

# 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

"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. 18, No. 38

TORONTO, JANUARY 25, 1940

Whole No. 923

## "SHARPER THAN ANY TWO-EDGED SWORD"

Following the delivery of the sermon appearing in this issue, we received an appreciative letter from one who was present, in which the writer refers to some others who accept the teaching given in this sermon. He referred also to a letter received from a missionary-son of one of the consulting editors of the Scofield Bible whose name appears on the title page. Our correspondent continues:

"In this letter young \_\_\_\_\_ says that his father was practically ostracized in the later years of his life, because after deep study of the Word he was led to discard the pre-tribulation position."

Our correspondent referred to another writer who had issued several articles on this subject, who, he says was warned "that there would be a storm of criticism over his articles, but pleaded with him to keep on, as a serious misconception needed to be corrected."

We are, of course, familiar with the attitude and spirit of those who have espoused the Darby-Scofield position. Most of them seem to agree that no new light can be thrown upon prophecy. Which, of course, is an indirect claim to infallibility as an interpreter.

In the sermon appearing in this issue, we have deliberately used the ugly word, "heresy", to describe the position the sermon was preached to combat; because we believe the time has come when earnest souls who are really more concerned to know the exact teaching of the Word of God than to establish their own preconceptions, should be awakened to a recognition of the seriousness of the error they are espousing.

When people become angry in the discussion of a matter of this sort, they afford certain proof that they are concerned mainly to maintain their own opinions, and to avoid the necessity of acknowledging their mistake. The correspondent to whom we referred, tells us of a certain paper that received not a few letters of protest against the position taken by that paper. It is everybody's privilege to protest against things with which they do not agree, but our friend tells also that the paper had received several notices from subscribers, cancelling their subscriptions.

That is a pretty small piece of business. We have papers coming to our desk which every week express views with which we have no agreement. But we take them because we want to know what other people think. On our shelves we have scores—perhaps we might even

safely say, hundreds—of books, with the contents of which we have no agreement. We could, indeed, appropriately put a red label on them marked, "Poison". We are not at all afraid of being corrupted, or in any way infected by exposing ourselves to opinions with which we do not agree. But the characteristic of the majority of the pre-tribulation rapturists, or, let us rather say, of Darbyites or Darbyists, is that they will not listen to anything that is not in agreement with their settled views of things. Let anyone announce a "conference" at which some Darbyite or Scofieldian, is to speak, who will be sure to say only what they have heard already hundreds of times, and they will flock to the so-called "conference", for the opportunity of saying, "Amen", or, "Hallelujah", to their own opinions.

Neither Romanists nor any other brand of errorist could be more bitter in their opposition to views at variance with their own than is the average Darbyite who knows so much about prophecy that he is sure no new light on the subject is possible. We are often amused at the announcement of "conferences"—which afford no opportunity to confer with anybody, but only to listen once more to expressions of eschatological infallibility.

If any are displeased with what we write, let them take the trouble to ask why we write thus. Certainly, not from any hope of personal gain. If what is written be not true, no one is under any obligation to receive it. Why get angry about it? We are not in the least angry, but we are trying to disturb the smug complacency of those who think they have arrived at finality in the interpretation of prophecy.

The Apostle Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians for the purpose of correcting those who had fallen into error. Evidently he anticipated the displeasure of some, but he did not tone down his words in order to avoid offending them. On the contrary, he said, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" The motive which inspired him is implied in the first chapter where he asks, "Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." A true servant of Christ, who will be faithful to his Master, and who seeks only to please Him, will succeed in pleasing only such other servants of Christ as share his desire to be found well-pleasing to God.

The teaching we combat in this week's sermon is being proved to be a positive heresy, as we have said, by the bitterness of its opposition to any contrary view. On the other hand, we never speak or write on this subject that we do not receive more appreciative communications than words of criticism. Multitudes of people have been led astray by the Scofieldian eschatology, by having put in their hands a Bible with the Scofield notes when, as Christians, they were immature. Naturally, turning to the footnotes to see what certain passages meant, they imbibed the Scofield theories because they had never been taught otherwise; but desiring to know the truth of God, and not being wedded to any particular human opinion, they have heard the word with open minds, and, on comparing it with Scripture, have found it to be true, and so have abandoned the Scofield or Darby position. Great numbers of people have written us expressing their gratitude for messages which have been used of God to free them from this error.

Jarvis Street Church is a large church. Not a few of its members were brought up in the Scofield school of interpretation. They have since, however, learned to allow the Bible to speak for itself, and have been delivered from these delusions.

In the sermon of this week there may be found repeated things which we have said before; but we have learned that it is necessary to say some things—as Spurgeon would have put it—a hundred times, for the simple and sufficient reason that ninety-nine times were not enough. We ask our readers to pray that the Spirit of God may use the message of this week at least to lead people to re-examine their position in the light of the Word of God.

### THE MEANING OF THE PAROUSIA

By Rev. W. Gordon Brown, M.A., Toronto Baptist Seminary

The following article has been prepared at the Editor's request by Mr. Brown, Professor of Greek in Toronto Baptist Seminary. We have asked for this article to rid the minds of some of unnecessary confusion in respect to a subject in which some controversialists have invoked "the original Greek" to support a position which is untenable in any language.—Ed.

The word *parousia* occurs in the Greek of the New Testament twenty-four times in all. Of these the Authorized Version (1611 A.D.) translates two by "presence": 2 Corinthians 10:10, "his bodily presence is weak", and Philippians 2:12, "not as in my presence only but now much more in my absence". The Revised Version (English and American, 1881 A.D.) also translates "presence" in Philippians 1:26, "my presence with you again". Elsewhere the two versions agree on the translation "coming", but the Revision adds in the margin every time "Greek, presence".

#### "Presence" and "Coming"

For the history of the word, one may say that in the classical Greek the usual sense was "a being there, presence", whether of persons or things; it was, however, also used in the sense of "arrival", e.g., a "coming" to a place.

In the New Testament, as we have already seen, *parousia* two or three times means "presence" in the sense of "being there". The other instances of the word mean "the presence of one coming, hence the coming, arrival, advent" (J. H. Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*). In one double instance we have the "arrival" of a man, 2 Corinthians 7:6, 7, "the coming of Titus . . . his coming"; compare Philippians 1:26, of a

return visit of the apostle Paul. The other eighteen instances, with the exception of the one concerning the mocking "coming" of the man of sin, 2 Thessalonians 2:9, all refer to the "return" of our Lord (but once of the "coming" of the day of God, 2 Peter 3:12). So in the Gospels the word occurs only in Matthew, and there only in the part of the discourse on last things recorded in chapter twenty-four, where we have it in verses 3, 27, 37, 39. In Paul's writings we have *parousia* in 1 Corinthians 15:23; 1 Thessalonians 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 2 Thessalonians 2:1, 8. (It occurs thus most often in these two epistles that have to do with the second coming.) In the General Epistles we have examples in James 5:7, 8; 2 Peter 1:16; 3:4, 12; 1 John 2:28 (where "in his (Christ's) *parousia*" is parallel to "he be manifested", from *phaneroo*, compare *epiphaneia* below).

It is interesting to note that by such a post-apostolic Church Father as Justin the Philosopher and Martyr (died about 165 A.D.) *parousia* is used of both advents, called "the first *parousia*" and "the second *parousia*" (*Dialogue with Trypho*, chapters 52, 151).

