each year to reach French Romanists, we have some new people attending our services lately."

The morning service of the Church is conducted in French and the evening in English, and for the past several weeks French people have been attracted to the services and new ones are welcomed almost every Lord's day. The very fact that these have entered the church is indicative of their interest, and much prayer must be made for them.

On the Sunday reported upon, Rev. Arthur St. James preached at eleven o'clock and Student Brodie Jamieson, of the Toronto Baptist Seminary, in the evening, following which the Pastor baptized a French woman and her fourteen-year-old son. This woman is one of the two women who, last June, brought their children to St. Paul's. Now she has taken a definite step at the Spirit's call, and prayer is asked for her husband and family.

RECORD ATTENDANCE.

The York Road Mission, conducted by the Suffolk Street Baptist Church, in Guelph, registered a record attendance on Sunday last when upwards of a hundred gathered at the afternoon Sunday School. Mr. Harold Sagar, a member of the Gospel Band, formerly of Annette Street Church, Toronto, was the speaker and held the interest of all.

SUFFOLK STREET, GUELPH.

The services of the Suffolk Street Church, Guelph, on Sunday, October 4th, were outstanding ones. The Pastor was assisted by several members of the Gospel Band, formerly of the Annette St. Baptist Church, and his appreciation of such help and the blessing which came to his people through the ministry of these visiting brethren made the day a happy one.

At the morning service Mr. W. Hills gave a ringing gospel message which the Lord used by the Holy Spirit to bring conviction to at least one heart.

Pray that there may be a complete surrender on the part of this young man.

The evening service was conducted by the members of the Band and Mr. Thomas Silcox brought the message, after which the Pastor, Mr. H. H. Chipchase, baptized two believers.

Many unconverted strangers were attracted to the evening service and heard the gospel presented in no uncertain way.

CANNINGTON.

Mr. Frank Wellington and Mr. John Cunningham assisted Pastor Robert Brackstone at the anniversary services held at Cannington Baptist Church, on October 4th. Splendid congregations were in attendance at both services, while the evening service saw the church packed. Mr. Wellington, with his gospel violin assisted greatly with the music and the duet, "He was nailed to the Cross", by Messrs. Cunningham and Wellington, was effective indeed. Pastor Brackstone gave a powerful message on "The Atonement".

WAVERLEY ROAD, TORONTO.

Pastor E. C. Wood, a member of the Waverley Road Church, and recently supplying First Baptist Church, Timmins, was the guest speaker at the morning service in his own church. The Waverley Road Church is known for its ability to furnish preachers with a message, and it was something new for Mr. Wood to be able to serve in his home church, as he is Pastor of Truth Regular Baptist Church, Mount Dennis.

An open session of the school was held in the afternoon, when Rev. P. B. Loney, of the Runnymede Road Baptist Church, brought a splendid message to the Bible School, holding the interest of everyone present as he spoke on "The Changed Heart", illustrating his talk with three large hearts.

The Pastor, Rev. David Alexander, preached at the evening service and administered the ordinance of baptism to two believers at the close of the service. Others are seriously considering this step of obedience and it is expected will shortly follow their Lord's command.

HILLCREST CHURCH.

A new Regular Baptist Church has recently been organized in the City of Toronto, and its Recognition Service is to be held on Monday evening, October 12th, at 7.30 p.m. The fact that this is Thanksgiving Day has been given consideration, but it is felt that some who might not otherwise be able to come might be able to arrange it that day.

The Hillcrest Regular Baptist Church has already attracted considerable attention in the neighborhood in which it is located, and last Lord's day there were some eighty present at its evening service. Mr. James Forrester, well known and beloved for his work's sake,

has been called as Pastor and is enthusiastic regarding the opportunities presented for service.

Pray for this new cause, plan if possible to be present at its Recognition Service. The church is very accessible from all parts of Toronto. It is located on Oakwood Avenue, corner of Earlesdale, and just about a block north of St. Clair Avenue.

It is expected that Rev. Clifford J. Loney will bring the message of the evening, while visiting Pastors and friends will also assist.

Remember the date, Thanksgiving Day, October 12th, Hillcrest Regular Baptist Church, corner Oakwood Avenue and Earlesdale Avenue, at 7.30 p.m.

SCOTCH LINE.

A note from Student John Cunningham, who so acceptably served the Scotch Line Baptist Church while Pastor Roy Hisey assisted his brother in special meetings, states that he has been happy to have had the opportunity and privilege of preaching the Word there. He has enjoyed his stay with the Scotch Line people and reports that the attendance at all services has been good and the power of the Spirit manifest, and that the prayer meetings have indeed been times of refreshing.

MR. SLADE IN TORONTO.

Passing through Toronto on his return to Timmins after a two months' rest, it was the privilege of many to hear a message from Pastor H. C. Slade. There are none who will ever be in doubt as to Mr. Slade's position, or wonder where he stands. He is indeed a man with a message—a man who holds in trust, The Message, and proclaims it in no uncertain way.

Mr. Slade's sojourn in the Maritime Provinces was necessitated by a breakdown in health, but if preaching every Sunday, and speaking at Bible Conferences, and doing many other things, is looked upon as rest by Mr. Slade, one wonders what he calls work. It is a cause of rejoicing that Mr. Slade returns, however, looking and feeling much better than when he went away and prayer is asked that he may be given strength for his arduous labours in the north country.

As Mr. Slade traced his experiences during the past several weeks and told of the churches he had visited where no hint of the gospel was preached, and of the lives which had been blighted by the teachings of the universities supported by Baptist money, and told how he was looked upon as allied with some fanatical sect because he gave an invitation, the place of the Toronto Baptist Seminary and its ministry were to some extent realized, as was the duty and responsibility of our Union of churches.

FORT WILLIAM.

Rev. G. F. Watts, of the Fundamental Baptist Church, Fort William, baptized two believers last month.

PROGRESSING.

Rev. Arthur Lee, who was recently operated upon for appendicitis, is making satisfactory progress. His many friends will continue to pray that his

condition may be such when his convalescent days are over that he will be able to return to his beloved work in Africa. Many of the Union churches have been indebted to Mr. Lee for his splendid services given without thought of self.

MOUNT ALBERT.

The Mount Albert Baptist Mission, which has been under the care of Mr. W. S. Whitcombe since its opening, is enjoying a time of blessing. On Sunday, October 4th, Student, Mr. John Armstrong, accompanied Mr. Whitcombe and told of his Western trip to an appreciative audience. At the close of the service a young man professed his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This believer had been persuaded of his need for a Saviour when Mr. Raymer visited the Mission on the preceding Sunday, but did not openly confess Him until this week.

MEDINA.

The Pastor of the Medina Baptist Church (Indian) recently held a week of Camp meetings on the Oneida Reserve near St. Thomas and twenty-five professed conversion.

While the Pastor was away from his own flock, the wolves were busy there and disturbed the peace to some extent. Rev. Melchie Henry writes concerning this, "I thank God for the faithful deacons who stand by their conviction and who kept the flock from being influenced."

The appreciation of the Medina Church and of their Pastor is expressed to the churches of the Union which support the work and make the regular preaching services possible.

The Medina Church and Bible School have a plan by which they contribute regularly to the Home Mission work of the Union.

LIBERIA.

The longest time has elapsed which we have yet experienced in getting mail from our missionaries in Liberia. As each day we watch for the mail man in anticipation of receiving a sheaf of letters and are disappointed, we realize to some extent what it must be to have but one mail a month and then fail to receive news from friends on the other side of the world.

Although no items of news have appeared in these columns for several weeks, let us continue to be mindful of our foreign missionaries in that land of hypnotism, magic and sorrow. Remember them as they share in the heartache of seeing those who promised to stand behind their work lightly toss it aside. Remember that an area of about 43,000 square miles stretches before five workers and more than a million and a half people await their message.

MICHIGAN NOTES.

By C. R. Peterson.

Grand Rapids.

Brother John Afman, a member of Calvary Church, was ordained by the

church to the gospel ministry, Tuesday, September 8th, 1931, by a duly-called council. The brother's statements of his conversion, doctrinal beliefs and call to the ministry were highly satisfactory to the council. Brother Afman was recently married, and with his bride, will soon depart for Port Said, Egypt, where he will be superintendent of the Boys' Home, under the direction of Salaam Mission. He will be supported by Calvary Church.

Kent City.

Two were recently baptized from the Bible school into the fellowship of the Church. Pastor E. A. Ford reports that the work of the church is progressing splendidly and the outlook is very good. They plan to hold a revival campaign in the near future.

Portland.

About three or four months ago, we are informed, this church voted to sever all connections with the Michigan Baptist Convention. Bro. Jas. C. Stewart is the pastor.

Milan.

Bro. L. W. Beckley, formerly pastor at Fostoria, Ohio, has been called to the church at this place. He has but recently come to the field, but in that time the work has moved forward. The new pastor has taken hold of the work with enthusiasm, and the future looks bright. Bro. Beckley publishes an excellent monthly paper entitled "Faith and Works".

Lansing.

There are perhaps few churches in the state that have done more along missionary lines than the newly-organized Bethel Baptist Church of this city. Like the church at Antioch, there are in this church certain prophets and teachers. They have supplied the church at St. Louis, Michigan, sixty miles distant, with preachers for more than half of the time during the past year and a half. This has been purely a labor of love. At the same time they conduct services more or less regularly at several other points, in addition to maintaining their own work. Bro. F. B. Mixer is the pastor, and Brethren Jas. A. Bowden and Lloyd J. Green his able assistants.

THE CONVENTION.

The Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec

will meet in

ANNUAL CONVENTION

in

Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
Toronto,

OCTOBER 19TH TO 22ND INCLUSIVE.

Inspirational Meetings

Outstanding Speakers

Plan to Attend