

Jarvis Street Church Resumes Broadcasting over Station CKOC (1120 kilocycles) Sunday, November 22nd, 7 to 8.30 p.m., and thereafter every Sunday evening at the same hour. Tune in Sunday next.

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES
AND IN DEFENCE 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
Editor S.S. Lesson: WILLIAM J. JONES

"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. 15, No. 28

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 19, 1936

Whole Number 757

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

CAN WE BE SAVED WITHOUT BLOOD?

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, November 15th, 1936

(Stenographically Reported)

"And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission."—Hebrews 9:22.

On the day of Pentecost the disciples, "after that the Holy Ghost had come upon them", spake "with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance". The word of the gospel is written, if I may so say, in the tongue of the Spirit. The gospel of the grace of God is unique. It has a language that is peculiarly its own. Its idiom belongs to no earthly tongue: it speaks the language of Heaven itself.

Most of us have observed how, endeavouring to learn some other language than that to which they were born, people begin by carrying the idiom of their native speech into the language they would acquire. For a simple example: you have observed some who, endeavouring to speak English, attribute to everything they see either masculine or feminine qualities. Because they know nothing of a neuter gender, as in French, everything becomes either masculine or feminine.

The Word of God is literally the word of God, and it is like no other word that ever was written. Perhaps you have noticed that men reflect in their speech, their calling or profession; and sometimes something of their resources. A man of limited means does not speak in terms of thousands—much less of millions. He counts his dollars—and very probably his cents. But quite unconsciously, a man who is aware of almost inexhaustible resources, reflects that fact in the very language he employs. He is not under the same necessity of being careful in his expenditures. Hence he speaks in large figures because of the great resources in the background of his thought.

Let us remember that the Word of God is the word of the Infinite, and that our God is infinite in every quality of His Being. He knows no limitation. Whatever aspect of the divine character you may hold in review, you must remember that that is without measure,

whether it be His wisdom, His faithfulness, His righteousness, truth, or justice, that quality belongs to God in an infinite degree. The Psalmist speaks of His mercy and faithfulness, "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; and thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds": these qualities outstrip and transcend all standards and measurements with which the Psalmist was familiar. His righteousness? His judgments? "Thy righteousness is like the great mountains; thy judgments are a great deep": their summits are inaccessible, and their depths unfathomable. The qualities—or the attributes, if you like the weaker word—of God: His wisdom, His faithfulness, His mercy, His love, His righteousness, His truth, His justice, His power—they are all without measure.

We find in the divine speech such words as holiness and grace. These terms involve concepts that are foreign to human thought. They are beyond our comprehension altogether. That is why the Scripture says that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men." What wonder therefore that when man exercises his puny intellect in an endeavour to understand the Word of God, if he depends exclusively upon his own powers of thought and understanding, supplemented only by other human aids, he should find much in the Word of Revelation at which to stumble. He must of necessity be amazed because the divine Author is speaking of another world, of a realm that is infinitely beyond all human experience, and outstrips the utmost bounds of the most vivid imagination. Therefore when we come to that which is the profoundest truth of the whole Christian revelation, that which is the very heart of it, as gathered up, epitomized in the brief words of our text—what wonder that men should fail to understand it: "Without shedding of blood is no remission."

I am not surprised that the human intellect staggers at that representation of truth. Nor am I surprised that the carnal mind, in its native antagonism toward God, should be especially opposed to that aspect of the gospel of redemption. It is no wonder that our higher critical friends should have ingeniously invented the theory of the composite character of the Pentateuch, and attributed and classified as belonging to what they call the priestly code everything that relates to the ritual of blood, the atonement by blood. (This perhaps should have no part in a sermon, because it belongs more appropriately to the classroom.) They excise the priestly code and date it some time beyond the Exile, and thus make the whole Pentateuch to be a forgery, and therefore utterly unreliable.

If that were true, the Epistle to the Hebrews would be valueless—indeed, the foundation of the entire New Testament would be destroyed, and we should have today—as we have in many places—a religion bearing the name of Christian which is but a system of humanitarianism, or even humanism. No! No! It is written, "Without shedding of blood is no remission."

I.

Let me say of this that IT IS THE ULTIMATUM OF DIVINE REVELATION. Whether you understand it or not, there it stands. Though you cannot explain it, and even if it be to your thought all but unimaginable, "the mere fact that it is part and parcel of divine revelation, that it is an integral part of the Word that God has communicated to His creatures, we ought to receive it. *It were the part of wisdom to acquiesce in the divine word, even though we cannot understand it.*

We must do so in many realms of human endeavour and activity. When you consult an expert, whether it be in the realm of mechanics, law, medicine, commerce, industry, or finance, you consult him because he knows more than you do. When there is sickness in the home, and the doctor gives a Latin designation to the disease, people who do not know another word of Latin, remember that particular word, and rather learnedly inform you by what malady their friend is afflicted. They may have but the remotest idea what the word means, but the expert has pronounced upon it, and therefore it must be true.

In other spheres also we take the advice of the expert. A friend of mine who had a little money in the bank, said to the banker, "Suppose I were to come to borrow a couple of hundred dollars, would you let me have it?" "Certainly. I know you well, and beside you have collateral here. We should be taking no risk." "If I were to borrow that amount, what interest would you charge?" "Seven per cent." (This was a few years ago.) "Seven per cent.? Will you please explain to me why your money is worth so much more than mine?" "What do you mean?" "What rate of interest do you pay me on deposit?" "Two and a half per cent." "And I borrow some of yours, and what do you charge me?" "Seven per cent." "Why should your money be better than mine?" But that is what you would have to do if you went to the bank to borrow—you would have to take the expert's advice! We must do many things we do not understand. Surely where the salvation of the soul is concerned, and where we have an unmistakable word from God, even if we could not understand it, we should be wise to accept His word.

The truth of my text was revealed *in the beginning*. When sin had entered, and the two sacrifices were offered, the firstfruits of the land and the firstling of the flock, it was the sacrifice that had blood in it, and that alone, that was accepted of God. After the flood, when Noah built an altar and offered sacrifices to Jehovah, "the Lord smelled a sweet savour"; and it was after the sacrifice had been offered that He said, "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake . . . while the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease"—notwithstanding that simple man of whom we read last night who has built an ark in expectation of another deluge.

Abraham took the ram caught in the thicket by the horns, and "offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son". When Israel was delivered from Egypt, there was the sacrifice of the passover. When the Hebrew worship was established, and the altar was set up, there was enjoined upon the people a ritual of blood. When the first tabernacle was dedicated, it was dedicated with blood. All through the Old Testament dispensation that crimson line runs. Make what you like of it, it is there. I attempt no explanation for the moment: I simply tell you that if you accept the Bible as the word of God you cannot reject the testimony of the word that "without shedding of blood is no remission".

When our Lord Jesus began His public ministry, the divinely-appointed herald of the Saviour introduced Him by saying, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." The Lord Jesus put the same interpretation upon the fact of His incarnation, and the function of His earthly ministry: "The Son of man", said He, "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom instead of many." The same truth inheres in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper which He instituted.

After His resurrection, when He met the two on the Emmaus Road, He said, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded with them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." And again "he said unto them, these are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Thus did He Himself declare that He had come into this world to die for our sins.