But why did the New Testament writers pick such a term as *parousia* if they meant the "advent" of Christ? There were other words to mean "coming", "arrival". There was *eleusis* (formed from the future stem of the verb *erchomai*, the common word to "come" or "go"); it may not have been a very common term, but in Stephen's speech it is used of the first coming of Christ, "They killed those who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One" (Acts 7:52). Then there was the common enough *aphixis* "arrival", but in the New Testament it occurs only in its secondary sense of "departure" (Acts 20:29). ("Coming" in the Authorized Version of Matthew 24:48; 25:27; Luke 12:45; 18:5; 19:23; Romans 15:22 is in the Greek infinitive or participle of the common verb to "come", *erchomai*.) In Acts 13:24 *eisodos* "way in, entrance", the opposite of *exodos* "way out", our "exodus", is used of the first coming of Christ, but it is never employed of the second (compare, however, 2 Peter 1:11).

But why did the Spirit of God lead the author of the Gospel which gives our Lord's eschatological discourse most fully, the Apostle Paul, James the Lord's brother, Peter the "rock" and John the beloved, to use *parousia*? One name of our Lord is Emmanuel "With us is God". In Him God was present with men. When He ascended, His Spirit He sent, and that Spirit is present in every believing heart and so in the whole Church of Christ on earth. But the Bride cries: "Bring near Thy presence, 'come, Lord Jesus'." She asks for the *parousia*.

#### "Royal Visit"

But is that suggestion really the answer to our difficulty? Why did the New Testament use *parousia* to describe the "advent" of the returning Christ? Here the older scholars were puzzled. Modern excavation, especially in Egypt, has unearthed great numbers of bills, receipts, records, invitations, letters, etc., written in the common Greek of everyday life; and these papyri have thrown a flood of light upon the meaning of many words in the New Testament. Inscriptions from Asia Minor and elsewhere have been collected, and from these, too, we learn how people in New Testament times expressed themselves. This new knowledge offers us the reason why *parousia* was the word.

When a king or emperor was to visit a city, elaborate

(Continued on page 9)

# The Jarvis Street Pulpit

## WHY I BELIEVE THE RAPTURE OF THE CHURCH CANNOT PRECEDE THE GREAT TRIBULATION

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 21st, 1940

(Stenographically Reported)

"For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.

"And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."—Matthew 24:21, 22.

The Scripture admonishes us, "Be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is". That should be the supreme concern of everyone who has been born again, who is a child of faith. We have been brought under a new authority. We know no higher law than the will of God; and for us, the will of God is revealed in the Word of God. This point, I shall not argue this evening, but content myself with the assertion that, to us who worship in this place, the Bible—our Modernist friends to the contrary notwithstanding—is the divinely inspired, infallible, and therefore supremely authoritative Word of God.

To that Court we bring our case; and it should be our endeavour to learn exactly what the Word of God teaches in respect to all matters related to the individual Christian life, and to the world at large, now and in the future. I must not come to the Bible to establish my position. I must not use the Bible in order to obtain sanction for my opinions. I must come to it sincerely desiring to know what the Bible teaches on any subject—whether it be the doctrine of the Lord's coming, or any other subject. I at least know no higher authority than the Holy Scriptures which are to me the inspired Word of God.

It is very wise, I think, frequently to re-examine the foundations of our faith. We are told to examine ourselves whether we be in the faith. We are told to "give diligence to make (our) calling and election sure". We are instructed to "prove all things", and to "hold fast to that which is good". Truth will always bear re-examination. If what you believe is really true, it will not do it any harm to bring it to the Scripture, and test it by the Word of God. It will only confirm you in your faith if, on examination, you discover that the thing you believe is that which the Bible teaches.

If you sincerely desire to know the truth, you will be willing to bring all your religious opinions to the Word of God, and if you find they are not in harmony with the teaching of Scripture, but are contrary thereto, you will correct them, and you will be courageous enough to say, "I was mistaken. I had thought for myself, or had allowed someone else to think for me; but, bringing these things to the Word of God, I find I was wrong, and I accept the teaching of Scripture."

We may any of us be mistaken as individuals. I have endeavoured, through a somewhat extended period, to practise the accurate quotation of Scripture. I remember reading, when I was quite a youth, a saying of Mr. Spurgeon, to the effect that those of us who profess to believe in verbal inspiration must be at pains to be ver-

bally correct. It is surprising how easy it is for us to fall into error.

I notice a certain man who is reputed to be a great Bible teacher—I shall not give you my opinion for the moment—says that there can be no new light on prophecy. You cannot do much with a man like that. You cannot improve upon perfection; and it is folly to argue with finality or infallibility. If any man says, "I know the truth; there is no new light", we may as well say, Good bye. He may be right or wrong, but it is useless to discuss a question with any mind that is thus locked and barred against any possible new light, by saying there can be none. But if and when we really desire to know the will of God, and not to prove ourselves to be right, there will not be much difficulty in finding what the will of the Lord is. Our great task is to rid ourselves of our preconceptions, and to come with open minds to the Word of God, and let the Bible speak to us for itself.

I remember on another subject, an experience I had some years ago before I became Pastor of this church. The membership of the church I then served was some five or six hundreds, and I had a list of members. Included in the list was the name of one of the deacons below whose name I had left a blank—his wife was not a member of the church. One day I playfully showed him my list, and asked, "Do you see the blank under your name?" "Yes; why is it there?" "That is for the name of your wife." "I wish you success", he replied; "I have made no impression so far."

The wife was a godly woman, she came to church regularly, and took part in the church activities, and seemed to be a spiritually-minded woman. One day when I dropped into their home she said, "I am out of condition spiritually. I am not just right, and I do not know what is the matter. I want to be right, I really want to know and do the will of God." "Are you sure?" She said, "I think I am." "Make sure of that first. Go to the Lord and put yourself before Him, and tell Him that you have come as a scholar to His school, and that you are ready to hear His word and to obey." "I think I have done that, but I will do as you say. What next?" "When you have done that, I suggest another step. Open your Bible, and see what it has to say about that which properly should stand on the threshold of the Christian life, see what the Bible has to say about baptism." "Do not talk to me about baptism," she exclaimed, almost crossly. "I am not going to," I replied. "Neither will the Lord while you are in that attitude. I thought you were willing to hear what the Lord had to say, and to obey it?" "I

think I am; but I have had sermons and tracts upon baptism pushed upon me for years." I said, "I am not going to give you a sermon or a tract. I am not going to waste a minute on you until you are ready to hear what the Lord says, and ready to do what He teaches. Will you do that?"

I said, Good bye, and went away. About two weeks afterward this lady sent for me, and when I called I said, "What is wrong now?" "I thought you would have come to see me again." "I had no intention of doing so." "Well, I have sent for you." "What for?" "I want to be baptized next Sunday." "What has happened?" "I am ashamed to tell you. I was brought up in a Methodist home, and I was prejudiced. Whenever I opened my Bible, I read into it what I had been taught. After you called the other day, I did go before the Lord and say, 'Lord, if there is anything in this, show it to me; I am ready to do anything I find the Word of God teaches me.' The moment I approached the Word of God in that attitude, it was as plain as day." I explained that that is what the Scripture says: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine."

I say, we need to re-examine this subject—not necessarily to surrender our opinions, certainly not unless the Scripture forces us to do so. We can re-examine our position without heat. I remember being in a minister's home one Sunday evening, to have a little chat after the service. His wife was the teacher of a very large Bible class. She asked me a question about the Lord's return, and related events. I said, "Mrs. So-and-So, I fear you would become rather warmed up. I know your position, and I think perhaps you know mine. Were we to begin a discussion of this matter, you might become annoyed. There is no profit in that, so let us not discuss it." She said, "No; I will not. I promise you I will keep sweet about it." "You are sure? All right, get your Bible." I asked her to open it at the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, particularly the verses I have read for a text.

