

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. 37

TORONTO, JANUARY 28, 1932

Whole No. 506

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

IS IT WRONG TO STEAL FOOD WHEN HUNGRY?

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 24th, 1932.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry;

"But if he be found, he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house."—Proverbs 6:30, 31.

Prayer by Rev. W. Gordon Brown.

O Thou King eternal, immortal, invisible, from Whose throne flows the river of life, Whose throne is the centre of all being, Who dost rule in the armies of heaven, and to Whom the children of men must be subject, we gladly acknowledge Thee as our King. We would have Thee, and Thee alone, to reign over us, for Thou art worthy to receive glory and honour, wisdom and power. We adore Thee. Because of Thy fulness and our emptiness, Thy riches and our poverty, we come in our beggarhood to beseech Thee to supply all our needs according to Thy riches in glory in Christ Jesus.

We intercede, O God, on behalf of those who are engrossed in the affairs of this world, who do not see the loveliness that is in Christ, who are not ready to have this Man to reign over them, to whom it would be a surprise for Him to come as King of kings and Lord of lords, the word of God being written upon Him. We beseech Thee to lift their eyes from the muck in which they are raking, and give them to see the things eternal.

We beseech Thee for those who do realize that there is more than eating, drinking, and making merry, but whose hope is a false one. We ask for those who are trusting in themselves, in their own righteousness, and perhaps despising others; for those who are relying on their own good works, their church, or some ceremony. Disillusion them, O Lord; cast them down in their own eyes, that they may rest on the Rock of Ages, the only sufficient hope which is in Christ Jesus.

We bring those who are sad—some of them are with us—sad because life has proved a veil of tears; sad because of the death of some loved one, because of disappointment, possibly because of disillusionment in human nature, because the heavens seem brass above and the earth iron roundabout. Come, thou Comforter, to those who are losing hope. Grant that in the hour of their extremity they may turn to Thee, Who alone art to be trusted.

We pray for those who know that they are sinners. Some are here gathered who feel that they are undone, that they are of unclean lips, and dwell among a people of unclean lips. O Saviour, show to such this night the Fountain that has been opened for sin and uncleanness, that they may plunge and be clean, that Christ may speak to them the word of forgiveness and of power.

We beg for those who do love Thee, and are seeking to go on in Thy service, that they may find peace and joy in Thy word. Accompany the preaching of the gospel with the ministry of Thy Spirit. May many to-night be born into Thy glorious kingdom. We make request for all the agencies that are seeking the spread of Thy gospel, that Thou wilt hasten the day when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, when He shall come Whose right it is to reign. Help us, with that day in view, to live and to work. These petitions we present in His worthy name, Amen.

There has been rather an interesting discussion in the press during the last week, on the question as to whether a man is justified in stealing food when he is starving. The discussion arose through an editorial appearing in *The New Outlook*, the official organ of the United Church of Canada. The Editor cites the case of our Lord's walking through the corn fields with His disciples, when they plucked the ears of corn, and did eat—and that on the Sabbath day. He refers also to the case of David, when, with a company of men, he was hungry, and took of the shew bread from the tabernacle, "which it was not lawful" for one to eat.

The implication of the editorial seems to be that our Lord Himself would justify a man for stealing when he is hungry.

It is very easy to condemn an utterance of that sort, but perhaps it would be wiser to examine into the principles involved. It is all the more serious because our Lord Himself is invoked, and His authority attached to this teaching, suggesting that were He here to-day in person He would be inclined to look leniently upon any who would steal to satisfy their hunger.

Let us assume for a moment the reasoning of that editorial to be quite correct, and look for a minute or two at its possible implications. It is perhaps not as simple as it seems on the face of it.

Just what may a man steal under such circumstances? A loaf of bread? But perhaps he would like a little butter on it. If he steals the bread, why not the butter? It may be that white bread would not be good for his system, and that he would need some little assistance to aid digestion. The man, being under-nourished—for it is assumed he is starving—would probably be in need of strong food, and, having taken a little bread, why not steal a little meat to go with it?

Then perhaps his taste ought to be taken into consideration. Perhaps he does not like ordinary beef. He might prefer chicken or turkey! Then what would the farmer do? It is no wonder they have a light outside their barns these days! Where would that sort of thing end?

And surely if any magistrate were called to pronounce sentence upon one convicted of such a theft, I can see the possibility of there being such complications in the case as would demand a wisdom more than equal to that of Solomon.

But if a man be justified in stealing food, and the place where food is kept should be so securely locked against him that he is unable to procure it, why not pick somebody's pocket, or steal a little money that is easier of access, so that he may have the wherewithal with which to buy food quite legitimately?

And, of course, if he is justified in stealing food, or money to procure it, in this climate there are other things which are equally necessary to life. Why not steal some coal? Why not take possession of a house? Because he has no money with which to pay rent, why not say to the landlord, "I must have some shelter. You keep out." Thus he may appropriate the house, and pay nothing for it.

He may indeed need some clothes for himself and his family. Why would he not be justified in possessing himself of clothing equally with food? For in climates such as ours, clothing is just as much a necessity of life as food. If he has not clothing, again, why not steal the money—and so on?

That doctrine, it seems to me, would make for utter lawlessness at last. It has excited a little discussion because the teaching of this particular editorial has to do with a man's social relations, with a man's possessing himself of the property of other people. But it is perfectly logical, and it is an inevitable fruit of *The New Outlook's* whole philosophy, for that is the fruit of Modernism. In the United Church there are individual ministers who believe the Book, and preach salvation. Here and there some still preach the blood. But if *The New Outlook* be the official organ of the United Church, and is to be regarded as its official mouthpiece, then it stands for anything but Evangelical Christianity. Such lawlessness as it advocates, by implication, in that editorial, I say is the inevitable fruit of its whole philosophy.

"Will a man rob God?" If men are taught to disregard their obligations to their supreme Creditor, if men are taught that they may be on right terms with God in spite of the tremendous obligations which men have failed to discharge, what wonder is it that they should be taught that which is contained in this editorial?

Yet, on the other hand, from the practical point of view, there seems to be something to be said for it. But it must be remembered that if we are to avoid endless confusion, we must not judge of principles as applied here and there to individual cases: we must give thought to the philosophy that underlies, and to what must be the result if these principles are generally applied. This wise observer of ancient time sums up the whole matter when he says, "Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry." He admits that there are circumstances that somewhat mitigate the man's guilt, and yet he insists that if he be found, the law still abides, and "he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house."

Let us examine that proverb a little this evening for our spiritual, as well as for our economic profit.

I.

I think we shall all agree that men who fall into error through the stress of special circumstances are to be judged in the light of the circumstances which have provoked the action. I do not think there is anyone here this evening who would be so hard-hearted as not to look with compassion upon any man who, being in need of food to satisfy his natural hunger, if he were unable to procure that food legitimately, and were actually to take that which belonged to somebody else—I say, I do not think anyone here would be so hard-hearted as to look without compassion upon an act of that sort. Certainly he would be in an entirely different class from the man who, having plenty, or at least sufficient to sustain life, deliberately and violently breaks into somebody's premises and takes that which is not his own.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the magistrate who, while saying that the law must be upheld, acknowledged that if a man were brought before him charged with theft for the purpose of procuring food for himself or his family, he would certainly look upon the case with such leniency as the law would permit him to exercise.