Throughout the apostolic ministry the blood, the death and resurrection of Christ, was the central theme of the apostles' preaching. All through the epistles subsequently the same great truth is expounded, that we are saved by blood. In the chapter from which Mr. Brown read, it is taught, and very especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews—and confirmed in the last book of the Bible. John saw the "Lamb in the midst of the throne"; and even in its concluding pages, in the vision of the

heavenly city where sun and moon and stars had paled before the greater Light, the city had no need of their ministry, for "the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof". So that from Genesis to Revelation, the Bible is bound together by this scarlet thread, the promise of the cleansing blood.

That ought to be enough without any explanation of it: the mere fact that the Word of God declares it, ought to be sufficient for His children to accept it.

II.

BUT DIVINE REVELATION IS NEVER WITHOUT ITS REASON. God made us rational creatures, and because of that, *He always secures the co-operation of all the faculties of the mind.* He never imposes His word or His will upon us. He gives us His word as the word of supreme authority. He does exercise the power of His omnipotent will, but in doing so, He invariably secures the co-operation of the whole man. "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord." Great as God is, He is never arbitrary. There is a sense in which what Whittier somewhere says is true, that

"Man, as man, retaineth yet
How'ever debased, and soiled, and dim,
The crown upon his forehead set,
The immortal gift of God to him."

He made us to have dominion. He made us to be kings, and all be it, our sin has converted the crown which He put upon our brow into a crown of thorns, it is there—debased and soiled and dim, and without value save as touched by the power of God. But having made us volitional creatures, men with intelligence, with reason, even the word of divine revelation never ignores our reasoning capabilities, but always so enlightens the mind that a man may, intelligently, by the enabling grace of the Holy Spirit, yield himself to the Word of God.

It is a great mistake to assume, as some moderns or modernists do, that the children of faith are very simple and credulous, and believe only because credulity asks no proof. Faith, my dear friends, is not the offspring of irrational credulity. It requires a thousandfold more credulity to accept the philosophy of Modernism than it does to accept the plain statements of the Word of an infinite God. And even when faith does transcend our understanding—and it does—it represents a truth that, though it transcends reason, yet recognizes the divine transcendence. True faith is a recognition of God as God.

Let us assume Mr. Brown makes a promise, I make a promise, a hundred other people here make promises. Let us suppose we are all men who have a reputation for ordinary honesty and trustworthiness. People say, "I believe that if those men say it, it must be so." You believe my promise? "Yes". You should not. "But why not?" My promise relates to to-morrow, and I may not live until to-morrow. My promise relates to certain human resources, and I pledge myself to do something if I am able, but before that promise is implemented, something might occur to prevent; therefore we are unable to perform that which is promised.

What is faith? The attitude and exercise of a divinely enlightened mind that differentiates between God and everybody else. That is the meaning of the profound scripture, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all

the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." True faith does not say of Jesus Christ—as I heard a man say over the radio this afternoon, that He is a divine creature. He is not a "divine creature": He is the sovereign Creator. The man who calls Jesus a creature does not speak according to the Word of God. True faith distinguishes between Jesus Christ and everybody else that ever lived. Faith says, "I can believe Him, and believe of Him what I could not possibly believe of anyone else." When faith transcends our puny reasoning powers, it is never contrary to sound reason, but saith, "It is God: let him do what seemeth him good."

I say, the revelation of God is never divorced from reason, and seldom without a reason being either stated or implied.

Why did Jesus Christ come? That God might be "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus". That was a strong word that Mr. Brown read to us this evening, that Jesus Christ was "set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past"—it is a different word from the word "remission" in the text,—really "the passing over of sins done aforetime"; sins that were not remitted, sins that were not cancelled, but passed over—as though a moral universe challenged the divine right to do so. Now, says the inspired apostle, Jesus Christ is "set forth"—what for? "To declare his righteousness, for the passing over of sins done aforetime." In other words, the cross of Jesus Christ is just as indispensable to the justification of the moral government of the universe, as it is necessary for the justification of a sinner. God is justified—and is declared to be just—in the setting forth of Jesus Christ as a sacrifice for sin.

The Bible sets forth the philosophy of salvation by blood. I have on my shelves a little book entitled, "The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation". It is an old book, written, not by a man who was, in the beginning at least, a theologian, but by a lawyer who was an agnostic, and very nearly a skeptic. He was accustomed to make light of the Bible, but one day it occurred to him that he ought to know more of the Book he criticized. He set to work diligently to study it—with the inevitable result that, coming with an open mind to the Word of God, he saw it to be what it really is, and was converted. He was so impressed with the philosophical aspect of the whole scheme of redemption, with its rationality, with its harmony with all systems of human thought that take cognizance of truth, that he produced the book, "The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation".

It may be there is a young man here who is a student for the ministry. If it be so, then in any college where your professor makes light of salvation by the blood, let his authority as a thinker from that moment cease for you. The profoundest intellects in all ages, having examined this masterpiece of Deity, have ever come to lay at His bleeding feet all their powers of intellect, as of heart.

Sin is dissonance in the soul's relation to God; it is an act of rebellion against God. Therefore salvation must involve a restoration to right relationship to God. When a man contends against God, he challenges—how shall I put it—a united Deity, for God is never divided against Himself. He is never at cross-purposes with Himself; and therefore every quality

of the Godhead, if there be one God, must reinforce every other quality; so that a man has allied against him every function of the Divine Mind. He has challenged the government of the universe, with all its resources. The issue of that inevitably must be death.

The Scripture says, "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." I have heard some of my evangelical friends labour to prove that that statement is in strict accord with what science now says and believes to have been demonstrated to be a fact, that the life of the flesh is in the blood. I am not sufficiently familiar with medical science to discourse upon it; but empirically, if not scientifically, that has been observed through all ages, to be a fact. When the body is emptied of blood the man is dead. A body, whether of man or beast, is flesh and blood, and the life of the flesh is in the blood. The blood is the life. It is life visible, life in solution.

What life is, nobody knows. Sir Arthur Keith, when President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, said he believed that science would yet demonstrate that life could be chemically produced. His successor said that science knew no more about life than the first man. Life is produced from antecedent life. Whence it originated, no one knows if he shuts the Bible. But if we believe the Word we know: "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." "The life of the flesh is in the blood." We know that when the blood fails, life departs; therefore the blood is the visible symbol of life.

Sin has outraged the divine nature. It has set everything there is in God at defiance. But Jesus Christ is "God manifest in the flesh". His life is the life of God; and when He gave His life a ransom for many, He gave Himself with all He is for man's redemption: a life for a life. I am sure from the Word of God that there is no gospel other than this, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures."

What follows? "Without shedding of blood is no remission." Salvation is possible only as God Himself steps into the breach and receives into His own capacious nature—the infinitude of Deity—the sorrows and sufferings of the whole world, dying "the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God". Only by this means could the scales be balanced, could the moral equilibrium of the universe be so adjusted that a holy God could save sinful man. Hence the blood spoken of here is none other than the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

III.