*What is the general position occupied by those who perhaps specialize on the Lord's return and the millennial question?* It is to this effect—I can only state it in brief. It is held that Christ will come for His saints first, and that there remains nothing more which must necessarily be fulfilled before His coming for His saints. Therefore He may come at any moment. That is what is sometimes called "the any-moment" theory, or the "imminence" of the Lord's return. They teach that He may come at any time; and that we ought now to be expecting Him; that He will come for His saints.

Then, in this view, some time later, Christ will come with His saints. When He comes for His saints, they will be raptured, caught up to meet the Lord in the air. In due time, He will come back again with His saints, and between the time of His coming for His saints, and His coming with His saints, there is usually said to be a period of something like seven years.

I received a paper from the United States, that was supposed to be published the day after the rapture. People were everywhere missing—from the office, from the shop, from Sunday School, from the railroads, from their homes. The believing people had been caught away, and the rest had been "left".

The one who hinders or "lets", according to this view, is the Holy Spirit. "He who now letteth or hindereth will hinder, until he is taken out of the way." Christ

may come at any moment, it is alleged, and rapture His church, gather it away, and simultaneously the Spirit's ministry will be terminated. The special dispensation of the Holy Ghost will end, and then the lawless one will be revealed; and for the first three and a half years the world will have rather a quiet time—not the "quiet time" of the Oxford Group however, but still there will not be any very great trouble.

Many of the Jews will have returned to Jerusalem, and others will return during that time. They will establish themselves in Palestine, and will rebuild the temple. Then, in the middle of this seven years Antichrist will break his covenant with the Jews. Then the Great Tribulation will set in. Though it is a time of great tribulation, during those years the greatest revival the world has ever known is to take place. Not the church but the Jews will be the evangelists of the world. After the salt of the earth is gone, and the Holy Spirit is withdrawn, a multitude that no man can number, not of Jews only but of Gentiles, are to be converted—during the Great Tribulation. At the end of it, Christ is to come, and Antichrist will be destroyed. That, in brief, is the position.

#### I.

I shall begin by asking, WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THIS GREAT TRIBULATION OF WHICH THE SCRIPTURES SPEAK?

Certainly it does not mean tribulation in general. The Lord Jesus said, "In the world ye shall have tribulation." The Apostle Paul said, "We glory in tribulations also." I think there will be general agreement on this point, that throughout the Christian era, those who have endeavoured to live godly in Christ Jesus have suffered persecution. It is no easy thing to be a Christian now: it has never been easy. True believers have always had tribulation.

But that is not the tribulation of which my text speaks. This is to be an incomparable tribulation—nothing like it before, nothing like it afterward. Surely that is clear. This is the great tribulation of which Christ speaks, "Such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever shall be." That is the great tribulation. I shall not discuss how long it may be, whether seven years or three and a half years—or a millennium or more. Mr. Churchill said some time ago, that Hitler decided when the war should begin: we shall decide when it will end. That is an important matter. Whatever differing opinions there may be among us as to when this tribulation begins, there will be unanimity of opinion respecting its termination: it will end at the revelation of Jesus Christ, when He will destroy Antichrist at His coming.

Once more! this great tribulation is usually identified with the rule of Antichrist; whoever he or it may be, it is while this person is exalting "himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God," that then the great tribulation will prevail.

I think it is a sound principle of interpretation to interpret the symbolic scriptures by the plain statements of the Word of God; but in the Book of Revelation we have a description, very probably of the rule of Antichrist, when "a beast rises up out of the sea," and so on.

I have heard and read descriptions of the great tribulation. I was at a meeting in London, and sat in a back

seat in Kingsway Hall. I heard an eminent physician by the name of Scofield—not the author of the Scofield Bible—a patriarchal gentleman who, through some infirmity, was obliged to sit in his chair while speaking. He described the great tribulation—blood to the horses' bridles, and I know not what else. He spared no effort to paint a very terrible picture, and I do not suggest he did or could exaggerate the horror of it. But when he had thus painted it in the most lurid colours imaginable, he paused, and, in almost ecstatic tones, clapping his hands, exclaimed, "But, my brethren, we shall not be there!" And from all over the hall there was a chorus of responses, "Hallelujah", and "Amen".

I do not believe that view has a vestige of scriptural support. I am as convinced as I am that two and two make four, that it is a figment of the human imagination; and that it has been and still is entertained by hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of Christian people, without a vestige of scriptural warrant. We shall see whether that be true or not.

Certainly this tribulation is a very terrible period, so terrible that *it would be unendurable to mortal flesh were it prolonged*. Jesus Christ Himself said, "Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved." If they were extended indefinitely, mortals could not bear it. "But for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." Who the "elect" are, is a question which I reserve for a little later consideration. I think, then, we shall agree that the tribulation, the *great tribulation*, whatever it is, whenever it begins, will end with the manifestation of Jesus Christ in glory when He comes "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;" for it is said of that day that the lawless one shall be consumed "with the spirit of his mouth, and (destroyed) with the brightness of his coming." Therefore the one who causes the great tribulation, though allowed of God, will be consumed, destroyed; and the Lord Jesus shall be manifest. It is well to begin where we can agree. You may not agree with the proposition I am arguing, but you will agree that the great tribulation will be ended with the coming of Christ.

## II.

WHAT OF THE RAPTURE? You have heard the rapture passage from 1 Thessalonians read this evening. *It is a certainty*. It is a promise that will be fulfilled. Paul said, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will bring God with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

If you believe in the inspiration of Scripture, if you believe the Bible is the word of God, you cannot escape acceptance of the teaching that the blood-bought church

of Christ, believers in Him, are to be raptured, caught up to meet the Lord in the air.

I will go farther and say that *the rapture is not a secret event*. It is quite popularly held that the Lord will steal down upon His people, and they will be secretly caught away—no one will see or hear them go. Later it will be discovered that a great host of believing people are missing. Where is it in the Word of God? Certainly, it is not in the chapter which Mr. Brown read, for there it says, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." If language means anything, it surely must mean that He will come "with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." If you can make a secret coming of that, language has no significance at all.

I believe in the personal, visible, return of the Lord—and I also believe in the *audible* return of the Lord. "Shout", "voice of the archangel", and "the trump of God". In the chapter from which our text is taken, we are told, "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." There can be nothing secret about that. He will be heard, and He will be seen. Again: "Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him."

*The New Testament does not tell us that the Lord Jesus will come two more times*. He has come once, and He "shall appear a second time". I do not read of a third coming. That idea of coming for His saints first, and with His saints afterward, makes two more comings; and in order to accommodate that view to the Scripture which says there are only two altogether—"He shall appear the second time"—the pre-tribulation rapturists have to make His coming for His saints a secret event. Surely there can be found no scriptural warrant for that.

I had rather an interesting thing brought to my attention the other day. A woman recently converted in Kapuskasing, from Roman Catholicism, Mrs. Oscar Richer, when the priest came to enquire as to why she was leaving the Roman Catholic Church, had a great many questions waiting for him. She had one I had never heard before. When he came she said, "I want you to look at this: you tell me that Christ is in that little cabinet that you lock. My Bible says, 'If they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not.'" Who taught her that?

The same principle is applicable to the whole question of the Lord's coming. If anyone tells you that the Lord is coming secretly, the Bible says you are not to believe it; He will not come secretly; He will come openly; He will come like the lightning. Let me quote that text with its context: "Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

Someone may say, "But there is a very important point

which, so far, you have not dealt with. Do you not know that in the two epistles to the Thessalonians, there are three words used to describe the coming of the Lord?