All that is to be admitted. We all recognize the difficulties which inhere in the present situation, and the temptation to wrong-doing which may arise therefrom. A young man came to me a little while ago. He had been several times before, and seemed inclined to keep coming. At last I had to say to him, "I am sorry, my friend. I should be glad to be of further assistance to you if I could, but unfortunately my resources are limited, and I have reached the end so far as you are concerned." He said, "I guess I will have to go and rob a bank." I replied, "I do not think I would do that yet if I were you; there will be a better way out of it than that."

It is well enough that we should sympathize with people whose circumstances try them almost to the limit of endurance, and if one should be pressed beyond the limit he must be judged then in the light of the circumstances which have provoked his act. That is simple enough. We need not raise much stir about that. As a matter of fact, the moral quality of an act is very largely determined by the circumstances which give rise to it. It is pretty difficult to conceive, in our human relationships, of morality,

right and wrong, under all circumstances, in terms of the absolute. That is to say, that under any and all circumstances a certain thing is right; and, under any and all circumstances, a certain other thing is wrong.

The Bible does not so teach. For example, it says, "Thou shalt not kill." It denies to any man—and every man—the right of private vengeance. But it is a strange straining of that commandment when men invoke its authority as an argument against capital punishment as imposed by the state in the interest of law and order. It is not right for you or me to take life. We are forbidden so to do. If any one of us should do it wantonly, he is a murderer; yet the Word of God says, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

"Circumstances alter cases", and what is wrong in the individual, may be perfectly right as an expression of the collective will of the state.

Our law recognizes—as does also the Bible—the right of self-defense. A man may be attacked by another. It is instinctive for him to protect himself. Of course, I know, theoretically, you would not do it! You would put hands down, and let anybody come and kill you! When the enemy is at a safe distance, you may propound that theory; but I am inclined to think that under attack you would be most likely to develop some liking for life itself, and probably would resort to some method of self-defense. And our law recognizes that while a man has no right to kill, he has the right to defend himself; and if, in that self-defense, another life should be sacrificed, he is not held guilty under such circumstances.

Thus we are to judge of the moral quality of all acts by the circumstances which give rise to those actions. What is a heinous offence in one situation may perhaps be partly excused in another. We speak of "mitigating circumstances," of circumstances which lessen the guilt of someone who has offended against the law. That principle is to be kept clearly in mind. That principle would apply in the judgment meted out in cases such as have been suggested.

II.

And yet, let me remind you of this fundamental principle. Law is law, and notwithstanding we look with greater compassion upon some than upon others, according to the situation under review, yet "if he be found, he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house." Surely it is the duty of all Christians to recognize, and submit to, the "powers that be". It is part of a Christian's duty to be law-abiding, to keep the law of the land himself, and to encourage others to keep the law as well. Such an editorial as has been discussed, appearing in a religious journal, it does seem to me, must have a most mischievous effect.

Surely in a time like this, it becomes the duty of every man who has any influence whatever in the moulding of public opinion, to stand uncompromisingly in the support of law and order. That is the position of this wise observer. He said in effect, "I should be sorry for him, but, detected in his crime, it would be viewed by the law as a crime; and the penalty would have to be paid. He would be required to restore sevenfold."

I have said that to make it possible for me to say this: the editorial in *The New Outlook* speaks of our Lord Jesus Christ as *Jesus*. I would not strive about words, nor condemn one who perhaps in some cases thoughtlessly would speak of our glorious Lord in terms which a Uni-

tarian would gladly employ, but there is sometimes in it a serious implication—the implication that Jesus Christ, as a kind of social reformer, would stand out against the principles of our civilization, and would be on the side, possibly, in some circumstances, even of the outlaw.

But who was Jesus? Why did He come? What is the explanation of the presence in this world of One, Who, being a man, was more than man? What is the reason for the Incarnation? I make the strongest possible protest against that view of the Christian revelation which would make Jesus Christ anything other than what the Bible declares Him to be, "God manifest in the flesh". Jesus Christ was not only man, but God; and the great problem for me to settle is this, Why did God come down to earth? Was it to feed the hungry? It was not necessary for Him to come to earth for that purpose. Was it merely to teach the erring, the ignorant? Then could He have sent prophets and teachers to expound His law.

Why was this Jesus in the corn fields when His disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat? Who was He? What was He doing on earth? Why did He come? If we can answer that question, we shall find a solution of all our problems.

Somebody says, "He came to save sinners." Certainly He did. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom"—said the apostle of himself, and which we might all say each for himself—"I am chief."

But again I ask, Why was it necessary for Deity to become incarnate in order to save sinners? Why could not an angel have accomplished the task? Why did not God send an archangel to redeem a sinful world? If there be any truth in that loose view of things, that while one must be reasonably careful in recognizing and fulfilling his obligations to his fellows, it really does not matter very much whether he recognizes that he has any obligation to God—if the religion of Christ be nothing more than humanitarianism, if its precepts and principles are given for no other purpose than merely to regulate our human relationships—if, indeed, He came to be a kind of social reformer, in order to set up new standards for human conduct, that men might learn how wisely and rightly to live together—if that be all He came for, why was it necessary for God to stoop to that task?

Whence come all laws? Who is the centre and source of all law? We live in a world of law, in a universe of law. I have not heard of any man of science teaching anybody to disregard the laws of nature. I have not read of anyone's being so foolish as to say that one may lightly attempt to set aside that which is written in the nature of things. The man who would exercise the healing art exerts himself to discover the nature of that malignant thing which takes such a toll of human life, which we call cancer. I do not know of any doctor, any man of real science, who, being persuaded that a person is suffering from a malignant thing like that, would speak lightly of it.

I have seen many cases where the man of science has said, "There is death in that thing." "But, doctor, can you do nothing?" "No." "Can medical science do nothing?" "No." "Why?" "Because it is of the nature of the thing to kill. We cannot change it, and we have found no cure."

I have never heard of a man of science proposing that you apply the principles of Christian Science if, by accident, you drink carbolic acid, or something of the sort. There is no man of science, real science, who, if some-

body has taken a deadly poison into his system, would be such a fool as to say, "Forget it; pay no attention to it." He would exercise himself to the utmost to provide an antidote, and do everything to counteract the effects of that deadly drug which, if allowed to work out its own way, would inevitably bring the subject of it to death.

Go with a man into the laboratory, and he will tell you that, under the microscope, he sees things that fill him with horror and terror. He says, "They are beyond my power. There is death in them."

The man who handles electricity does not know what it is, but he knows that by doing certain things he can escape its power. He can handle it safely if he and it are properly insulated. But why have we certain laws regulating it, and regulating everything? Why are you not allowed to build any kind of house you like? What right have the people down at the city hall to say to me that I shall not build a wooden house if I have a piece of land? What right have they to say it? They say, "You are part of a community." "All right, I will keep my house clean." But they reply, "It is of the nature of wood to burn. If you build an inflammable structure of that sort you will imperil others."

But upon what are all these human enactments based? Always upon a principle which inheres in the nature of things. In other words, upon some natural law.

Suppose I am an architect, a builder, and I plan a great structure to rise many, many storeys. When I have prepared all my plans and specifications, I submit them for approval. The authorities say, "You cannot erect that building in that way." "But why not?" I enquire. "Because it would not be safe." "How do you know?" "Because in the fabrication, according to your plans, you have ignored certain physical laws. If you were allowed to put up that building in that way, it might crumble of its own weight. Its plan of construction is not in accord with the proved principles which underlie sound architecture, sound engineering."