Now very simply, What is THE RESULT to be expected from the shedding of this blood? "Without shedding of blood is no remission." If the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ represents the blood of the Son of God, then it, in its turn, is a symbol of all the powers of the Godhead of which we have reason to be afraid. Someone may say, "I believe in the love of God. I am a sinner, but I believe in the mercy of God." By and by he sees himself in clearer light, and discovers that there is nothing in him worth loving, and that even the mercy of God may be outraged by the greatness of his sin. He begins to say, "I am not so sure. I do not feel very safe in trusting the mercy of God." But when he

sees the truth of the gospel, he finds that the righteousness of God, the truth of God, the justice of God, have become his friends; so that now, when God saves a sinner, he is justified. Not only in mercy, but according to the strict principles of righteousness and truth He deals with us, for the reason our sins have been paid for, and the debt cancelled. Now we stand on solid ground. The very sword we feared would slay us, we now see to be unsheathed for our protection; the very attributes of Deity which filled us with fear, become the bulwark of our faith. We love Him because He is righteous and just, as well as because He is loving and merciful.

That being so, you will see readily that this text *excludes the possibility of remission by any other method than by the blood.* Notwithstanding there are many people who make light of the blood, this is God's way: "Without shedding of blood there is no remission."

I need not go into details as to how men try to save themselves, except to say that church membership, good works, almsgiving, saying of prayers, reading the Bible, engaging in any or every form of religious service and charitable ministry, cannot save you. You may do all that, but "without shedding of blood is no remission". It makes no difference what else you do, there is no salvation for anyone apart from the blood.

How then are we to avail ourselves of it? By accepting it for what the Bible says it is, the way of life. *If it be so that there is no salvation without it, we may safely assume there is full salvation by it:* "The blood of Jesus Christ, his son, cleanseth us from all sin." When I have said all I have tried to say to you this evening, I am aware that not a word of this great spiritual truth will find entrance to any mind unless the Lord of light and truth shall open that mind, enabling men to see that Jesus Christ is, after all, "God manifest in the flesh"; and that only as we accord Him that place, and trust Him, and leave our sins where God has put them, upon the Lamb of God, can we be assured of everlasting life.

But what a comfort to those of us who believe in a crucified and risen Saviour! I have often had to go to the bedside of the dying. I went to see someone recently. He is still lingering amid the shadows. Of what use is it to go to one who has but a few hours left of life unless you can preach to him the gospel of the blood? Life is behind him. He has now no chance to redeem himself.

There is not one of us who has not spent part of his life—some here most of it—and if it be not so that the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, "cleanseth us from all sin", what hope is there for us for time or eternity? But blessed be His name, it is true. Let me say it again, listen as I whisper it: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish; but have everlasting life."

Let us pray:

Forgive us, O Lord, if any of us for a moment have wandered from this truth, if we have been foolish enough to put our trust in anything other than the blood of Thy Son. If there be any here to-night like the poor woman who had suffered many things of many physicians, and are nothing better, but rather worse, who have tried every ism that the devil can invent, bring such an one to the cross of Christ, to the open grave—yea, to the open heavens, to Him Who has promised eternal life. Once again we pray: the prayer, God be merciful to us sinners; for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE STORY OF THE PLOT THAT FAILED

The History of a Church's Struggle to Maintain an Evangelical Ministry in a Free Pulpit

By T. T. SHIELDS

CHAPTER III.

The First Four Years

The reason I now speak of the first four years is that that broadly defines the pre-war period of my pastorate. No Pastor could possibly be more loyally supported than I was. The congregations increased until Sunday evenings the auditorium was invariably filled. The finances of the church showed a steady improvement. Nor were we without a measure of spiritual blessing.

Additions to the church were:

	Baptism	Letter	Experience	Total
The first year:	25	99	124
The second year:	38	67	10	115
The third year:	70	283	10	363
The fourth year:	65	50	16	131
	198	499	36	733

The large number received by letter in the third year included the Parliament Street Church which was taken over by Jarvis Street at that time. But exclusive of such additions, the average for the four years was one hundred and twelve per year.

From 1910 to 1911, the total revenue reported was:

First year	\$28,465.44
Second year	28,889.19
Third year	33,765.80
Fourth year	39,437.11

A total for the four years of \$130,857.54, an average of \$32,714.38 per year.

When the call to Jarvis Street was presented to me, and I talked with officials about the prospects for the future, I was told that they hoped to see Jarvis Street Church become a great preaching centre. It was said to be a downtown church. Its membership, with the growth of the city, was being scattered more and more widely, and the distances members had to travel was constantly increasing. Nobody could then foresee the general use of motor-cars which obtains to-day. At that time there were only three or four people in Jarvis Street who owned motor-cars.

The average attendance at Sunday School was about one hundred and ninety-five, and I was told there could be no reasonable expectation of any large increase in that direction because Jarvis Street was becoming less and less a family church. The Deacons very generously proposed that I should have an assistant, but I suggested we had better wait until I had had opportunity to study the whole church situation. Having done so, seven months after my coming, December, 1910, I recommended to the Deacons that the church should call Rev. B. W. Merrill, B.A., who was the Secretary of the Sunday School work in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, to become Associate-Pastor and Director of Religious Education.

I have never been associated with a more industrious man than Mr. Merrill proved to be. He was always at

it. Little by little he obtained information as to the date of the birthdays of all the children, and nearly all the adults; and for years it was his practice to write by hand a birthday letter to every member of the church and congregation. Only a man who is an animated machine, who can formulate a system and operate it, could possibly keep on with such an undertaking. But Mr. Merrill was able to do so. In fact, I generally forgot that the first of November was my birthday—I found it easier to remember the fifth of November—and repeatedly I was reminded only when, on the morning of the first of November, the postman would bring me Mr. Merrill's kind birthday letter of felicitations.

Mr. Merrill and I worked very happily together for nearly ten years. No colleague could have been more loyal, or readier to co-operate in every way, than he was. I look back upon those years as years of delightful fellowship.

Toward the end of that time, Mr. Merrill and I differed sharply on certain questions, and decided to dissolve partnership; but we parted as good friends. In the denominational controversy that followed, Mr. Merrill was in the opposite camp, but so far as he and I were concerned, there was never to my knowledge any bitterness on either side. The memory of ten happy years made it impossible for me at any time to entertain any other feeling than one of deep affection for my former colleague. He and his family were dear to me, and while life remains those ten years of association will never be blotted from my memory.

My dear friend—as he always was to me to the end of the chapter—has been in heaven for two or three years, with many other lovely saints from Jarvis Street Church. Some day we shall all be there who have been washed in the blood of Christ; and I have a feeling we shall talk over the experiences of earth, and be inclined to laugh at our folly for having attached such importance to some things, while being amazed at our blindness at having regarded too lightly matters which find their issues in eternity.

During the years of Mr. Merrill's regime the Sunday School was ordered on the pattern of the most modern and approved Sunday School methods. But it was an afternoon School. It was difficult for workers to attend the morning service and get home and back in time for afternoon School; or, if they attended in the afternoon, almost equally difficult to get home and back for evening service. The result was that the School, with the removal of the membership to outlying districts, gradually became almost a separate organization. The School increased, but not largely. If the Home Department and Cradle Roll were reckoned out, the average actual attendance would not greatly exceed three hundred.

But that was no fault of Mr. Merrill's. In those days, few members of Jarvis Street had learned to give the Lord all their time apart from that which was necessary for their business and their home life. Our present Sun-

day School could never have been operated with the type of life we had in Jarvis Street in those days.