We are told that the Greek word, translated "coming" (*parousia*) may be translated "presence", and does not necessarily imply visibility. The second word in its Anglicized form is epiphany (*epiphaneia*) which means appearance, brightness, manifestation. The third word is *apokalupsis*, or, in its Anglicized form, apocalypse; this word means revelation. Our friends tell us that the *parousia*, the coming; the epiphany, or the manifestation; and the apocalypse, the revelation, the complete disclosure are different stages of the same event. You have only to read Thessalonians where these verses occur to see that that, to say the least, is a very doubtful theory. The same word (*parousia*) is used of the coming of Antichrist as is used of the coming of Christ, and certainly the coming of Antichrist will not be secret. He is to be "revealed", but his "coming" is spoken of too, "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." Surely that indicates a manifest coming. Antichrist is to be destroyed by the brightness of His coming, the *epiphaneia* of his *parousia*. I think a careful examination of those passages, will show that these words describe varying but simultaneous aspects of the same event, the second advent of our Lord.

Observe, further, verses six and seven of the first chapter of Thessalonians. Listen to this: "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you: and to you who are troubled rest with us." Those who afflict the saints are themselves to be afflicted by a divine visitation; and "it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you who are troubled rest with us"—when? At a *parousia*. Meaning, as it is alleged, that He comes invisibly, silently, catching His saints away, distributing His rewards to the saints? Nothing of the kind—"To you who are troubled rest with us, WHEN THE LORD JESUS SHALL BE REVEALED FROM HEAVEN WITH HIS MIGHTY ANGELS."

There is another verse—and I am going to use Dr. Scofield's Bible this time—the third chapter of Revelation, verse ten. It is part of the message that was addressed to the church at Philadelphia: "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth."

I cannot tell you how many times that verse has been quoted to me as a proof-text of the rapture of the church, before the tribulation. A dear friend of mine, one whom I love in the Lord, and in whom I believe, whose genuineness as a Christian and as a sound evangelical, I glory in, but with whose eschatology I do not agree, wrote me a letter and quoted that text, and said, "What can it mean but the rapture of the church before the great tribulation?" Scofield has a note here, in the margin which says, of "the hour of temptation":

"Tribulation (the great) Rev. 7:13-14. (Psa. 2:5; Rev. 7:14).

I spoke to a conference of ministers in New York State a year or so ago, and I quoted the letter to which I have referred. They had asked me to speak on this subject, and I asked them to examine that text. To whom was it written? "To the angel of the church at Philadelphia."

"Was there a church at Philadelphia?" They agreed that there was a church in Philadelphia of ancient time—not a mythical church, but a real church that had an historic existence. "Very well, to whom was that word addressed? Certainly, primarily, to the church at Philadelphia; and however wide the application may be in principle, it must have had its primary application to the church to whom it was then addressed."

When Paul wrote to the Galatians, did he not intend that the Galatians should make application of his epistle to themselves? It is for you and me, also, but primarily his letters were written to the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians, the Philippians, the Thessalonians, and so on. Here is a letter that was addressed to the church at Philadelphia, and they were commended for having kept the word of His patience, and not having denied His name; and because of that, they were promised a particular reward. What was the reward? "I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth."

Said my friend, in his letter, "What can that mean but the great tribulation?" My answer is, "I do not know quite what it means, I only know that it cannot possibly mean the great tribulation, if the tribulation is what, and is to be when, you say it is. You say the great tribulation is still future. Now it is historically indisputable that the last member of the church at Philadelphia was laid in his grave over eighteen hundred years ago, that they all died over eighteen hundred years before the great tribulation began, according to your theory. Therefore how in the name of common sense can a promise made to people who died over eighteen centuries ago, promising them deliverance from a certain 'temptation', or 'tribulation' have been fulfilled if that tribulation is still future? You cannot have it both ways."

Is that conclusive? When I said that to those ministerial brethren, one who was the author of a theological text-book and a professor in a certain seminary, who held to the Scofield eschatology enquired, "May not that have been the Lord's way of delivering them from temptation, from the great tribulation?" I said: "I should like to understand you; correct me if I am wrong. Do you mean that the Lord fulfilled that promise, and delivered the Philadelphia church from the great tribulation, which even now you say is yet future, by letting them die nearly nineteen hundred years before the tribulation began? Is that what you mean?" "Yes." "Doctor", I said, "are you serious, or is that a joke? You will admit that during the intervening centuries there have been countless millions of Christians, nominal, and even real, who did not keep the word of His patience, who were not, on the ground of such faithfulness, entitled to that particular reward, who also were allowed to die?" Turning to the company I said, "Brethren, what our professor-friend has said is one of the finest illustrations of the absurd lengths to which that theory must drive one."

If the tribulation is yet future, that promise to the Philadelphia Church cannot possibly be fulfilled to the Philadelphians who are already dead. Therefore it cannot possibly refer to the rapture of the Church before the tribulation; since both are said to be future.

Why cannot the rapture precede the tribulation?

"Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." I said to the wife of my ministerial friend to whom I have referred in our discussion, "What do you make of that? There are no elect; they are all gone; the church is gone before the great tribulation begins." "Oh, do you not know that the 'elect' there means the Jews?" I replied, "I was waiting to hear you say that. It is your turn, now give me your authority." "Ah, but *it does!*" "I know, but that does not carry weight with me. I want your authority." "It is in Matthew's Gospel, and Matthew's Gospel was written for the Jews." "Yes, you say so. So do many others. But what is your authority?" "But *it is so!*" I replied and still reply, "You cannot find it in the Scripture, for the simple and sufficient reason that it is not there." "But there is the fig tree—'When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh.' The fig tree means the Jews, and the budding of the fig tree is the Jew returning to Palestine—and they are going back now." I answered, "You say the fig tree means the Jews; but on what Scriptural authority?" "But *it does!*" "The Bible does not say so: 'Behold the fig tree, and ALL THE TREES; when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand.' So sayeth the Scripture, but how dare you say that the return of a few hundred thousand Jews to Palestine is the budding of the fig tree?"

I have told you a story which will bear repetition. There was a little boy who was brought up in a home where he had heard his father and mother discuss this question, and affirm that the Gospel of Matthew was written for the Jews. He knew it; he had heard it again, and again, and again. One day this little fellow, the scion of a pious family, got into a fight—as little boys may do. It was a real fight, and he gave one of the neighbour boys a real trouncing. When he came in, victorious but not without some scars of the battle, his mother said, "What have you been doing?" "I have been fighting." "With whom have you been fighting?" He told her. "What were you fighting for?" "He started it; he hit me first." "But do you not know that the Bible says you should turn the other cheek?" "You cannot put that over me; that is in Matthew, and that is for the Jews."

Do you not see how such cutting and carving of the Word of God must destroy the authority of Scripture to those who so believe—even with a little child? We are told that Matthew's Gospel is not for us, it is not for the church. The Sermon on the Mount was not for the people to whom the Lord Jesus delivered that address. It is not for anyone but the citizens of the kingdom that is to be established some time by and by. If you can swallow that, you might well compete with the whale that swallowed Jonah. I cannot. That teaching is not in the Book—in Matthew or anywhere else.

If the "elect" are in the world during the great tribulation, who are they? There are some who are called "elect" according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." We are all "elect" if we are believers. And who dares to say that the "elect" in Matthew's Gospel are the Jews, unless the Bible itself so affirms? Unless you can establish the Jewish character of Matthew's Gospel,

and strip it of all authority for Gentiles, your whole pre-tribulation theory comes tumbling down in a crash, on the strength of that one verse. It annihilates the whole theory. The "elect" will still be here during the great tribulation. For their sakes, in pity for them, God will shorten it.

The coming of our Lord is to be preceded by a great apostasy? Yes, but what is that? Some say it is present-day Modernism. I grant you that the modern church, of all denominations, is largely an apostate church. I do not hesitate to say so. There has been a falling away from the faith—and that is bad enough. But is that the apostasy spoken of here? I wish some of my brethren would be a little more diligent in the reading of history than they are.