I could go on and apply the principle chemically, as architecturally, and in many other ways. I say, all these restrictions and regulations are based upon the assumption that we live in a world of law, and that there are certain principles which operate in this natural realm which must be observed, which cannot be changed, but are inexorable in their operation and in the penalty they exact. The only way we can live in safe relationship to those laws is to obey them, and men, by long experience and experimentation, have discovered how those natural forces operate. Certain laws are laid down, and I am told to walk that way if I would be safe.

But back of all that, what is there? In this world of ours there is a design, and the principle of law enters into every dew-drop; it enters into every atom.

I do not know whether this is true, because I am not a physicist, but I read somewhere something to this effect. In a lecture delivered by one of the world's masters of physical science, he said that there was a time when men believed the atom to be the smallest particle of matter, but that it had since been discovered it was made up of still smaller particles known as electrons; and that these electrons were always revolving within the atom. Then he sought for a standard, a kind of speedometer by which to estimate the revolutions of the electrons within the atom. He supposed the possibility of the synthetic production of a kind of material that would be lasting, that would never,

never, never wear out; and the further possibility of discovering motive power which could never be exhausted. (When that day comes, I want a motor-car made of that material, and driven by that power.)

But he assumed the possibility of such a thing for purposes of illustration. Then he went on to say that the most rapidly revolving machine yet produced, the machine that accomplished the greatest number of revolutions per minute, was the most powerful aeroplane engine, and he supposed such an engine to be produced of this indestructible material, and to be driven at its highest rate of speed without a moment's vacation, by this inexhaustible supply of power; and he said if that aeroplane engine could revolve at that rate, without pausing for a moment, or stopping for repair, for one hundred millions of years—that the aggregate revolutions accomplished in a hundred millions of years would approximate the total revolutions of an electron within the atom in one minute! It is no wonder they say mathematics is the language of physics.

That is a story by the way. But what I am calling your attention to is that learning outside the pulpit always magnifies law, and that the more men know of this world and its related systems, the more they bow to the inexorability of law. That, of course, is in the physical realm. It is the function of religion to teach that law in the moral realm is just as real, just as far-reaching, just as inexorable, and just as truly based in the nature of things as it is in the physical realm.

Why did Jesus Christ come to earth? I will tell you why He came: to magnify God's law. "He is before all things, and in him all things consist", or, hold together. The Incarnation, the death of the Incarnate God at the place called Calvary, His burial and resurrection, so far from justifying lawlessness anywhere, is the final revelation of God, to the effect that heaven and earth shall pass away, but His law shall not pass away. The Cross does not make for lawlessness, but the very opposite; and because the Judge of all the earth could not even pass over the sin of a man, though he steals when he is hungry, He came to bear in His own person the penalty of our sins, in order that He Himself, the Source of law, "might be just, and yet the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

The philosophy of such journals as *The Outlook*, and of such writers as "The Observer" in *The Toronto Star*, and others who mock at the atonement, makes for lawlessness and anarchy, and is the enemy of society as it is the enemy of God. That is not Evangelical Christianity. That attitude has no justification whatsoever in the Word of God.

But what a hungry world this is! May it steal? No! Not only so—it cannot! Why did Jesus Christ come? He came to be the Bread of Life to a hungry world. He came to give His life a ransom instead of many. Let no one invoke the glorious name of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as justification for any kind of lawlessness anywhere. Whoever comes to Him will find in Him all things reconciled unto God. The law is kept, and God is just, and yet "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Let us pray: We thank Thee, O Lord, for the disclosure of Thyself in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are all sinners. We have all broken Thy holy law. We have not only robbed each other, but we have robbed Thee. There is not one of us who has not indulged in that which is itself lawlessness, even sin which is an

offence against God. Oh, we thank Thee for the precious blood. We thank Thee for the balancing of our account. We thank Thee that Thou hast made provision for the hunger of our souls. We bless Thee, O Lord, for this great gospel, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.

Teach us this great lesson, that peace and joy abounding are to be found in a life that is harmonized with the will of God. So come to us this evening, and help us to put Jesus Christ first, to seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and then to trust Thee Who dost feed the sparrows, and by Whose power and grace the lilies are clothed. Help us to trust Thee to provide us with these necessary things. Thus teach us this lesson of simple, childlike, faith, which will relate us rightly to the things of this life, and happily and savingly to the things of the life that is to come. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

"STRANGE FIRE"—ANCIENT AND MODERN.

A Lecture by Dr. T. T. Shields.

Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto,
Thursday Evening, January 21st, 1932.

*Twelfth in a Series of Thursday Evening Lectures on
Biblical Theology, which are included in the
Curriculum of Toronto Baptist Seminary.*

(Stenographically Reported)

It will interest the students to know that the lecture on Biblical Theology will be omitted next Thursday; we shall have an examination instead. Next week will be examination time, and next Thursday evening, as has been our practice, you will write on this subject. I must ask you therefore to take notes this evening, because you may have to write on this lecture before it is printed; hence you will have to be your own stenographers.

Chapters eight to eleven will form our lesson text this evening. Several of these chapters have engaged our attention quite recently in the Sunday School. Those who have been following the Sunday School lessons will already have covered this ground in part.

I.

The eighth chapter contains an account of the institution of Aaron to the office to which he had been divinely appointed, that of high priest. He had before been chosen, and full directions had been given respecting the garments he was to wear; and the ceremony which was to accompany his consecration. Here we have an account of the execution of these orders.

"The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take Aaron and his sons." You will recall that it is written in Hebrews, "And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." You will recall, too, that when Moses modestly offered some objection to the divine programme, saying he was not eloquent, the Lord said, "Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well. And also, behold, he cometh forth to meet thee: and when he seeth thee, he will be glad in his heart. And thou shalt speak

unto him, and put words in his mouth: and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do. And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God."

Here Moses is the divine instrument. He is acting in God's stead, setting Aaron and his sons apart to minister in the priest's office.

Our Lord was ordained a Priest from all eternity. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world. The Old Testament contains full particulars respecting the office of the priesthood which Jesus Christ was to fill. "When the fulness of time was come" Jesus Christ came forth from the Father: "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." In the days of His flesh, through the incarnation, our Lord was instituted to the office of the Priesthood to which He had been ordained, qualified by the fact that He was made under the law. He took on Him our nature, even as Aaron put on his priestly robes. It was necessary that we should have an High Priest Who could be touched with the feeling of our infirmities: "Verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Thus He wrought out a righteousness for us by His perfect obedience to the law.

The Scripture says that Jesus Christ was "subject" to Joseph and His mother. When they sought him sorrowing, He said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" He put God first, and loved the Lord with all His heart; and then began immediately His life of obedience to the second table of the law. He honoured His mother after the flesh, and Joseph; "he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them."

Then He was especially anointed for His task. The Spirit of God came upon Him, and in due time He, through the eternal Spirit, offered Himself a Lamb without spot or blemish. He became Himself the Sacrifice and the Priest, and offered Himself without spot to God; and then ascended to the right hand of the Father, and there He presented, not the blood of others, but His own blood. The manifestation of Christ, that period spoken of in the Scripture as "the days of His flesh", involved the institution of Christ as an High Priest. And He is now entered into heaven itself, which is the reality of which the tabernacle was but a figure.