I would not be misunderstood. I do not remember that it was ever necessary to apologize for the life of any Jarvis Street member. They were delightful people on the whole, and walked circumspectly before the world. But they had not learned the principle of entire separation: "unto the gospel of Christ". On the other hand, I have often thought in these later years of how happy such a systematic and industrious worker as my friend Mr. Merrill was, would have been as part of our present organization. To him, our present Sunday School would have been a bit of heaven upon earth. That is only my opinion. But I look forward to talking it all over with him in that "better" land, in which there shines a "better" light—where, indeed, the Lord is manifestly present, and everything is "far better".

All that I have said of Mr. Merrill, was equally true of the Deacons of the church. During these years there was never a ripple on the surface of the tranquil waters of our church life. We lived and wrought together as harmoniously and happily as is possible to mortal men.

When I came to Jarvis Street, we had a Mission on Sumach Street, which was politely called "the Branch". It was housed in a small building which was always crowded. It was, however, only two blocks from the Parliament Street Baptist Church; and Parliament Street Church was already feeling the pinch of its steadily deteriorating surroundings, and was experiencing great difficulty in making the proverbial "both ends" meet financially.

In 1912 the workers at the Branch began to agitate for a new building. I felt it would be an unneighbourly thing for Jarvis Street, with its larger resources, to erect a new building two blocks from the Parliament Street Church; and therefore negotiations with the Parliament Street officials were begun, with a view to co-operative action in that neighbourhood. It was ultimately decided to merge the membership of Parliament Street Church in Jarvis Street, disposing of the Sumach St. building, using the money to pay the mortgage off Parliament Street, and transferring our mission activities to the Parliament Street building. A substantial retiring honorarium was granted the Pastor of the Parliament St. Church. The members of Parliament Street were encouraged to take their letters to any church with which they desired to unite; but Jarvis Street announced that it would welcome to its membership all those who preferred to come to us.

That done, on my recommendation, Rev. C. M. Carew, of Maitland Street Baptist Church, London, was called by the church to become Associate-Pastor, and Superintendent of the Parliament Street Branch. Mr. Carew accepted the call, and began his work about the end of 1912.

Reference to Mr. Carew opens up another chapter in my ministerial experience. I made Mr. Carew's acquaintance when I went to London in 1904. We grew together until at the end of the six years we were well-nigh inseparable. I welcomed the opportunity for closer fellowship with him, which his new position as my associate would afford. Mr. Carew continued with us for eight years, and even in heaven itself one can scarcely hope for a sweeter association than those years provided. His was one of the most restful personalities I

have ever known. The subject of conversation was of secondary importance: his presence was the main thing.

I remember to have read an article years ago by Sir William Robertson Nicol on, "A Pair of Old Shoes", or, "A Pair of Old Slippers", I forget which. In that article Sir William likened different persons to different kinds of shoes. As I recall it now, there were some patent leather shoes. There are people with whom one associates in a formal and public relationship, clad in evening clothes and shoes, when everything is precise, immaculately perfect, dignified; in fact, rather grand on the whole. But when the necessity is over one welcomes the opportunity of getting out of formal clothes into negligee.

From that level people were graded down—or up—by Sir William until one was found like a pair of old slippers—not that he was less dignified, for kings and presidents must ease their tired feet and wear slippers. He said there are some people who have a faculty for making everybody comfortable and easy in their presence. I am drawing now only upon my memory—I have not the article before me. But my recollection is that the writer described the tired man coming from his office, or from some professional exercise, and reaching the privacy of his own home. Putting off his formal clothes, getting into lounging jacket, slipping his tired feet into a pair of old slippers, he drops into his favourite arm-chair, with one of his favourite authors for company, and putting his feet on a stool before him, heaves a sigh of relief, murmuring to himself, "This is luxury indeed."

The Editor of *The British Weekly* said there are people like that. They are the people to whom you resort when you are tired, and perhaps despondent—and a little bit lonely. Slippers do not talk: they merely make you comfortable.

Every recollection of Mr. Carew, to me is a benediction. In Jarvis Street he was greatly beloved. Repeatedly leading members of the church said to me in those days, "Now, Pastor, when you must go away, do not look outside for a supply. Have Mr. Carew preach. We all love him so much." Often I endeavoured to comply with their request, but it was difficult to persuade Mr. Carew to accede to their desire. Only a few times did he preach in Jarvis Street. If he had a defect, it was an inferiority complex. He underrated himself. His ability in every direction was greater than he knew.

In practical matters, Mr. Carew was a veritable embodiment of the wisdom that is "first pure, and then peaceable". A man of profound conviction and splendid courage, he never sacrificed principle to policy. But he used to say to me that he believed a man might often show his strength by a recognition of his limitations. He said, "Some men seem to think themselves equal to anything, and often attempt the impossible—that is, that which is impossible for them; and bring humiliation to themselves, and to all associated with them." Whenever I asked Mr. Carew to preach in Jarvis Street, he would reply, "Well, T. T., you know how I feel. It scares me stiff to think of it." But a few times I managed to persuade him, insisting that he would certainly survive the experience of being "scared stiff", and that he owed it to the people who loved him to respond to their request. On the few occasions in which he did preach in Jarvis Street, of course I was absent; but I was told it was lovely

to see how the people thronged about him—for they were all in their slippers that morning, comfortable and happy as could be.

Mr. Carew went to Fenelon Falls in January, 1921, and there he remained until October, 1934—and then he went to heaven. Without exaggeration I can borrow Tennyson's words:

"Dark house, by which once more I stand
Here in the long unlovely street,
Doors, where my heart was used to beat
So quickly, waiting for a hand,

"A hand that can be clasp'd no more—
Behold me, for I cannot sleep,
And like a guilty thing I creep
At earliest morning to the door.

"He is not here; but far away
The noise of life begins again,
And ghastly thro' the drizzling rain
On the bald street breaks the blank day.

"A happy lover who has come
To look on her that loves him well,
Who 'lights and rings the gateway bell,
And learns her gone and far from home;

"He saddens, all the magic light
Dies off at once from bower and hall,
And all the place is dark, and all
The chambers emptied of delight:

"So find I every pleasant spot
In which we two were wont to meet,
The field, the chamber and the street,
For all is dark where thou art not."

Another happy feature of those early years was the presence in the membership of the church of Dr. and Mrs. B. D. Thomas. Dr. Thomas and I had always been great friends from our first acquaintance. He was present at both services on March 6th, 1910, the occasion of my first visit to Jarvis Street; and went with me from the church to my hotel to dinner. He was graciously and most indulgently enthusiastic about the service, and at the dinner-table said, "Mark my word: this day will prove a turning point in your life."

After I became Pastor, we saw much of each other. I told the people they could not possibly please the Pastor and his wife more than by keeping Dr. and Mrs. Thomas in the place they had made for themselves in their affections through the twenty-one years of their joint ministry. I told them, too, that if, happily, there should be marriage occasions, or, sadly, the necessity for funerals, they would not offend me in the least if they asked Dr. Thomas to officiate; and that in such circumstances I would gladly take the second place, or no place at all. I said further, "If you can immediately give any other man the place that rightly belongs to the man who has ministered to you in the things of God for twenty-one years, I shall not value your friendship." I told them that I believed they would manage to find it possible, as the years went on, to make another little chamber on the wall, with bed and table and candlestick, for me; so that their Elisha could continue to occupy the place they had especially built for him.

And so, thank God, it proved. I asked Dr. Thomas to feel free to accept any invitation, from any member of the church, to serve in any way, without any reference to me; and that he could always rest assured that I should be only pleased by the people's remembrance of him.