Think of the apostasy issuing in the Roman Catholic Church from the time of Constantine down. Think of a Church with more than three hundred million followers, with a man at their head who arrogates to himself the attributes of God, and whose followers call him, "Our Lord God the Pope"! There was a time when in all Europe there was scarcely a ray of light. Bad as we are to-day, I do not think we are as bad as Europe was in that day. You must go farther back than these last twenty-five or fifty years since Modernism put the church on the toboggan slide, to find the beginning of the great apostasy. Present-day Modernism is doubtless a part of it, but the falling away is surely centuries old. The Church of Rome is not only a harlot, but the mother of harlots. Most of the heresies that have cursed the church, have emanated from Rome.

In the chapter Mr. Brown read to you, we are told that that day of the Lord will not come "except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." In other words, the revelation of Antichrist himself will precede the revelation of Christ. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, said, "Do not be deceived by what others say." I think he meant that. Some have thought that a forged letter had been sent in his name. That may have been; or he may mean, "I do not want you to misunderstand my first letter." Many of us have had to write a second letter to correct a wrong impression created by the first one. Be that as it may, until Antichrist is revealed, Christ will not come.

Will He come at any moment? I do not think so. Someone says, "But the early church expected him at any moment." No; they did not. Peter did not: he knew he was going to die. Paul did not: he knew he was going to die. I do not think it can be said that the apostolic church believed in the imminence of the Lord's return. I do not. I believe in the certainty of it. I am sure He is coming. His coming will be personal, audible, visible. He will surely come. But I think that if you follow the simple statement of Scripture that certain things must first take place, and that until they have taken place, Christ will not come, you will save yourselves many difficulties.

Someone sent me a letter that had been written by a man in England, addressed to a certain man who is a noted "Bible teacher". This brother writes two long pages—read the letter in the current issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS which you may get at the door. The writer complimented the "Bible teacher" on some of his books, and urged him to write another, for said he, "The time has come when people should be aroused to look for the

Lord's return, to expect it." The letter was dated in April of nineteen hundred and thirty-eight. He said he had been a student of chronological prophecy for fifty years, and was sure the church would be raptured in nineteen hundred and thirty-eight or nineteen hundred and thirty-nine, but he was inclined to think in the earlier year. The Antichrist, after the church was gone, was to be revealed. That was to take place between nineteen thirty-nine and nineteen forty-six, and he would reign rather quietly until nineteen hundred and forty-three. Then the Great Tribulation would break out. Well, my calendar tells me it is nineteen hundred and forty—and if the church has been raptured, I have not heard of it. I hope to go when that day comes, but I have not heard of anyone's being "missing".

What folly! Is there anything that has discredited the precious doctrine of the second coming of our Lord as have these baseless speculations—until reasonable men have turned against it. When the subject is mentioned, they say, "Oh, we are weary of speculation about Antichrist and Armageddon.

I knew a certain man who had written a book. It was on the press, a wonderful book! One day he picked up his newspaper—and he had to go to the telephone and shout, "Stop the press." He had to go down and take one chapter out!

You have not to amend the Bible like that. Let us believe in the Lord's return with all our hearts. I believe the doctrine, the truth of the second coming of Christ is as much a part of the revelation of God as that of the first coming. It is the complement of the first. He must come again. But let us not occupy our minds with these useless speculations, or allow our imaginations to substitute our own thinking for that which the Word of God plainly teaches.

Only this word. You ask, "Does it matter?" I think it matters. While I glory in Dr. Scofield's loyalty to evangelical principles, I doubt whether any greater harm has been done to the Christian Church in many centuries than the teaching of the notes of this book respecting the coming of the Lord, has done. It is shot full of error. The church is to be caught away; the Spirit of God is to be withdrawn—so they interpret, "He that now hindereth will hinder until he be taken out of the way"—and after that, with no church, and no Holy Spirit with His peculiar and special function to convince of sin—after that, the greatest revival the world has ever known will take place! Brethren, I believe that that is a dangerous heresy. I say "heresy"—for that it surely is. People are led to assume we shall have a revival after the Lord's coming. We shall be looking down on it from heaven. The Jews, or at least a "remnant" will be preaching the gospel, and thousands of people will be saved—without the Holy Spirit? Without the testimony of the church?

Those who teach that Matthew is for the Jews, tell us that the Great Commission was not intended for the church. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature . . . and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the age." That was not given to the Christian church. That and all that is in Matthew was intended for the Jew, after the church has been raptured! I call such teaching by the ugly name of *heresy*. It is a most dangerous doctrine. It disposes people to

sit down with their arms folded, and wait for the coming of the Lord. "We cannot do much anyway. Everything is going to the devil, and we may as well sit and wait. After a while, we shall be caught away and the Jews will succeed where we have failed." I cannot find any such teaching in the Bible.

A FINAL WORD. In Peter's Second Epistle he warns the believers, "There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation . . . but beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance . . . wherefore; beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless. And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation."

Did you hear that? Peter says, "You wonder why He does not come? It is because He is reluctant to terminate the period of grace. He delays the judgment. He waits, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." When you get tired of waiting, remember there are a great many people not saved, and "account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction."

Peter plainly teaches that the period of grace, the dispensation of grace, will end with the coming of Jesus Christ. There will not be millions saved after the Lord comes. I can find no such teaching in the New Testament. Indeed, He will come "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God"—and what else?—"and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Why will He come? To take vengeance "on them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ"—not to give them another chance to repent and believe it. My brethren, "behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation."

I do not know when the Lord will come, but I do know—I am as sure of it, for myself, as of my own existence—that when at last Jesus Christ comes down the skies, when that lightning flash shall sweep across the heavens, and the world shall be startled with the shout, and with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, when that takes place, the doom of every unrepentant soul will be forever settled; the day of grace will be over; the day of judgment will be ushered in.

Believing all these things, what manner of men ought we to be? What manner of men ought we to be? How earnestly ought we to be beseeching others to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, lest the Master of the house should rise and shut to the door, and men should stand without, knocking at the door which can never be opened! May the Lord make us all "wise unto salvation" for His name's sake; Amen.



## THE MEANING OF THE PAROUSIA

(Continued from page 2)

preparations would be made, just as we Canadians delighted to prepare for our gracious King and Queen's triumphal procession across Canada last year. Gifts would be collected, crowns made, and all for the *parousia*, as they called it, of royalty. The Latins called it *adventus*, our "advent". Sometimes the Greek-speaking peoples called the "visit" *epiphaneia* "manifestation", "appearing", our "epiphany"—the epiphany of the king. This was natural. The emperor was thought to be a god, and to him temples were built for worship. When the emperor came, their imperial "god and saviour" was manifest.

The Christians knew well the terminology of emperor worship, in protest against which they were soon to suffer terribly. Said they in effect: "We have a God, and our God will come Himself and manifest His glory. We look for his *Parousia* and the *epiphaneia* of the Saviour. We would prepare for Him. We have been saved by His first *parousia*, we await His second *parousia*, the royal triumphant, glorious arrival of Christ the King of kings and Lord of lords."

Striking also is the way in which *apocalypsis* "unveiling, revelation", our "apocalypse", parallels *parousia*, and so each interprets the other. In 1 Thessalonians 2:19 believers are to be Paul's hope, joy, crown of rejoicing "in his (Christ's) *parousia*". (Recall the preparation of a crown for a *parousia* of an emperor!) In 3:13 he prays for them to be "established . . . in the *parousia* of our Lord Jesus"; and in 5:23 he asks that the whole man may "be preserved blameless in the *parousia*". Now in 2 Thessalonians 1:7 that same Paul looks for "rest", "release" for troubled saints "in the apocalypse of the Lord Jesus from heaven". And similar expectation is that of Peter (1 Peter 1:7) for the "proof", "genuine element" "stirring temper" of faith to be "found to praise and glory and honour in the apocalypse of Jesus Christ." So must we "hope for the grace being brought to" us "in the apocalypse of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 1:13; compare 4:13). According to Paul again, believers "earnest expect the apocalypse" (1 Corinthians 1:7) (A.V. here "coming"). James tells us that we must "have long patience till the *parousia*" (5:7). Thus we see that *parousia*, epiphany and apocalypse are three kindred terms to describe one great future event.