Moses "put upon him (Aaron) the coat, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod upon him, and he girded him with the curious girdle of the ephod, and bound it unto him therewith." On the twelve precious stones which were set in the breastplate were engraved the names of the twelve tribes. On each of the shoulder-straps that supported the ephod was an onyx stone, and on each stone the names of six tribes. Then upon the mitre was the golden plate inscribed with the words, "Holiness to the Lord", that he might represent the people. Thus he bore the people upon his heart, and upon his shoulders, and upon his head, as he went in to appear in their behalf before the Lord.

Thus our Lord has taken our names upon Him;
 "The names of all His saints He bears
 Deep graven on His heart;
 Nor shall the weakest member say
 That he has lost his part."

In this connection the three sacrifices were offered in the consecration of Aaron and his sons: the sin offering, the burnt offering, and the ram of consecration, or "fillings up". You recall our teaching respecting that matter: the first speaking of the *atonement*; the second, the *abandonment* of the priest to the service of God; and the third, the *appropriation* by the priest of the riches of grace that are treasured in Christ for us. Christ is our Sin-offering, our Burnt-offering, and He is the Offering of consecration. He makes it possible that we should be filled with all the fulness of God.

II.

In the ninth chapter Aaron and his sons exercise the office of the priest. In the eighth chapter Aaron is instituted: in the ninth he begins the exercise of his ministry, and presents the first offering according to the law, and in strict obedience to the law's direction.

This is parallel to the appearance of our Lord in the presence of God for us. He has offered Himself now, and having been made an High Priest, He has entered into the heavenly places and presented His own blood as an atoning sacrifice in our behalf, so that we now have an High Priest in the heavens: "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father." These other priests stood "daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." Having offered His one sacrifice, our Lord has now—and does now—appear in the presence of God for us.

Observe especially the twenty-second and twenty-third verses: "And Aaron lifted up his hand toward the people, and blessed them, and came down from offering of the sin offering, and the burnt offering, and peace offerings. And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out, and blessed the people: and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people." When the offering had been presented, the Lord appeared in glory, signifying His acceptance of the offering.

We ought to read in that connection the next verse: "And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces." It is written in John's gospel that the Holy Spirit was not yet given because that Jesus was not yet glorified, but when He ascended to the Father, as our High Priest, and began the exercise of His ministry in our behalf, then there came out a fire from before the Lord. Just as Aaron disappeared within the holy place, and was lost to the view of the people, so He Who had been manifested among men, became the invisible Christ. He returned to the Father, and His disciples saw Him no more.

You remember the sweet story we had in Exodus, that part of the equipment of the priest consisted of a row of golden bells around the skirt of his garment. When the high priest disappeared within the veil, the people must have wondered whether his ministry was

accepted, whether he had died before the Lord. They could not see him, and no voice issued from behind the veil. But as he sprinkled the blood upon the mercy-seat, and moved about within the veil, exercising his office, with every movement of the high priest the golden bells about the hem of his garment rang out their golden music. As long as the people heard the ringing of those golden bells they knew they had a living priest within the veil.

Jesus Christ disappeared. He became invisible. He said to His disciples, "Because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart." Then they tarried just like the congregation of Israel. When Aaron had withdrawn from their view, the people tarried without; after Christ's ascension the disciples tarried at Jerusalem ten days, and when "the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place." Then they, too, saw the glory of the Lord, for when He had presented His offering there came out a fire from before the Lord: "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." The people wondered whether these men were full of new wine, but Peter answered, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel," and declared that the manifestation of divine power at Pentecost was the certification of the acceptance of Christ's offering: "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear."

III.

I would have you note this very particularly. The direction was given before Aaron was thus consecrated, "The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out." When Aaron here offered his sacrifices, and the burnt offering was put upon the altar, the fire came out from before the Lord and consumed the burnt offering. Thus was kindled upon the altar of Israel a supernatural fire. It was necessary that the people, through the priest, should keep that fire ever burning: "The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out." It was kept burning by the daily offering of sacrifices. That supernatural flame distinguished the worship of Israel from that of all other peoples; that supernatural element entered into every act of devotion which was performed by the priest in the tabernacle.

So the Fire has come from before the Lord. We have not now to wait for it to come. It is our duty to keep the fire ever burning upon the altar by yielding ourselves to God as living sacrifices. Hence we are admonished, "Grieve not the Spirit," and, "Quench not the Spirit."

IV.

Now observe the tenth chapter where it is recorded that certain priests dared to offer "strange fire" before the Lord. We have noticed in our study of Exodus that the Lord gave the most particular direction as to how He was to be served. The tabernacle, to the last detail, was divinely planned. Moses was permitted no discretion. He was strictly enjoined to do everything as he was told. Among other things,

there was certain incense to be compounded after the art of the apothecary, but the ingredients were divinely ordered. They were to serve the Lord as he had directed. Incense and sacrifices were to be offered by this supernatural fire.

It surely suggests the whole scheme of salvation by grace. Nothing goes up to heaven which does not first of all come down from heaven. Whether it be prayer or praise, or whatever our service to God may be, it can be accepted by Him only as it is inspired by the Holy Ghost. We are to live supernatural lives. We believe in a supernatural religion. We trust a Saviour Who was supernaturally born, Who was more than man, Who supernaturally lived, Who by supernatural power was raised from the dead, and ascended into heaven; and by that divine visitation on the day of Pentecost, His acceptance was certified. We are to endeavour to serve the Lord not in the energy of the flesh, but in the Holy Ghost. We are to "pray in the Holy Ghost". The love of God is to be "shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us". We are to "walk in the Spirit". The Spirit is to dominate us. Even our thoughts are to be brought into captivity "to the obedience of Christ". Only thus can we be as Aaron's sons, serving under Him Who is our great High Priest, offering spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Christ Jesus.

Here were some men who were born to be priests. They belonged to the Levitical tribe. They belonged to the house of Aaron. They had been duly consecrated to their office. They were recognized as priests. They put incense in their censers as directed—but they offered their incense with strange fire. I presume that means with some other fire than that which was taken from the altar. It was an attempt to serve God by the wisdom, and the will, and the energy of the flesh. It was rendering to God a purely carnal service instead of a spiritual service. It was an attempt to approach God in some other than the divinely-appointed order.

Let us as teachers and preachers, let us as Christians—all of us called to work in the Lord's vineyard, all of us spiritual sons of Aaron—let us take this lesson to heart. If we are to serve God acceptably, there must be no strange fire in our service.

I should only state the actual facts of the case if I were to say that in hundreds of churches to-day where people meet for worship, there is no sacrifice, there is no mention of the blood. They presume to call upon God in some other than His appointed way. There is no recognition of the divine revelation, that God will be served according to His own prescription. Instead of that, the wisdom of man is substituted for the Word of God—the reason of man for the revelation of God.

Very often men preach in the energy of the flesh. I hope you will be far more than sermon-makers. I knew a man once who thought he was a great preacher. He was a man who had a fine mind, a thoroughly trained and disciplined mind. He was a good essayist, a good writer. There was a fine literary charm about all he wrote. He was a good homilist. He knew how to order and express his thought. There was no confusion in his presentation of the truth. It was written in a perfectly orderly fashion, and was theologically sound. He knew his Bible, and his sermons usually consisted of an exposition of Scripture. But I never saw a little boy prouder of a toy, or a little girl prouder of the bow of ribbon in her hair, than

that man was of his literary productions which he called sermons.