Once I had the pleasure of having Dr. Thomas and Dr. Perry on the platform together with me, and one dear old saint—I think I will mention her name so as to perpetuate it in this relation, Mrs. J. C. Miller—said to me at the close of the service—my readers will excuse me for recording the compliment—"Pastor, I do not believe you have a jealous hair in your head." To which I replied, "Mrs. Miller, I sincerely hope you are right. But if you or anyone else can identify one, I would thank who ever did so, to pull it out."

How I hate ministerial jealousy! Alas! alas! in other directions I have not wholly escaped its sting. But my relationship to Dr. Thomas, from the beginning to the end, was a foretaste of heaven.

Dr. Thomas lived in Grimsby during those years, and once he wrote us to the effect that he was "in a strait betwixt two". He did not feel free to belong to a church without giving it his financial support; and, on the other hand, he did not feel free to enjoy the fellowship of the little church at Grimsby without giving that church such financial aid as he was able to give. He, therefore, wrote us in January, 1911, suggesting that letters be granted enabling him and his family to unite with the church in Grimsby. It was my great pleasure on that occasion to present to the Deacons the draft of a letter, with the proposal that the letter be sent in reply to that of Dr. Thomas; and I believe, as a tribute to that great man of God, it is worth reproduction here:

"February 3rd, 1911

"Rev. B. D. Thomas, D.D.,
Grimsby Park, Ont.

"Dear Dr. Thomas:

"Your letter of January 4th, 1911, addressed to the Pastor and Deacons of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, was very earnestly considered at a large meeting of the Deacons held last evening; and I am instructed to forward to you the following resolution, moved by the Pastor and seconded by Deacon D. E. Thomson, and very heartily supported, and which was passed unanimously:

"Having received a letter from Dr. B. D. Thomas, former Pastor of this church, in which he expresses his sense of obligation to the church at Grimsby where he resides, and requests the transference of the membership of himself and family from Jarvis Street to Grimsby, the Pastor and Deacons of Jarvis Street Church desire to place on record in the minutes of this Board, and thereby to assure Dr. Thomas and his family that it is our judgment that the memory of his long and successful ministry in Jarvis Street and his continued beautiful exemplification of the gospel of Christ, are a perennial contribution to the church's life and work of such inestimable value as to absolve them, in view of the need of the church where they reside, from all financial obligation to this church.

"And further be it resolved, That we assure Dr. Thomas and his family that they occupy such a large and abiding place in the hearts of the officers and members of Jarvis Street, that the severance of their connection with us would occasion the profoundest regret throughout the entire church,

"And that the Secretary be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Dr. Thomas expressing our earnest hope that he and his family may feel free to accede to our desire, a desire which we are sure is shared by the church as a whole, that they retain their membership in the Jarvis Street Church.

On behalf of the Deacons and Pastor,
(Signed) Robert Lawson,
Secretary."

Dr. Thomas readily acceded to our request, and continued as a member of Jarvis Street to the end.

At the 1916 Convention he was again elected President, though not then in the active pastorate. Some time before the Convention he talked with me about it, wondering whether he would be justified in attempting to preside. I suggested to him that he content himself with delivering the presidential address, thereafter handing over the conduct of the Convention to the Vice-Presidents, so as to relieve himself of strain. This suggestion he followed. The 1917 Convention was held in First Baptist Church, Woodstock. On Friday night the hotel dining-room was filled with Convention delegates, Dr. and Mrs. Thomas among them. I went over to their table to talk with them, and Dr. Thomas said, "Do not say a word about it, but we are going to surprise Gertrude on Sunday"—referring to his daughter in Toronto—"we are going to Lewellyn's (his son), but we shall all be down at church Sunday morning."

And they were. That morning I preached on the text, "How excellent is thy lovingkindness, O God! therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of thy wings." We had a good service, and Dr. Thomas listened with his usual inspiringly appreciative attitude. Again and again as the loving kindness of the Lord, and the measure of its excellence beyond all other affections, were exalted, great tears rolled down his cheeks. I remember thinking as he sat there what an eloquent exponent and exemplification of the last verse of the twenty-third Psalm he was: "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." Following the last hymn I called upon him to pronounce the benediction. He came forward, and, lifting his hand, with deep emotion, with tears in his voice, said, "O Lord, may we all abide for ever under the shadow of Thy wings", and then the benediction.

Dr. Thomas went to hear his son preach in the evening. On Monday he gathered his children and grandchildren about him at luncheon somewhere downtown, went home to his house in Grimsby, went to bed, remained in bed, I think, on Tuesday, and if I am not mistaken, falling asleep Tuesday evening, he wakened in heaven some time before the morning.

What precious memories these are! Let me say in my own defense, I have never been an Ishmaelite. In these later years I have been given a reputation as one who is never happy unless embroiled in controversy. It is not within the longest astronomical measurement of the truth.

So far as I am now able to recall, and the church records show, during the first four years there seemed to be a steady increase in spiritual vigour. The congregations were gratifyingly large; conversions were not infrequent; and the monthly baptismal service, which was observed at that time, found always some awaiting baptism. The records show also there was a steady increase in financial support, increasing from \$28,000 to \$39,000. The life of the church was characterized by a delightful unity, while the one weekly prayer-meeting, held on Wednesday evening, always comfortably filled the Lecture Hall.

But there was no great spiritual movement, nothing that could be described as a revival. During those years Jarvis Street was "like a tree planted by the rivers of water": it brought forth its fruit in its season, not perhaps the "much fruit" which is peculiarly glorify-

ing to God; but it did bear some fruit. Certainly its leaf did not wither, and, by ordinary standards of religious progress, whatsoever it did prospered.

A new departure was taken at the Annual Meeting in 1914, when authority was given to the Deacons to appoint the Church Clerk. A Clerk was appointed to give his entire time to the work of the Church, and the church office was thereafter open daily from nine to five o'clock for church business.

I ought, for the sake of my brother-ministers who read this, to call attention to one matter. Jarvis Street Church had in its membership many men prominent in business and professional life. When I came to Jarvis Street Church I assumed I should find it perfectly organized, and its business affairs ordered and systematized as the businesses of these men must have been. Therefore, I did not immediately intervene, but quietly observed how things were done.

We had a large Deacons' Board, and a Finance Committee consisting of more than thirty members. But for the first three years the Treasurer reported a deficit at each Annual Meeting. The brethren were not at all disturbed about it, and I was told not to worry because everybody knew that Jarvis Street Church had large resources financially, and could be depended upon to pay its debts. I attended the meeting of the Finance Committee whenever possible, to see how things were done. At one meeting, a letter was read from a certain man who had been paying the rent for one or more pianos; and in the discussion which followed, it transpired there were several pianos about the building which were not the property of the church, but were privately rented for the convenience of different organizations. The letter referred to intimated that the gentleman who had been paying the rent for one or more of them, now desired to be relieved of the responsibility.

One of the members of the Committee, who was also a deacon, brought the discussion to an end with a remark like this: "I am tired of listening to these discussions about pianos. I move that Deacon So-and-So be authorized to buy what pianos we need." It was carried without dissent, and that week several pianos, including a grand piano for the Lecture Hall, were delivered at the church. But no provision was made to meet the extra expense thus incurred.