Cremer's summing up regarding the *parousia* is good:

"The *parousia* of Christ denotes His coming from heaven, which will be an advent and revelation of His glory, for the salvation of His church, for vengeance on its enemies, for the overthrow of the opposition raised against Himself,—of antichristianism,—and finally, to realize the plan of salvation." (*Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, English Translation 1878, p. 234.)

If this older scholar were living to-day, he would have to add from the new knowledge that the *parousia* of Christ denotes His *royal* coming. For the arrival of the King, for His divine manifestation, for His glorious revelation, Bible Christians hope and wait and pray.

## WESTERN CONFERENCE IN LONDON

The Western Conference will be held in Briscoe Street Baptist Church, Thursday, February 8th. There will be two sessions, 2:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. The special speaker will be Rev. H. C. Slade, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Timmins, and Vice-President of the Union. All are invited to bring their own lunch baskets; tea will be served in the Bible School room.

## CANADIAN UNITY

By Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.

An amazing news item appeared in "Le Soleil" of Quebec City on December 7 last. We believe that we are rendering a real national service by reprinting it here, for it sheds light on certain dark corners of public opinion in French-Canada almost entirely unknown to many of the citizens of the rest of this great Dominion. This piece of evidence, taken from a French Roman Catholic paper, demonstrates to what lengths the Church of Rome pushes its intolerance in districts where she possesses an overwhelming majority of the population. It is our strong conviction that English-speaking Canadians ought to know the unvarnished truth about the tactics employed by the Church in the province where it enjoys all the privileges of a state church, for a clear view of the religious situation in the Province of Quebec serves to explain many features of Canadian life and politics which are otherwise dark mysteries.

The following is a translation of the article appearing in "Le Soleil":

### A PROTEST OF THE PRIEST OF SAINTS-MARTYRS

Curé Laberge goes to the City Hall to protest against the construction of Protestant School in his Parish. Some aldermen approve plan.

Agitation is recommencing in the Montcalm Ward to prevent the Protestants from constructing a school within the limits of the parish of Saints-Martyrs, and last evening Curé Laberge went to the City Hall to protest against the plan to allow a school in this part of the city where the children of Protestants will be instructed in their language and religion.

It is known that the Protestants have recently purchased a large piece of land in the parish of Saints-Martyrs, and intend shortly to commence the construction of a modern building where they will house their children of school age. A group of aldermen did not find this protest of the Catholics against the project of the Protestants to their taste, and yesterday at the City Hall certain declared that they favoured giving Protestants the same measure of liberty as Catholics with respect to schools.

Many of our Protestant compatriots will wish to believe that such an incident is an isolated case; they will perhaps attempt to console themselves with the reflection that every movement is cursed with extremists who injure their own cause by the very excess of their zeal for it. We too should be most happy to pass over this matter in silence and give a fool's pardon to the narrow-minded curé of the Holy Martyr's Church, if he were so regarded by those of his own religion and race, and especially by his ecclesiastical superiors. But if the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec, the Primate of the Church of Rome in Canada, has administered any rebuke to his neighbour it must have been a private one. So far as we noticed no protest was issued by either of the two Federal Cabinet ministers that represent Quebec City at Ottawa. The Quebec papers, so far as we know, did not take up the cry against this piece of bigotry, and certainly not "L'Action Catholique", the official daily organ of the hierarchy. It is true that one French language newspaper did administer a well-deserved rebuke, but this ray of light from "Le Jour" of Jean-Charles Harvey only served to make the surrounding darkness more apparent. We should add that "Le Jour" has eked out an existence for some two years in spite of the op-

probrious epithet "anti-clerical" that its many enemies use to damn it.

But it is not only by silence that the Church has lent consent to this sort of intolerance; open acts have declared its determination to keep alive the ancient spirit of the Inquisition. A humiliating proof of this was given in the pages of this paper less than two years ago, when we told how Superintendent Gagnon of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police blackened the name of that famous body of men by using his authority to deny a Baptist pastor in Quebec the privilege—or more accurately the right—to distribute the New Testament from door to door. The studied insolence of this police officer's letter to a Protestant minister, we said then, and repeat now, was worthy of Stalin's *Ogpu* or Hitler's *Gestapo*. But when the Hon. Ernest Lapointe, Federal Minister of Justice and member for Quebec City, was asked a question concerning this matter on the floor of the House of Commons he answered by saying that the Superintendent's action was not taken by virtue of his authority as a federal officer but as reorganizer of the Quebec City police force and under municipal instructions. A pleasant reputation indeed for Mr. Lapointe to give his own constituency before the elected representatives of this great Dominion!

The infamous Padlock Law enacted under the even more notorious Duplessis régime, of late and unlamented memory, provides another case in point. This utterly stupid travesty of British liberty and British justice enacted with the blessing of the Church, was not only responsible for arbitrary acts suppressing the freedom of speech, among which we might remind our readers of the confiscation without explanation of some two hundred copies of the Gospel of John, but the vicious principles of this law also threatened to subvert the very foundations of freedom in Quebec. During the recent elections in Quebec some Canadian papers reported that under the authority of this act provincial police officers confiscated some hundreds of thousands of copies of a picture puzzle because the picture of Stalin appeared on it. Hitler's picture also appeared on the puzzle, but this was not the reason for the police action. The trick of the puzzle was to fold the pictures of the two dictators together in such a way as to find the likeness of the third dictator. The then Prime Minister was apparently afraid that a wholesale distribution of these puzzles would betray his identity for his police seized the whole lot. We sincerely hope that this story was an imaginative bit of pleasantry on the part of our press—we of course did not need the aid of the puzzle to identify the confrère of Messrs. Stalin and Hitler—but it is certainly true that by the terms of his own Padlock Law Mr. Duplessis had the uncontrolled and unconditioned authority to confiscate any document of which he disapproved.

Mr. Duplessis has gone; the Padlock Law remains. We shall await with interest the action, if any, of the new government under Mr. Godbout, who was a member of the legislature when that infamous bill became law without a single opposing vote. Mr. Godbout has a splendid opportunity before him of enabling Quebec to bring forth works meet for repentance, and thus to declare to the rest of Canada and to the world that the day of bigotry and intolerance in Quebec is past for ever. We shall all welcome such works with the utmost cordiality,

but until such time the record Quebec has written must stand.

Canadians everywhere welcomed the news that the Duplessis government was ignominiously swept out of office in the recent provincial elections, and they look for better things from Mr. Godbout and his party. It was disappointing to many to read Cardinal Villeneuve's comment on the election, made during his recent visit to the capital of the United States. Speaking before the Press Club, the Cardinal took special pains to make clear his interpretation of the results of the provincial elections. He said: "We must not interpret the vote in Quebec as a vote in favour of Imperialism. The vote was not so much in favour of Great Britain and France as it was for Canadian unity."