When any of his intimate friends visited him, they might always expect to be asked to sit down and listen while he read one of these great sermons. I am not discounting them: they were very good. I have known men who write poetry. (I hope you will all do so—and I hope after you have written it you will have the good sense to keep it to yourselves. It is a good exercise; it is a good training in the exercise of condensing much into little. I know of nothing that will teach you how to condense a great deal into a few words, when you are shut up to a prescribed measure, when you must find such words as are properly accented to carry out the measure of your rhyme, as to attempt to write poetry. All that is very interesting. Write all you can—then put it away in a drawer and forget it! Do not send it to *The Gospel Witness* for publication. Some people do, and tell me that they would make a special concession to *The Gospel Witness*, and would be quite willing to contribute their poetry without charge.

That man was like many poets, who, having written poetry, bore all their friends with the reading of it. Sometimes it is rhyme and no reason, but this man was an excellent preacher in many ways. But his spirit and practice always jarred upon me. I shrank from them. I felt it was out of keeping with his position as a messenger of Christ to be so proud of his intellectual powers, so proud of his homilectical ability and his literary skill. I can see him now, after reading some production, put it down and say, "What do you think of that?"

That is dangerously near offering "strange fire". By all means, labour over your sermons. Write them—not once, nor twice, but many times. Write them; write them carefully. Be careful of your language. See that they contain nothing but the truth of Scripture. See that they are well ordered, so that people will be able to remember what you say; that you may be a teacher as well as a preacher; that you may teach while you preach, and preach while you teach. And in the doing of all that, remember that you need the illumination of the Holy Spirit—in your study as much as in the pulpit. When at last you come to deliver your message, make sure it is delivered in the power of the Holy Ghost, and "not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect". In all our sermons, let us be as simple as little children before the Lord; let our entire dependence be upon God, and upon the truth of His gospel. Let us rely upon God to make our preaching and teaching effective.

Strange fire indeed!—not only as applied to preaching and teaching, but to the art of living as Christians, and to the virtue of giving as Christians. "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Let us see to it that we are energized in every thought of the mind, in every word we utter, and in every act we perform,—that we are energized and directed by that Power that is from above.

When this strange fire was offered, there came out a fire from the Lord and destroyed Nadab and Abihu, "and they died before the Lord." Moses explained the situation. It is as though he said, "Did I not tell you that if you come to God, you must come in His way, and not in your own? This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified." They died before the Lord.

One cannot read that without thinking of the New Testament parallel, Ananias and Sapphira, who certainly offered strange fire when they came with a lie upon their lips, and died before the Lord, literally, for their falsehood. May it not be that there is a divine visitation that comes upon the preacher and teacher, and upon the church, that presumes to offer "strange fire"?

I think I told you once what a friend reported to me of the great D. L. Moody. Almost the last time he addressed the students of the Institute, standing before them with tears coursing down his cheeks, he said that it was his daily prayer that the Lord would not suffer him to live long enough to lose his power to preach the gospel, to lose his spiritual power over men.

Some of us have had a long enough experience in the Christian life to see men who began their life's work like Nadab and Abihu, with every promise of exercising a useful ministry, men of ability, men of real distinction, men to whom people looked for leadership, go to pieces. Something happened, and they seemed to wither away and die out, so that they lost all power to influence men. May we pray constantly that we be not castaways, that we be not laid on the shelf, and put out of the service of the Lord.

The sentence at the end of the third verse is very significant: "And Aaron held his peace." He saw his own sons die before the Lord—"and Aaron held his peace." He had nothing to say. He acquiesced in the divine judgment. He offered no protest whatever, but held his peace. Thus also our Lord Jesus Christ, infinitely gracious as He is, will hold His peace and pray not for such as offer strange fire and call down judgment upon themselves.

Moses then gave direction for their burial, just as Peter gave direction for the burial of Ananias, and later of his wife, Sapphira. The people were forbidden to mourn. They were not to uncover their heads, nor to rend their garments: they were to show that they had no sympathy whatever for those who had thus transgressed before the Lord.

V.

There is a very useful word, for ministers particularly, in the ninth verse of the tenth chapter. In one sense, it may not apply to you. There are none of you who will be disposed to drink strong drink. But certainly it may well be understood as a word of direction to care for one's physical frame. Though none of us drink immoderately, we may eat immoderately, or be immoderate in other ways. We do well to be temperate in all things, and to put a difference between the holy and the unholy.

VI.

From the twelfth verse to the fifteenth, the priests are instructed to live of the offerings, to eat the meat offered. They that minister at the altar are to live of the altar. Our religion ought to be, not medicine, but meat. The priests were to find delight and joy in their service.

I remember a man who came to this church, and who was later a deacon, a very warm friend of mine. He left us later—nearly eleven years ago. But he was a faithful member for some years, and he once said a thing which brought me great comfort. It was this: "Since coming to Jarvis Street I have had an entirely new conception of what it means to be a Christian." I said, "I am glad to hear that. What has happened to you?" He replied, "I always looked forward to Sunday as a day of

trial, of irksome duty. I dreaded its coming, and was always relieved when it was past. I had so many years of that, that it did not enter my mind people could look forward to the Lord's day as a day of refreshment and inspiration and real joy, a day when they would get a foretaste of heaven. But my attitude has changed entirely in that matter, and now sometimes toward the end of the week I say, 'Thank God, it will not be long until Sunday.' And when Sunday comes, it is a high day; I live on the inspiration of it until the next Sunday." So much for the house of God.

That ought to be our attitude toward the Bible. It ought not to be only as a medicine-chest—it is a medicine chest. I was brought up on homoeopathy. I do not know anything about it, but I know we had a book in our house that gave all sorts of directions. It made no difference what happened to any member of our family, my mother could always recognize the symptoms, and know exactly what it was. I think she could diagnose a great deal more accurately than some doctors. Then, when she knew what was the matter, it was a simple matter to go to the book and find the remedy. I used to take belladonna, and I know not what else! There was a medicine-chest with all these homoeopathic medicines in our house, and it was only in a case of very serious illness the doctor was called in. We had a family doctor who knew how to look after the children pretty well. Some of them have survived the treatment fairly well!

The Bible is our medicine-chest as Christians. If we have any ailment we can find out from the Book what is the matter. It will diagnose the case, and will prescribe the remedy—and it will not be long until the medicine is provided. It is a family physician.

But who wants to be sick all the time? I know some people who like to be sick. I was in a home one time where there were two little children. The little girl evidently had a very peculiar taste: she was fond of vinegar. Think of drinking vinegar! The little boy went into the pantry and saw his sister drinking the vinegar. (I think the little girl's name was Popsy). He ran out to his mother, exclaiming, "Mamma, Popsy is drinking vinegar." To which Popsy replied, "Well, you are not sick"! She seemed to think that was a special privilege, to drink vinegar!

I have known many people who seemed always to be sick—and always drinking vinegar—and prescribing it for other people. They are about as sour as they look—and look as sour as they feel.

The religion of Christ ought not to make us vinegar-drinkers! It ought to sweeten us up. We ought to learn how to live of the altar. Moses said, "There is your meal. Go and eat it. Be happy about it. Be satisfied with it." There is something radically wrong with our religion and our spiritual state if we can find no gladness at all in our religion.