Some time later a member of the House Committee told me they were putting new brussels carpet over the entire gallery, as the other carpet was rather worn. By this we do not mean strips of carpet down the aisles, but a carpet over the entire floor space. This also was done without any effort to provide the money to pay for it, although it involved an expenditure of more than six hundred dollars. These amounts were merely added to the church debt. There was no mortgage on the building, and in those days the bank never troubled about Jarvis Street's deficit.

In our next chapter we shall complete the story of the first four years of Jarvis Street Church life, and, parallel with that, tell the story of the Bloor Street Convention of 1914, when the decision in the controversy initiated by Dr. Elmore Harris, and which had to do with the teaching of Professor I. G. Matthews, was reached; for that controversy was directly related to all that followed both in Jarvis Street Church and in the Denomination at large.

ARE YOU A FRIEND OF TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY?

This institution did not originate in a desire to start something, much less in a desire to have the credit for doing so. We knew at the beginning that it would be a difficult task, and that only by divine help could the work be begun and continued. But we can say, to the praise of the Lord, that, "having obtained help from God, we continue unto this day."

We have learned that a number of people who are interested in the Seminary intend to give the Seminary a place in their wills. We are writing this article to suggest to all such interested friends a way by which they can avoid all double meanings in their wills, and make them so simple that everyone shall know exactly what they mean.

Three or four years ago a friend left us a certain amount of money. The Seminary and two other objects were named as beneficiaries in the will, each of which was to receive a specific bequest. The Seminary was to receive \$4,000; a certain local branch of the Bible Society, \$2,000; and a local church \$4,000 for the purpose of paying off the mortgage indebtedness. The clause of the will covering these specific bequests, stipulated that if at the time of the testator's death the mortgage indebtedness of the church named should be less than \$4,000, whatever was left after the mortgage was paid off, should go to the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec for missionary purposes. The next clause in the will directed that after these stipulated bequests had been paid, the residue of the estate should be left "to the above-named objects".

The question then arose, How many objects were named? The Bible Society, Toronto Baptist Seminary, and a church were named; and, provisionally, the Union of Regular Baptist Churches was named as the organization to receive whatever, if any, might be left from the \$4,000 after the mortgage indebtedness of the particular church had been paid.

To a layman, it seemed clear enough that the testator desired to limit his benefaction, so far as the church was concerned, to the paying off of its mortgage indebtedness; for the reason that if the mortgage at that time should be less than \$4,000, he did not propose that the balance should go into its general funds, but should be diverted to some other object. Therefore, it looked as though that were the extent of his benefaction to that particular church; and "the above-named objects" referred to in the next clause meant Toronto Baptist Seminary, the Bible Society, and the Union of Regular Baptist Churches. But the executors had, of course, to take it to the courts for an interpretation, which involved a good deal of extra expense. If the lawyer, drawing that will, instead of saying "The above-named objects", had set out in plain language what those objects were, there would then have been no question whether the residue was to be divided into three or four parts.

Many readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS are interested in the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, and we know for a fact that some of them have made bequests to the Union—and we hope very many more will do so. The object of this article is to urge upon our readers who propose to make a

will, to see to it that the will is set out in such unmistakable terms that there can be no two interpretations of its meaning. To secure this end, we would advise our readers not to depend upon a lawyer only. We have found that it is almost impossible to get the average lawyer to understand what is meant by an independent Baptist church, or what is involved in an organization of independent Baptist Churches. They all seem to think in terms of one big church like the United Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Anglican Church, or the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, while it is wise to have a lawyer to attend to the legal matters, if you would make sure that the will is written in such a way that there can be only one interpretation, and that, the interpretation which you yourself intend, it would be well to submit the wording of a clause to someone familiar with these matters; or, otherwise, to follow some such suggestion as we make in this article.

First, let me explain that Toronto Baptist Seminary is an incorporated body, incorporated under the laws of the Province of Ontario, and, as such, is an organization separate from Jarvis Street Church. But, as the Seminary has no physical assets, and is dependent upon the use of Jarvis Street buildings, it is necessary for the present that the Seminary should be entirely under Jarvis Street's control. For that reason, the Deacons of Jarvis Street Church, as they are elected every two years, are elected thereafter as Trustees of the Seminary. There may come a time when someone will leave the Seminary enough money, and it will be possible for the Seminary to come more directly under the control of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches; but that would be impossible while it is dependent upon the use of the Jarvis Street buildings, for Jarvis Street must retain control of its own premises.

But while that is so, the present and future usefulness of Toronto Baptist Seminary is wrapped up with the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec. The Seminary was established to train students for the proclamation of those great biblical principles for which the Union of Regular Baptist Churches stands. On the other hand, the Union has no other source of supply for its ministers, than the Seminary. We have nothing to say against the general usefulness of Bible Colleges and Bible Institutes, except that they are not particularly useful to Baptists when they are of an undenominational or interdenominational character. When such is the case, the great doctrines for which different denominations have stood, whether rightly or wrongly, cannot be discussed. These undenominational institutions are just as dangerous to the Presbyterian, United Church, or Anglican Churches, as they are to Baptists. They may produce students who are theologically sound, but of necessity, they will produce students who will be ecclesiastically ignorant. That is to say, they will know nothing about the New Testament teaching respecting the church and its ordinances, for the reason that such a subject cannot be discussed without trespassing upon the preserves of this or that denomination. Therefore, by tacit consent, these things are not discussed at all.

The Union of Regular Baptist Churches needs an institution that will turn out sound Baptist ministers, men who are just as sound in their views of the church and its ordinances, the relation of the church to the state,

soul-liberty, and other distinctive Baptist principles, as they are in their strictly theological or gospel views.

Let no one misunderstand. We know of useful Baptist ministers who have been trained in such institutions. But they went to them with a clear Baptist background. They already had had Baptist training, and did not abandon their views in the institution at which they studied. But it is dangerous for a Baptist church to call to its pastorate a graduate of one of these institutions without first ascertaining what sort of Baptist he is, and whether he is a Baptist only in the sense of being an immersionist, with no clearly defined views of the Scripture doctrine of the church, its ordinances, and its ministry.

If Baptist testimony is to be perpetuated in this country, we know of no other educational institution in the entire Dominion of Canada fitted to perpetuate it. McMaster University, beyond question, exists to destroy it; and the longer it continues to function, the weaker Baptists, as Baptists, will become. Only last Sunday a certain Baptist minister, a very excellent man as a man, but a man who must be profoundly ignorant of church history, in a sermon bearing a title to the effect, What should be our attitude toward Roman Catholics? gave the impression, to the reporter at least, that the Roman Catholic Church was an institution for which everybody ought to thank God, even though one could not agree with some of its doctrines. Surely Baptists need ministers who are trained to recognize that Roman Catholic paganism—or pagan Roman Catholicism—is the very antithesis of New Testament Christianity!

For this reason we are profoundly convinced that both the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, and Toronto Baptist Seminary, have a great ministry to fulfil in the future. We are aware that some institutions which are now teaching Modernism, like McMaster University for example, were endowed by evangelicals, and money left by them for the propagation of what they believed, is now being used for the propagation of its opposite. Notwithstanding, we are sure that it would be possible so to set out a trust that money left to the Seminary, for example, could never be used for other than to propagate the truths for which the Seminary now stands.