We bow to the Cardinal's dictum, but our agreement is founded not so much on his exalted position nor his shrewd insight as a political observer, as on the manifest truth of the case. The deliberate choice of conscription as an issue in the election and the party manifestoes of which it was the subject leave no room for interpreting the vote in favour of "imperialism". Both parties agreed perfectly in anathematizing conscription. They were at one in hating it with a perfect hatred. The sole choice in the matter for the voters to decide was which party was more advantageously placed to implement its election promise that conscription would not be introduced. For the attainment of this end Quebec could not have chosen better than it did in giving Mr. Godbout an overwhelming majority. This gentleman is very closely associated with Liberal government in power at Ottawa; with his consent the leading French-Canadian federal ministers entered the arena of provincial politics and went up and down the country reiterating that as long as the present Liberal government endured there would be no conscription. They went even farther than that: they threatened that if Mr. Duplessis won the provincial election they would at once resign their seats in the federal house and thus precipitate a Dominion-wide election. Some may have regarded this as blackmail, but it was left to none to doubt its effectiveness. Quebec remembered the "Khaki Elections" of 1917. It remembered how it once made the mistake of provoking the rest of the provinces against French-Canada. Quebec always votes in a solid phalanx, but it has learned that to stir up English-speaking Canadians to vote in one bloc is fatal to its balance of power. Quebec resolved not to make the same mistake a second time. It was evident, even in Quebec, that Mr. Duplessis's arrogant, swash-buckling "nationalisme" was exceedingly offensive in the other Provinces, and that he could only provoke fruitless dissent without fulfilling his guarantee against conscription. Mr. Godbout, on the other hand, could do all that Mr. Duplessis had promised and more, and this with a minimum of danger of stirring up the rest of Canada since the King-Lapointe combination was playing his game for him at Ottawa. Indeed some of the English language press in the goodness of its heart, ventured to interpret the defeat of Mr. Duplessis in Quebec as an expression of that province in favour of the war. No doubt it was to correct such well-meant interpretations and to prevent the full force of the election being lost on Ottawa that the Cardinal uttered his warning to the Press Club at Washington.

It is unfortunate, we think, that the Cardinal saw fit to use the word "imperialism" in this connection. While

it is not necessarily a word that carries an accusation, yet in many circles—and these the most ferociously opposed to English traditions—the word has a decidedly evil connotation. No doubt there were many readers who so understood it and their interpretation would be strengthened by the fact that the Cardinal took special pains to assure them that the vote was *not in favour* of what he termed “imperialism”.

We wonder again, what the Cardinal meant by the phrase “Canadian Unity”. If he meant a unity based on liberty and justice for all then Protestants are heartily in accord. If, however, he meant a unity that was to be purchased by the surrender of such elemental rights as that of building a Protestant school or distributing New Testaments in his city, then we will never submit. Another Catholic country recently obtained “national unity” by the blessing of the Church and the slaughter of more than a million of its people. French Canadian Roman Catholics ought to know that the ideal of English liberty and justice was purchased by Protestant blood and that Protestants will never submit to the kind of “national unity” exemplified in Spain.

It is also disheartening to read the following press dispatch from Montreal appearing in a Quebec city paper:

“Montreal, 8. (P.C.) (Authorized by the censor) The Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, the Hon. Adélar Godbout declared to-day that he had requested the federal authorities to suspend the recruiting campaign in the rural districts of the province on account of the necessity of keeping young farmers on the farms.”

A columnist in one of the Toronto papers remarks rather pointedly that there has not been any recruiting campaign carried on in the countryside of Quebec. What does Mr. Godbout mean? No doubt his friends at Ottawa know.

But to return to the narrow-minded and short-sighted parish priest of Saints-Martyrs and his protest against the building of a Protestant School in his parish: We earnestly hope that the Municipal Council will magnanimously grant the Protestant School Board the enormous concession of allowing them to build a school on the land they have purchased in the Parish of Saints-Martyrs (Holy Martyrs). It is gratifying to know that “certain aldermen have declared that they favoured giving the Protestants the same measure of liberty as Catholics with respect to schools.” But though the location of a Protestant school is not a matter of national importance, of supreme importance, dearer than life itself to every true Protestant, is the cause of religious liberty. And so long as the granting or withholding of such elementary rights as this can still be regarded as an open question in the Province of Quebec, few Protestants will feel that the cause of liberty is finally won in Canada.

## FROM “BAPTIST AND REFLECTOR”

### TENNESSEE

(The following article has special value just now.—Ed. G.W.)

### THE FUTURE OF RUSSIA AND GERMANY?

We have read a number of Bible expositors who hold that Ezekiel foretells a future confederacy of nations north of Palestine headed by Russia in which, along with others, Germany will also be included. Many people see in the recent rapprochement between Russia and Germany a foreshadowing of this confederacy.

## I

The prophet is told to “set thy face toward Gog, of the land of Magog, prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal,” and to declare that God is “against thee, O Gog, prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal” (Ezk. 38:2, 3; 39:1, R. V.).

The army arrangement and those confederate with “Gog” are indicated in 38:4-7 (A. V.): “Persia, Ethiopia, Libya . . . Gomer, and all his bands . . . Togarmah . . . and all his bands; and many people with thee.” The relationship of “Gog” to these is, “be thou a guard unto them.”

Verses 8-12 in chapter 38 describe an invasion of Palestine by the confederacy. It shall be “in the latter years” and the confederacy shall “come into the land that is brought back from the sword” “to take a spoil; to take a prey.” The invaders shall “ascend and come like a storm” and it shall be “when my people Israel dwelleth safely” after they have been “gathered . . . out of their enemies’ lands” (38:14-16; 39:27). The result of the invasion shall be a spectacular and devastating defeat of the confederacy by the Lord.

## II

Agreement and disagreement are found among expositors when it comes to identifying the parties named here. The usual course is to refer to the three sons of Noah and their descendants in Gen. 10. There the names “Gomer,” “Magog,” “Meshech,” “Tubal,” “Togarmah,” etc., are found, and by the parties named “the nations were divided in the earth after the flood.” From this an effort is made to identify the names in Ezekiel.

“Gog” is generally understood to be the head of the confederacy. “Gog” is the prince and “Magog” his land” (Scofield, Reference Bible). But Graves (Seven Dispensations) says that “Gog” is the antichrist, while A. C. Gaebelein (Harmony of the Prophetic Word), James M. Gray (Textbook on Prophecy) and L. Sale-Harrison (The Coming Great Northern Confederacy) say he is not.

Graves locates “the land of Magog” in the territory of Austria, Hungary and Germany. But Scofield, Gaebelein, Gray and Sale-Harrison locate it within Russia, while B. H. Carroll (An Interpretation of the English Bible) locates it in Central Asia.

The preponderant view is that “Rosh” means Russia and that “Meshech” and “Tubal” mean Moscow and Tobolsk, the capital cities of Western and Eastern Russian and their territories.

Among those confederate with Gog is “Gomer and all his bands.” Graves emphatically says, “Gomer is France.” But Scofield, Gaebelein (“Our Hope”), Sale-Harrison and others say Gomer is Germany, which was originally called “Gomerland.” Also among the confederates is “Togarmah and all his bands.” Some say this means the people possessing Armenia, while others say it means Tartar hordes between the Aral and Caspian seas in the southern portion of Russia, etc., etc.

Thus certain expositors understand Ezekiel to foretell a future Magogian confederacy headed by Russia and with Germany included in it.

## III

There are also agreements and disagreements as to the time and the nature of the fulfillment of Ezekiel’s prophecy.

The general view of premillennial expositors is that “the latter years” in the prophecy mean the closing days of the present dispensation. It is held that the Jews will have been regathered to Palestine in unbelief and that the Roman Empire will have been revived and be the opposer of “Gog” upon his invasion of Palestine. Then come the devastating defeat of the Magogian confederacy by the Lord, the coming of Christ to the earth with His saints, the national conversion of the Jews and the Millennium.