That was a suggestive word that Brother Pettingill brought us Saturday evening, of the man who had lost one hundred and seventy thousand dollars, and had a face as long as the proverbial fiddle. He had a Christian friend whom he told he had lost all he had yesterday; he had nothing to-day. "Are you not saved?" asked the friend. "Yes." "Have you lost that?" "No." Before he left this friend's store he had taken an inventory of his assets, of the things he could not lose; and was happy in the Lord notwithstanding his great material loss.

We shall not be immune from these things. We shall have our losses. We shall have our trials. We shall have our privations, and our tribulations too, plenty of them. But over and above all that, surely if we are Christians, we shall find some satisfaction in Christ. If there is not satisfaction in Him, then I would advise all who have come to the Seminary to pack up your bags and go home. You are wasting your time, and we are wasting our time, if the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ does not minister satisfaction to heart and conscience. If it is not what this weary world needs, then let us have done with it.

Sir Wilfred Grenfell went to hear Moody preach once when he was a medical student in London. When he came out of the building where that simple but great evangelist had preached, he said, "I am going to do one of two things: make my religion real, or chuck it." You know what he did—or, what the Spirit of God did for him. He made it real. And Sir Wilfred Grenfell has been a missionary to the stricken people of Labrador now these many years, and is one of the greatest missionaries of the world to-day. Let us make our religion real. Let us live on it. Let it be our daily meat, and not our occasional medicine.

VII.

"And Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin offering, and, behold, it was burnt." I cannot expound that passage. It suggests something that is rather elusive, but it is wonderfully suggestive. He asked Aaron why he had not eaten, and this is what Aaron said: "And Aaron said unto Moses, Behold, this day have they offered their sin offering and their burnt offering before the Lord; and such things have befallen me; and if I had eaten the sin offering to-day, should it have been accepted in the sight of the Lord?"—"And when Moses heard that, he was content."

There is a passage for you. There is a field in which to do a little digging, in which to do your own thinking,—“Such things have befallen me”! What had happened to Aaron to-day? He had seen his own sons slain before the Lord. He had seen them carried out, and buried out of sight for their sin; and he had no appetite for anything. It was a time to fast rather than to feast. It seems as though he had said to God, even through Moses, "In the anxiety of my soul, in the bitterness of my spirit, let me be excused from eating to-day."

This I know, experiences will come to us sometimes that are indescribably painful, too painful to talk about. You will have to go into the depths, as Aaron did. But think that out for yourself.

VIII.

Just a word about the eleventh chapter. It is about the clean and the unclean beasts, the things that might be eaten, and the things that were not to be eaten. The animals that chewed the cud, and parted the hoof, were clean. Those that chewed the cud, but did not part the hoof; or those that parted the hoof but did not chew the cud, were unclean. And, of course, those that neither parted the hoof nor chewed the cud were unclean. These were forbidden. There were also creatures of the deep that were equally forbidden: fish without scales or fins. There were also certain of the fowls of the air that were clean, and others unclean; some of them were not to be eaten. Then there were the creeping things, things that crept and flew, that went on all fours and had wings, as

locusts. Some of them were clean, and some were unclean.

We have not time for a minute examination of those things—and I at least should not be competent to discourse upon it, because I do not know enough about the nature of these animals to give you a reason even for my own statement. But it is a conviction with me—I give it to you only as my opinion. You may think about it, and make application of it as you will—it is a conviction with me that no law of God is ever arbitrary. God never says, "Thou shalt not", just for the sake of saying it.

I have known some parents who were arbitrary in their attitude toward their children. I lived in a home once with one such. That mother seemed to take delight in saying, "Don't"—when there was no reason for saying it. It was just an arbitrary prohibition for which there was no real necessity. It depended very much upon her own mood. When her little girl said, "Mamma, may I do so-and-so?" if the mother was in a good mood she would say, "Yes, dear." If she was not, she said "No!" That child soon found out that her mother often forbade her doing things for no reason at all. I was only boarding there, and it was beyond my province to say anything,—but I thought a great deal. I often think more than I say—although I do say a great deal. It is a good thing, like Aaron, to learn to hold one's peace.

There is always a reason for everything that God commands, whether it be a negative or a positive. To show you what I mean, think of sin in general—not particular sins, but that which is contrary to the divine holiness, and which God prohibits. It is not merely an arbitrary law which says, "Thou shalt not do this or that." It is forbidden because the thing itself is injurious to us.

As for instance, a delicate child wants to go out and play when the ground is damp. Her mother would like her to have a good time, but she says, "No". She knows very well if she goes out she will have croup. She knows the child is so delicate that she cannot be permitted to go where it is damp. When that mother says, "No", it is not that she would deprive the child of pleasure: she says it in the interest of the child.

If one were going to drink something that has poison in it, if you were even roughly to strike the cup from the hand, while you might seem to be discourteous, your act would be one of kindness. You know it would kill.

That is the reason sin is prohibited. Sin is poison to the soul. It kills. There is no way out of it. That is why it is prohibited. I believe if we knew more about the nature of things—I do not say character, the outward form of things, but the *nature*, the essence—we should discover that every law of God is founded on the nature of things. That is my own conviction.

I believe that behind these prohibitions there was a deep hygienic reason. I think you are likely to be healthy if you observe these laws. I do not mean as a religious ceremony. We are delivered from all that. I do not mean that aspect of it,—but you are likely to be healthy if you follow these rules. For instance, snails are among the forbidden things. It is easy for me to keep that law! I do not want any of them. There are several other things here—but I need not name them; study the chapter for yourselves. Of course, there are others that are within the category of the clean that, I suppose, untrained, we should not care to eat. But I suggest that line of enquiry to you, and give it to you as my own opinion, that when

(Continued on page 11)

Baptist Bible Union Lesson Leaf

Vol. 7

No. 1

REV. ALEX. THOMSON, EDITOR.

Lesson 7 February 14th, 1932
FIRST QUARTER.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

Lesson Text: Lev. 15, 16.

Golden Text: "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. 9:15.

Daily Bible Readings:

Monday—Psalm 103:1-11.

Tuesday—Psalm 103:12-22.

Wednesday—Jer. 31:31-37.

Thursday—Ezek. 36:25-38.

Friday—Luke 23:22-46.

Saturday—Col. 1:12-23.

I. THE UNCLEAN ISSUE. (15:1-33).

Another instance of the care of God over the bodies of His people is seen in this lesson, wherein explicit directions are given concerning persons afflicted with an unclean issue, (vs. 1-33). The person so afflicted was unclean, anything touched by the issue was unclean, and any person coming in contact with the same was likewise affected. On regaining cleanness, the one afflicted washed his clothes and bathed his flesh, and on the eighth day brought an offering unto the Lord of two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, the one for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering, (vs. 13-15). The person unclean by contact washed his clothes, bathed himself in water, and remained unclean until the even, (v. 5). The issue was unclean in its nature, as well as ceremonially, and is a profitable and interesting study from such an aspect, but it speaks to us also of something deeper than the laws of hygiene, good and necessary though these may be. We learn therefrom of the unclean nature of sin, and the manner of its cleansing, for the consequences of sin affect man's whole nature, reaching deeply therein, even in his own defaced likeness, (Gen. 5:3), and all his relationships are tainted with sin. The only way of cleansing is through the washing of regeneration, (Titus 3:5), based on the expiatory sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, (Eph. 5:25-27). Note the desire of God for cleanness in His people, and the dread consequences of defilement, (vs. 31). Explain this from the spiritual standpoint, and show the necessity of being clean here and hereafter.

II. THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, (16:1-34).

The preparation of the priest. Among the observances of Israel the day of atonement was accounted the central one. To the Israelite the time of its observance was THE day. This was due to the sacrificial importance of the services. The offerings were national in their scope, and covered the sins of the whole people. The time of the institution of this observance given as "after the death of the two sons of Aaron when

they offered before the Lord and died", (v. 1; 10:2) and the important nature thereof is seen in the directions given concerning the various rites. The priest is instructed first of all not to come at all times into the holy place within the veil before the mercy seat which is upon the ark; that he die not", (v. 2). This place was the holy of holies, symbolical of the place of God's immediate presence into which the high priest alone entered only once each year on the day of atonement, and that not without blood, (Heb. 9:17). At that time the way into the secret place was not open to all, but at the death of Christ the veil was rent from top to bottom, (Matt. 27:51), signifying free access into the divine presence through the sacrifice of our Lord, (Heb. 10:19, 20), and the fulfillment of the type in the antitype. We are invited now to enter boldly unto the throne of grace, there to obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need, (Heb. 4:16).

Aaron is further instructed concerning the cleansing of his body which was to be washed, and the putting on of the holy linen garments, the coat, the breeches, the girdle, and the mitre, (v. 4). Such directions emphasize the necessity for holiness in the presence of God. This He desires in all His own, (Heb. 12:14). It also typifies the holiness found in our Great High Priest, Jesus Christ. He was the One in whom there was found no sin. And in the divesting of himself of His gorgeous garments by the high priest, in order to put on the plain white clothes, we learn of the humility necessary on the part of all who would approach God to receive His mercy.

The offering of the priest. There cannot be a complete type of our Lord among men anywhere, for the finite cannot adequately portray the infinite. And this is illustrated in the case of the Aaronic priesthood. Each priest must die, and when he did so his priesthood ceased, but our Lord's priesthood is eternal, (Heb. 7:24). He is alive for evermore, having overcome death and the grave. This contrast is seen also in relation to the offerings. Before presenting the offering for the nation, Aaron offered one for himself and his house, (v. 6). He was only a man, and consequently imperfect, and required an offering to atone for his own sins and those of his house. Our Lord did not require to offer an offering in His own behalf. He had no sin to cover, no defilement to cleanse away. He was absolutely perfect. It is with thanksgiving we thus state His character. He was the God-man, without defect of any kind. In this offering of the priest on his own behalf we see again the necessity of holiness on the part of the one who would serve God, and especially on the part of the one who would offer sacrifice on behalf of others. There must by no possibility be any sin unatoned for on the part of the priest, no ceremonial uncleanness must be found in him. All must be cleansed before performing the duties pertaining to the day of atonement—all speaking of the perfection alone found in our Lord.

The offering for the priest was "a young bullock for a sin offering and a ram for a burnt offering", (v. 3), the former being offered first. The bullock was slain, then Aaron took a "censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar

before the Lord in his hands full of sweet incense beaten small", and brought it within the veil; and "put the incense upon the fire before the Lord that the cloud of the incense" might "cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony", (vs. 12, 13). After that he was instructed to take the blood of the bullock and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward, and before the mercy seat seven times, (v. 14). In this manner the blood was presented before the Lord, and unto Him. The burnt offering was not offered until later, (v. 24). The significance of these offerings has been noted in former lessons, therefore no further explanation is necessary, except to state that the sin offering has an expiatory significance and the burnt offering a dedicatory.

The offering for the congregation. After offering his own offering the high priest killed the goat of the sin offering, and did with its blood as he had done with the blood of the bullock, (v. 15), the blood of this offering making "an atonement for the holy place because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins", (v. 16). No man was in the tabernacle while the high priest was performing these duties, (v. 17), and upon his emerging therefrom after making atonement "for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel", (v. 17), he made atonement for the altar, sprinkling the blood of the offerings thereupon, (vs. 18, 19). After this part of the service was completed, the second goat which had been presented unto the Lord with the other, (v. 7), and known as the scapegoat, (vs. 8-10), was sent into the wilderness after a prescribed service had been performed over it. The high priest laid both his hands upon its head then confessed "over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat", which was then sent away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat into the wilderness."

The typical significance of the slain goat is quite clear as representing, with the bullock, our Lord in His death for our sins. Concerning the living goat, difference of opinion has existed concerning the meaning of the term translated "scapegoat", some referring it to "Satan", others to "a thing separated unto God". Whatever view is adopted the typical application is to Christ who bore away our sins, (Heb. 9:28), for this goat was presented before the Lord with the one which was slain. Typically the goat bore away the sins of Israel into the wilderness, "unto a land not inhabited". Among the many lessons to be derived from this observance, note: the twofold aspect of the work of our Lord, in suffering the penalty, and bearing away the sin; the disposal by God of the sins of His people—removed them, (Ps. 103:12), cast them into the depths of the sea, (Mic. 7:19), blotted them out, (Is. 44:22); the inadequacy of the animal offerings required repetition; the sufficiency of our Lord's offering, and the nature of divine salvation, by substitution.

(Continued from page 9)

the Word of God says a certain thing is unclean, and is not to be eaten, you will do very well without it.

I would not say that on religious grounds these things are prohibited. I have no sympathy whatever with Seventh Day Adventism, or its legalism. But just as one day in seven should be set apart for rest, because we need it, so I believe there is a deep hygienic law running through these prohibitions. If we observe them we are likely to be better in health. At all events, I like the safe side of uncertainty. Skirt the precipice if you will: I prefer the high road fenced on both sides when I want to make a journey. Think that through for yourselves.

DON'T FORGET THE HOD-CARRIER

Who is he? The Gospel Witness of course. The friend of all good causes, and a succourer of many."

The fiscal year for The Gospel Witness will close March 31st also. Plan to send a contribution to The Gospel Witness Fund before that date, and to make sure, send it now.

KEEP THE FIRE BURNING

Toronto Baptist Seminary is the only Baptist Theological seminary in Canada irrevocably committed to Evangelical principles, teaching its students that the Bible is the infallible word of God, and that men may be saved only through faith in the cleansing efficacy of the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

On this ground Toronto Baptist Seminary solicits your support.

We need \$1,500.00 per month. Our fiscal year will close March 31st. Send in a contribution now.

Put Toronto Baptist Seminary, Jarvis St., in your will.

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

NO FUTURE WITH THE REGULARS.

We are told that a young minister was recently approached by an older one and given advice. This advice was to the effect that if the young man wished a real field of service, he should seek elsewhere than in the ranks of the churches associated with the fellowship known as "The Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec".

Now, while we believe that the young men who have been separated unto the ministry of the gospel and are associated with the Union are anxious to have a large sphere of service, we do not think they are over anxious to make a name for themselves, but to exalt His holy Name. The above "advice" reminds one of the fact that when Charles Haddon Spurgeon went to London, "men comforted his father with doleful prophecies of failure; and one hardly wonders at their fears. A mere youth, unknown, save to very few, without wealth or powerful friends, and, moreover, belonging to one of the most despised of all sects, it did not seem probable that the new-comer would be known beyond the narrow circle of his own church," so writes one of his biographers.

The Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec promises nothing to the men associated with it: if it is not enough that the Lord has promised that "He goeth before" and that His followers have been ordained that they should go and bring forth fruit, they should certainly seek other associations, for as in Spurgeon's time we belong to "the most despised of all sects".

* * * *

HODGE PODGE AGAIN.

A week or so ago, it was noted in these pages that there were those who evidently had a taste for "Hodge Podge", but we had no idea that there would be others who would publicly broadcast their distaste. It was, therefore, quite a shock to read the headline of an interesting news item in the Toronto Daily Star of January 25th as follows—"TILLEY OBJECTS TO 'HODGE PODGE'". The above refers to the eminent lawyer, W. N. Tilley, K.C., who is reported to have said—"We object to being tried under a hodge podge principle by means of which it appears as if they were determined to get a conviction in one manner or another". The principle of "Hodge

Podge" whether in pudding, or not, is always the same and is an insult to one's intelligence and one must certainly be the most gullible of the gullibles not to detect it in spite of sanctimonious wrappings and its hypocritical content.

* * * *

TURKEY AND ALL THE FRILLS

Were enjoyed by our out-going missionary party on Christmas Day, 1931. On board the Elder-Dempster Liner bound for Africa, we are told that there was a real Christmas celebration and that funny paper hats were donned by all, while pretty balloons added to the festive decoration.

Miss Stacey played for the singing and this was greatly enjoyed until about eleven o'clock when the members of the missionary party retired. After they left for their state-rooms, they realized that there was another sort of party held, and yet they have faith to believe that the Lord will honor their testimony.

Mr. Hancox endeavoured to speak to the members of the crew and others, as did Mrs. Hancox and Miss Stacey, when ever opportunity presented itself, but in most cases met with rebuff. The chief

steward seemed more interested than the rest and Mr. Hancox had a long talk with him about his soul's salvation. Join with the missionaries in prayer that the Lord will bring him to Himself.

The Captain of the boat, while seemingly resenting the missionaries' desire to preach Christ to him, was most considerate of the party's comfort and was kindness itself and the prayers of God's people are asked for him also.

The above interesting notes have been culled from a card received from Mrs. Hancox. It was mailed from Freetown. We are still anxiously awaiting letters telling us of the arrival at Grand Bassa.

At the time of writing, Mrs. Hancox felt that it would be Monday, December 28th, before Grand Bassa was reached, but from the cable advice, it would appear that that port was made two days earlier.

**PLEASE NOTE—
IMPORTANT.**

The Union Office endeavors to keep an up-to-date list of all Church Officers, that notices may be forwarded when necessary, without delay. It is to be expected that there will be changes of officers from time to time and the churches are requested to cooperate with the Office by sending word of any such changes to the Office Secretary, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto.

With regard to change of address for the Missionary Bulletin, it is also asked that the Office be advised, as even a slight change in address will mean the return of your Bulletin which is forwarded under the circular postal rate.

ORANGEVILLE.

The Orangeville Baptist Church is experiencing good times. The Young People's meetings are of a particularly interesting character and one meeting a month is given to the Pastor, Rev. A. C. Whitcombe. At this meeting, the Pastor speaks on a topic which has been chosen by the Young People themselves and the discussion of these subjects is profitable to all.

The women of the Orangeville Church continue their prayer meetings and there is a desire to, by prayer and work, get the Lord's business done.

At the close of last Sunday evening's service, in response, to an appeal voiced by the Pastor, a large number of the congregation came forward signifying their desire to consecrate their lives anew to the service of the Lord.

SPRINGFIELD.

Very happy times are being experienced at Springfield Baptist Church and

at the church's recent Annual Meeting splendid reports were received from all departments of the work.

The Young People's meeting held on Monday evenings has been particularly encouraging lately and forty young people are often gathered there to "Learn of Him". The prayer meetings of the church are times of blessing and refreshing and the Bible School shows a good increase in attendance. Rev. R. K. Yal-land is Pastor.

In connection with the services held at Otterville and Rosanna, it is noted that there were several responses to the invitation and that at West Oro, when the Band visited the Church to assist in the re-opening of the church after its hav-

of bringing them into the school for the sake of numbers, but to have the opportunity of bringing them to the Lord Jesus Christ. Last week, there was an attendance of one hundred and three in the Bible School and the preaching service was also well attended. New families are becoming interested from week to week and the pastoral care of the flock is demanding. Pray for Mr. Chipchase and the faithful members of the Suffolk St. Church who are so willingly giving of their best in behalf of the Mission.

A NOTE OF INTEREST.

From Mr. D. H. Bailie, a member of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, and one of the men of the Toronto Baptist Seminary, we hear that he has with Mr. Melbourne (one of the young men who accompanied Mr. Bauer's Gospel Truck last summer through Saskatchewan) conducted a special campaign in the East Nisouri Baptist Church. A real time of blessing was experienced and a number of decisions for Christ were made. Every house in the district was visited and the occupants invited to come to the services, those who would not come had the gospel preached to them right there at their own door or in their own homes. Mr. Bailie will be preaching at the East Nisouri Church on Sunday evenings and asks that he be remembered in prayer.

**RUNNYMEDE
REGULAR BAPTIST.**

Runnymede Road Regular Baptist Church, Rev. P. B. Loney, pastor, held its annual meeting Wednesday evening, January 21st, at which reports were received announcing that the gross income for the year was \$7,512.30, the net income \$5,262.30; from the current fund receipts were \$3,123. Church gifts to missions were \$943.50, and gifts to missions from all sources amounted to \$1,091.78. The following were re-elected to the Deacons' Board by acclamation: Mark Woodley, George Mellish, G. A. Mortimer. Thomas Silcox was elected to the office of Church Clerk, and H. Breechin was elected Treasurer. An increase in membership of 82 makes a total of 242. The occasion was marked by the recognition of the tenth year of the pastor's service, and in moving a vote to make a substantial increase in his salary, Deacon Mortimer expressed appreciation of his work.

SOMETHING NEW
IN THE WAY OF PROGRAMS
WILL BE PRESENTED
AT THE GREAT MEETING TO BE HELD
FRIDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 5th
in the
JARVIS ST. BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO

For once the work which is being done by the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec will be given publicity.

**THE PRESENTATION WILL BE INTERESTING;
THE FACTS WILL BE CONVINCING.**

COME — SEE — HEAR

The Meeting Will be a Challenge to All Who Call Themselves Baptists and to Christians Generally.

LANTERN SLIDES WILL BE USED TO ILLUSTRATE AND WHILE THE WORK AT HOME WILL BE ESPECIALLY EMPHASIZED, THERE WILL BE A NEW PRESENTATION OF LIBERIAN INTERESTS.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5th, AT 8 P.M.
JARVIS ST. BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO
The Members of the Executive Board of the Union will be present.

ing been renovated, there was a great meeting. Every available seat within the church was taken and many who could not gain admittance listened through the windows and doors. At this service, one young man accepted Christ as Saviour.

GUELPH.

"I have played baseball and I know the thrill of winning a game," says the Pastor of the Suffolk St. Baptist Church, Guelph, with which is associated the York Road Mission, "but I have never enjoyed anything more than the Contest which we have recently held in our Bible School". The contest about which Mr. H. H. Chipchase speaks was a campaign for boys and girls, not merely a means