The Trust Deed of McMaster University was drawn when no one anticipated the present wholesale drift from "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints". Though not a lawyer, we are positive we can frame a trust in such language as to make it impossible for the money to be used for anything other than that to which it is left. We are aware, too, that there are people who are opposed to endowments. We are confident, however, that an educational institution must have an endowment of some kind; and we should be quite prepared to guarantee that an arrangement shall be made by which bequests to the Seminary can never be alienated from the object of the trust. We therefore ask our readers seriously to consider whether they can do something to help us to establish the Seminary on a permanent financial foundation.

The Editor of this paper, who is President of Toronto Baptist Seminary, never felt better in his life than he does at this moment; and, so far as his general health would indicate, according to the verdict of several doctors, he is likely to live for a good many years. That, of course, is in the hand of God. While he lives and has his

strength, he may be able, by keeping everlastingly at it, and getting a little money here and a little there, to keep the Seminary going. But he would like to see the Seminary established quite independently of any effort of his, so as to make sure that it will still carry on when he shall have finished his day's work. We therefore ask our readers to keep this in mind.

Remember, money left to the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec for missionary purposes is not thereby left to the Seminary. Nor is money left to the Seminary, left to the Union. While these organizations are in the closest possible cooperation, both are truly Baptist, and they are separate and distinct from each other. How, then, should money be left to the Seminary? Merely by setting out in plain language that a certain amount, the residue or whatever is bequeathed, is left to "Toronto Baptist Seminary, situated at 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto, Canada, and connected with Jarvis Street Baptist Church."

On the other hand, friends who desire to leave money to the Union should not be content to state that it is left to "Baptist missions", but set it out clearly that it is left for the support of the "missionary objects of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, with offices at 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto". No other Baptist missions have ever had offices in that building, and there could be no possibility of mistaking what the money is for if it is set out clearly in that fashion.

Another matter we must make perfectly clear, and that is that Toronto Baptist Seminary is a missionary enterprise. Only last summer students from the Seminary went out, if not like Abraham, not knowing whither they went, at least as Jacob, who said, "With my staff I passed over this Jordan." Mr. John Boyd went to Sudbury, and so far as we know, he had \$10.00 in his pocket, given by one of the Seminary instructors, with the promise of a roof over his head with a family living there but members of Jarvis Street Church, who before coming to us, were members of the Baptist church at Timmins. No Board stood behind Mr. Boyd. The Union Board had no money to send him, or to support him. He went out without promise of support, and even in a few months has established a healthy cause in Sudbury, and is still carrying on. (Let us here say, Thank you, to the friends who responded to our appeal in his behalf for transportation as he goes back and forth from the Seminary week-ends. We still need more for this purpose.)

The same is true of Kapuskasing and Kirkland Lake; and work in these three places is now being carried on. If Home Mission work is to be done in the future, and if new churches are to be established, it will be done, and they will be established, by students of Toronto Baptist Seminary. There is no greater Baptist mission work being done in Canada to-day, by any branch of Baptists, than the work of Toronto Baptist Seminary. Therefore, if you are interested in extending our Baptist work in the Dominion, in opening up new Baptist churches, in preaching the gospel as old-fashioned Baptists understand it, leave your money to Toronto Baptist Seminary.

What about foreign missions? Foreign missionaries, who are real Baptists, will have to be produced by Toronto Baptist Seminary, just as Home missionaries must be. There is no other source. So that if the Home and Foreign Mission interests of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec are to be extended, Toronto Baptist Seminary must be maintained.

(Continued on page 12)

Whole Bible Course Lesson Leaf

Vol. 11 4th Quarter Lesson 48 November 29th, 1936

REV. WILLIAM J. JONES, EDITOR

THE CAPTURE OF JERUSALEM

Lesson Text: Jeremiah, Chapters 39-41.

Golden Text: "For I will surely deliver thee, and thou shalt not fall by the sword, but thy life shall be for a prey unto thee: because thou hast put thy trust in me, saith the Lord."—Jeremiah 39:18.

DAILY BIBLE READINGS: Monday—II. Kings 25:1-7; Tuesday—II. Kings 25:8-17; Wednesday—II. Kings 25:22-26; Thursday—Jer. 38:7-13; Friday—Ps. 74:1-11; Saturday—John 4:1-26.

EXPOSITION

The Siege and Capture of Jerusalem. Ch. 38:28 b, connects with 39:3, thus making vs. 1, 2 parenthetical (cf. R. V.) material about the eighteen-month siege of the City (cf. 52:4-7; II. Kings 25:1-4). It was during that period that the events of 32:1, ff., and 37:3, ff. (see notes) took place. The princes of the Chaldean army sat at the gate which separated the lower city which they held, from the upper city [probably the "fish gate" (Neh. 13:16)] to execute matters relative to the capture (3). Because of the foreign titles, there is some confusion regarding the identity of the men listed. Probably after an ingenious analogy with v. 13 there are not four names, but two, for Rab-saris ("chief of the eunuchs"), and Rab-mag ("chief of the soothsayers") are titles of officers belonging to Nebo-sarsechim, Nebushazban) and Nergal-sharezer respectively. The latter, son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar, murdered his brother-in-law Evil-Merodach, seizing the Babylonian throne (560 B.C.).

The Flight and Capture of Zedekiah (4-10). This section is probably parenthetical, for it contains much of the matter of 52:7-16, and II. Kings 25:4-12. When Zedekiah (on the ninth day, fourth month, eleventh year of his reign—v. 2) saw the Chaldean princes entering the city (or before that time, perhaps, 52:7) he took flight by night, escaping from the lower city, probably going through what was the "fountain gate" (Neh. 2:14) and walls which may have skirted the Southwestern and Eastern hills of the City (4). He may have had to force his way through one wall (Ezek. 12:12) to get to the "way of the plain" called the Arabah (the depression of the Jordan extending from Mt. Hermon to the Gulf of Akabah on the Red Sea). The Jews were overtaken on the west side of the Arabah and carried captive to Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah, a strategically-located bivouac near Lebanon on the right bank of the Orontes, close to a rich agricultural area (5). There Zedekiah was judged, his eyes beholding his conqueror, all right (34:3); seeing his sons and nobles slain; and their light going out in the horrible darkening of Oriental punishment (5-7). While he was being carried to Babylon in chains (7), his city was being levelled by fire (8), and his people being carried away to Babylon by Nebuzaradan (9) the Captain of the guard who, if he did not arrive in Jerusalem personally until a month later (the "fifth month"—52:12) may have deputed others to the capture. He left only the poor (including, perhaps, artificers—52:15, R. V. mg.) of the land as a residue, giving them undevastated areas to cultivate (10).

The Release of Jeremiah (11-14). This section continues the narrative of the conclave of v. 3. Probably before the city fell, Nebuchadnezzar had given special orders to Nebuzaradan concerning the preservation of Jeremiah (11) who was probably looked upon as a friend of Babylonia because of his advocacy of capitulation (note 37:14). The Captain was to keep his eyes on the Prophet for good, and to heed the Prophet's advice (12). Nebuzaradan, whether personally or not (cf. v. 9) simply executed the orders through his officers (13) who released Jeremiah from the confinement of the "court of the guard", delivering him into the hands of the governor Gedaliah whose godly connections already have been noted (26:24; 36:10, f.). He was to live in his own dwelling close to that of Gedaliah, and enjoy a great measure of liberty (14).