But, while he understands that the Jews will be regathered to Palestine, and that there will be an invasion of Palestine as foretold by Ezekiel, B. H. Carroll, postmillennialist, holds that the Jews will be converted prior to the coming of Christ to the earth and prior to the Millennium and that Christ will come after the Millennium. And Dr. Carroll inclines to the view that “Gog” and “Magog” in Ezekiel 38 and “Gog” and “Magog” in Rev. 20 at the end of the thousand years mean the same and says that it may well be that Ezekiel and Revelation “both use the terms ‘Gog’ and ‘Magog’ to image the character of the last opponents to the Kingdom of God without intent to fix geographical boundaries.” (Commentary on Revelation, p. 287.)

We have read two books by Philip Mauro, entitled "The Hope of Israel: What Is it?" and "Things Which Must Shortly Come to Pass." He once strongly held the usual premillennial view in the interpretation of prophecy. But, he has changed his mind and now holds that no national restoration of the Jews to Palestine in the commonly accepted sense is taught in the Scriptures and that "Gog and Magog" in Ezekiel and "Gog and Magog" in Revelation relate to the same time and events.

## IV

The view that Ezekiel foretells a future, anti-Semitic confederacy of northern European powers including Germany and headed by Russia is very plausibly presented by those who hold the view. If it is foretold then the recent rapprochement between Russia and Germany does take on a special significance.

But when great and good men differ so radically on the matter, how can we and other readers lacking their ability have sufficient penetration to say who is right?

While these divergencies are confusing, we do not introduce them in order to confuse—of course not. Nor do we introduce them to discredit prophetic study—of course not. We introduce them to urge our readers to exercise caution in accepting the prophetic conclusions of men. There are prophecies whose meaning is revealed. One can be certain about them. But there are other prophecies on which, as we have seen, diverse conclusions are reached by men of equal goodness and ability. Therefore, in relation to such prophecies, people need to be very cautious about taking a given set of earthly events and then because some men say so, affirming, "This is what the prophet means." Maybe he does and maybe he does not. We recall that certain brethren affirmed that prophecy revealed the World War as the last before the second coming of the Lord.

Warning against a certain fanciful book or prophecy claiming to have "new light," Gaebelein ("Our Hope," October, 1939) says "there is no new light" on prophecy. This is a broad statement. Does Mr. Gaebelein have all the light there is in dealing with prophecy? We feel that what Scofield in his Reference Bible says about certain things in the Book of Revelation applies to various prophecies in other places whose meaning or full meaning has not yet been disclosed; "Doubtless much that is now designedly obscure to us will be clear to those for whom it was written as the time approaches." This recalls the words of the Celestial Messenger to Daniel (12:8-10): "Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end." But the Messenger also said that when the time came "the wise will understand." If the end-time is here or is approaching, God's people will be enabled to grasp things that are not now clear to them.

In the meantime, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. 24:14). Our main task is to keep busy at this task.

## Bible School Lesson Outline

OLIVE L. CLARK, Ph.D. (Tor.)

Vol. 4 First Quarter Lesson 5 February 4th, 1940

### CHRIST TEACHING PRAYER AND TRUST

Lesson Text: Matthew 6.

Golden Text: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."—Matthew 6:33.

#### I. Good Works Without Undue Display—verses 1 to 18.

The righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees fell far below the standard of our Lord (Matt. 5:20). He warned His disciples against performing deeds of righteousness (verse 1, Revised Version), merely to win the approbation of men (Matt. 23:5-7). The Scribes and Pharisees are designated as "hypocrites" (This word is derived from the Greek word meaning "actor"), because they were playing a part, as it were (Matt. 23:13-15, 23-27). Their selfish motives did not

correspond with their seemingly pious actions; they were not what they seemed (Matt. 23:28).

Giving to the poor and needy is an important duty (Prov. 19:17; Matt. 25-40; 2 Cor. 9:6-14; Jas. 1:27), but to parade one's deeds of charity spoils the grace of generosity. Those who give in order to be seen of men, have already received the reward which they sought; they may look for no further recompense (John 5:44). The Greek word translated "they have" in verses 3 and 5 denotes possessing a receipt in full for a purchase. The Christian should be content to do good for the sake of doing good, and to please the Lord. He knows that in the Lord's own time and way He will reward His faithful servants (Matt. 10:41, 42).

The Scribes and Pharisees entertained a false conception of prayer. In the first place, they regarded it as an opportunity to parade their own piety. Accordingly, the public synagogue or street rather than the secret chamber was chosen as a fit place for their devotions. True prayer is addressed to God alone.

In the second place, they conceived of prayer as a magic formula, the virtue of which lay in the number of times it was repeated (1 Kings 18:26, 29; Eccles. 5:2; Mk. 12:40; Acts 19:34). Heathen forms of worship provide many illustrations of these senseless repetitions. It was thought that the spell would be broken if any of the original words should be omitted, misplaced or changed. Our God, on the other hand, regards rather the yearning of the heart. He knows our every need; He understands even our thoughts afar off (Psa. 139:1-16).

The prayer which is generally known as "The Lord's prayer" should be called "The Disciples' Prayer". It was not intended to be a formula, to be repeated in vain repetition as some do, each repetition being counted as they touch the beads of their rosary. Our Saviour was teaching the principles of true prayer (Lk. 11:2-4).

Prayer, to be acceptable, will be offered in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself (John 14:13, 14; 15:16; 16:23-27). It will be addressed to God as our Father. The Gospel of Christ revealed God as the loving heavenly Father of those who believe in Christ (John 1:12; Rom. 8:15, 16; Gal. 4:6). We may draw near Him in confidence (1 John 5:14, 15).

The last three petitions concern our personal needs. We require sustenance for each day; not merely the supply for our physical natures, but the strength from the Word of God for our spiritual natures, (Deut. 8:3; 33:25). Forgiveness of sin for which we pray will be provided as we confess and forsake it (1 John 1:9). An unforgiving spirit toward others will indicate a lack of fellowship with the Father, which is an indispensable condition of prayer (Matt. 18:21-35; Mk. 11:25, 26; Jas. 2:13; 1 John 2:9-11; 3:14).

The word "temptation" is used in two senses in Scripture: it may mean "test" or "try" (Gen. 22:1), or it may mean "entice into evil" (Jas. 1:13, 14). Conscious of our weakness, we would shrink from the place of testing; but if, by the providence of God, we are brought into such, our prayer will be that we may stand true (1 Cor. 10:13; Jas. 2:2-4, 12), and that we may be delivered from the power and enticements of the Evil One (Matt. 26:41; Lk. 22:40, 46).

Prayer has its commencement and its consummation in thanksgiving and praise (Psa. 95:2; 100:4; Phil. 4:6). All glory, praise and honour be unto our God (1 Chron. 29:11; 2 Chron. 20:6; Rev. 1:6; 5:12; 7:12)!

#### II. Good Aims Without Undue Distraction—verses 19 to 34.

There are those who hoard up treasures upon earth. Such inheritances are subject to corruption and destruction, for nothing is permanent on this earth. Such people are foolish; they are not rich toward God (Lk. 12:15-21; 1 Tim. 6:17-19). The wise are intent upon possessing a heavenly inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled and passing not away, but reserved in heaven's storehouse (Jas. 2:5; 1 Pet. 1:4).

What is the treasure of your heart? What is your most valued possession? As the eye is to the body, so is ambition to the spirit. The eye is the window of the soul, revealing the hidden man. The ambition or goal of life is an indication of the tendency of the spirit. If the ambitions and aims of life are pure, the outward actions will also be pure: if the impelling thoughts are evil, the whole life will be corrupt.

All men are either servants of righteousness or servants of sin; servants of God or servants of Satan (Lk. 16:13; John 8:34-36; Rom. 6:16-20). To some people the welfare of the body is the subject of their chief concern; they neglect their immortal souls.