The Prophecy of Jeremiah Concerning Ebed-melech (15-18). A prophetic word concerning the befriending Ethiopian had been given to the Prophet earlier (38:28). The content of the message was that although the Word of the

Lord regarding the destruction of Jerusalem would be performed (16), yet he would be delivered (17) from his enemies [whether the Jewish princes, hostile to him for his solicitude for Jeremiah (58:7); or the Babylonians, possibly] because of his trust in Jehovah (18).

Chapters 40 to 45 comprise a series of episodes in the Prophet's life after the fall of Jerusalem, 40:7-41:3 forming a single unit, for example.

The Release of Jeremiah (1-6). This section deals with what was most likely a second stage in the final liberation of the Prophet. In 39:11-14, it is the first release which is discussed. It is very probable that in the confusion of the siege when Gedaliah was absent from Jerusalem, Chaldeans, ignorant of their monarch's charge (39:11) carried the Prophet to Ramah (near Bethel in Benjamin, north of Jerusalem) the assembling place of the captives before deportation to Babylon. There the error was discovered and revealed to Nebuzaradan through the instrumentality of Gedaliah, perhaps. Knowledge of the Prophet and his message (see influence of Paul on others, Phil. 1:13) accounts for the Captain's echo of Jehovah's Word (2, 3). He offered liberty to Jeremiah, suggesting residence with the captives in *Babylon*; return to Gedaliah in the *Land* (5); or liberty to go *anywhere* (5). Noteworthy is the promised solicitude (4) and the liberality (5) of the Captain. Jeremiah had debated the proposal apparently, finally making his decision at the mention of Gedaliah (5) and acting accordingly by making his residence in Mizpah (6), not far from Ramah in Benjamin.

The Governorship of Gedaliah (9-12). When the leaders of the Jewish bands or forces heard of the elevation of Gedaliah by Nebuchadnezzar, they put themselves and their following into his hands, pledging allegiance to him (7, 8). The Governor assured them of security by continued submission to the Chaldeans, indicating that they need not fear the servants or officers of the Chaldeans posted in the Land (II. Kings 25:24) or (following the Septuagint translation of that parallel passage) their passing through the Land on military expeditions to Egypt (9). He was to intercede for them, while they were to carry on the pursuits of agriculture and commerce (10). The fugitive Jews in other countries whither they had fled, hearing of his governorship likewise joined him (12), all the inhabitants labouring long enough to share in the August and September harvest of grapes and other produce, but two months after the capture of Jerusalem (cf. 39:2).

The Plot Against Gedaliah (13-16). Johanan, one of the chieftains (8), accompanied by other captains, informed Gedaliah of a plot against his life by Baalis, king of Ammon (13, 14). Because of his frustrated plans (37:3) Baalis probably instigated Ishmael of the royal Jewish line (41:1) who was jealous of Gedaliah. The governor refused to believe the charge or to sanction the assassination of Ishmael, even though Johanan urged the act upon the grounds of the indispensability of Gedaliah in the national life (15c).

The Murder of Gedaliah (41:1-3). Three months after the capture of the City, Ishmael slew his host at a banquet, and thus emboldened, the Jewish companions and Chaldean attendants or body-guard (3). The act probably occasioned a fresh captivity (52:30).

Further Murders by Ishmael (4-10). The secrecy of Gedaliah's murder (4) aided Ishmael in disposing of the eighty sorrowing pilgrims from the Northern Tribes, who went to Jerusalem to worship at the site of the old Temple whose destruction they lamented; or possibly some new temporary structure erected by Gedaliah at Mizpah (4, 5). The murderer trapped them (6) making their death facile, casting their bodies in a great cistern (9). Ten escaped by bribing Ishmael with an offer of food stored in one of the common Eastern cisterns used as storehouses because of their preserving qualities (8, 9). He took other captives, including royal princesses, from Mizpah (10).

Johanan Pursues Ishmael (11-18). The murderer was on his way to the Ammonites (10) when Johanan and his force overtook him (12) by the waters of Gibeon (II. Sam. 2:13) where he had lingered, probably looking for the stores (8). He escaped, but his captives were released (14, 15) readily departing with Johanan to the "khan" (lodging place) of Chimham whence they prepared to go to Egypt, because they feared Chaldean reprisal (18) for the murder of Gedaliah (3).

ARE YOU A FRIEND OF TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY?

(Continued from page 10)

Let no one suppose we are setting the Seminary up in competition with the Union, much less in opposition to it. By all means, remember the Union of Regular Baptist Churches in your will; but we say this after much thought, that if there were no Seminary, the Union of Regular Baptist Churches would almost certainly, in time, die out. On the other hand, if there were no Union of Regular Baptist Churches, Toronto Baptist Seminary would create one within four or five years. More than

fifty per cent. of the Pastors of the Union at this date are the product of Toronto Baptist Seminary. Therefore support the Seminary, and support it generously.

A week or so ago a friend sent us \$500.00 for the Seminary, and a few days later a man and his wife sent \$130.00. If you have it to spare, and do not actually need it for your living, it is still better to make your gifts while you live. If Mr. Hepburn goes on at his present rate, it looks as though he is going to increase the succession duties to such an extent that it will amount almost to the confiscation of the estate. Therefore help the Seminary now if you possibly can. It is always needy; and is in very urgent need at this writing.

GET YOUR CHRISTMAS PRESENTS OFF YOUR MIND

Many people grow weary, are all but tired out, before Christmas comes, trying to select Christmas presents for their friends; which must be, first, within their means; which will be agreeable to their friends' tastes, and so be to them a gift of real value; and last of all, which in some degree will reflect their own desire for their friends.

To those who are really believers, the further consideration will be added: whether the present will express the donor's testimony for Christ, and thus tend to further the spiritual interests of the recipient, and in the end be glorifying to God.

TO THOSE WHOSE MINDS ARE THUS EXERCISED

We offer the following suggestions:

Send "The Gospel Witness" to as many friends as possible for 52 successive weeks. Every week it will preach the gospel to the unconverted, edify the saints, and minister comfort to the shut-ins and the bereaved. We therefore make these

SPECIAL CHRISTMAS-PRESENT OFFERS

No. 1 "The Gospel Witness" with copy of "The Most Famous Trial in History" to any address—\$2.00.

No. 2 "The Gospel Witness" to six separate addresses—\$10.00.

No. 3 "The Gospel Witness" to three separate addresses—\$5.00.

No. 4 "The Gospel Witness" and a copy of "Other Little Ships"—\$3.00.

(Regular \$2.00 and \$1.50 respectively, or \$3.50)

No. 5 "Other Little Ships" to any address, postpaid—\$1.50.

No. 6 Four copies of "Other Little Ships"—to one or four addresses—\$5.00.

The binding of "Other Little Ships", the publishers say, is such as is used for books selling for not less than \$3.50. You will not be ashamed of this book as a Christmas gift.

Order your "Gospel Witness" subscriptions now, and we will mail on any date you direct. If you desire to use your own card of Christmas greeting, and will forward it to us, we will enclose with "Witness" or book; or, otherwise, we will provide the card and use as you direct.

The year's subscription may begin with any issue you name between now and Christmas. To all subscribing between now and the year's end, we will supply back numbers of "The Plot that Failed", from the first chapter, free of charge.

ORDER FORM

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Canada.

Please find enclosed \$..... for which send No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, as per above advertisement (cross out number or numbers not ordered) to the following address or addresses:

Name

Address

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Signature:

Address: