

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Vol. 29, No. 47

130 Gerrard St. E., TORONTO, MARCH 15, 1951

Whole Number 1503

AN HERETICAL PREPOSITION

GOD did not design the material universe with a view to making Himself an absentee Landlord. After He had crowned His creation by making man in His own image, He walked "in the garden in the cool of the day".

The Bible is designed to supplement and complete the revelation of God in nature; and from the first of Genesis to the last of Revelation, God reveals Himself as being present in His world, and a potent Factor in all its affairs.

That revelation finds its culmination and climax in the coming of Jesus Christ into the world. We are told that "God sent his Son into the world". Hence,

"No mere machine is nature,
Wound up and left to play;
No wind-harp swept at random
By airs that idly stray!

A Spirit sways the music,
A Hand is on the chords;
O bow thine heart, and listen,
That Hand, it is the Lord's."

Jesus, Himself, said that "God", not a mere Abstraction, not an impersonal Force, but "God" clothes "the grass of the field". And the animate creation is not less subject to divine supervision: "He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry". Our Lord also said of the birds: "Your heavenly Father feedeth them". And as to His human creatures, men are everywhere represented as free, moral, agents; but as being responsible to God, "So then, every one of us shall give an account of himself to God". It is unthinkable that the new creation, in its widest scope, should not be designed to restore man to fellowship with God, and the whole created order to its pristine glory, by being "delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God".

Notwithstanding all this, the modern conception of religion, bearing the Christian name, is that it affords man a new opportunity to make of himself the man God designed him to be. Hence, men are exhorted to work FOR God. The church as an institution and organization, must be occupied with doing things FOR God, as though God had, in mercy, merely granted to this world a new probation, and that man is told to make the best of it, and that some day God will come and inspect the result.

Men speak of "Christianity" as they might of Mohammedanism, or Confucianism, or Buddhism — "Christianity" as though it were a system designed to afford one an opportunity of doing his best in the name of someone who is as dead as Mohammed or Confucius.

Why do we speak of an heretical preposition? Because that preposition "for" germinally represents the whole philosophy of Modernism, a form of semi-humanism, in which man is to busy himself doing the best he can FOR God.

The principle of supernaturalism is either partially, or wholly excluded from the concept of Modernism. It assumes that God does not live in His world; and that He has not much to do with it, beyond viewing it from a distance. He is not thought of as being a Factor in its affairs, as providentially ordering and sovereignly ruling its life and "upholding all things by the word of his power". Hence, at best Christ becomes an Example; the Holy Spirit, an impersonal, moral, influence; and the Father, an absentee Landlord, Who will come to collect His rents at the Judgment Day.

As we understand the word of God, nowhere in the pages of Holy Writ are men exhorted to work FOR God. The prodigal's experience in experimental independence, was disastrous. After he returned home, henceforth he lived, not FOR his father, but *with* him, in the experience and enjoyment of his personal presence and power.

Neither in the Old Testament, nor in the New, are we told to do anything FOR God: but everything WITH God. We bear fruit only as we abide in Christ, and His word abides in us. We work out our own salvation with the assurance that "it is God that worketh in you, to will and to do of His good pleasure". We are to be "strengthened with all might by His Spirit in the inner man". We are to have power to bear witness to the invisible, but ever-present Christ, only as the Holy Ghost comes upon us. We are admonished to go into all the world, and teach all nations, for the reason that all authority is given to our risen Lord in heaven and on earth, and that He is with us always, even to the end of the age.

But ecclesiastical, and organizational formalism, and ceremonialism, and ecumenicalism in all its aspects, are merely human attempts, by organization, or an army, and by carnal energy, to do that which can be accomplished only by the power of the Spirit of God.

We must recognize that in the whole scheme of redemption,—the salvation of the individual, the betterment of society, the uplift of nations, and the regeneration of the whole creation, — these things are predicated upon the assumption that man at his very best, and at his utmost, is only "a worker together WITH God".

L'ENVOI

Better a thousand times to try,
A thousand times to fail;
Than, quenched by fear of what is high,
The spirit cringe, and quail.
'Tis better to essay a task
No mortal could achieve,
Than never for a chance to ask
A failure to retrieve.

Wiser it is to gird the sword,
And battle for the right,
Though hopeless of a knight's reward.
Than safety seek in flight.
Wiser, yes wiser far to seek
The fleetest to outrun,
Than effortless, supine, and weak,
Cease when but just begun!

Though Victory be fleet of foot,
And Conscience handicap,
And heavy be Faith's brazen boot,
Where Duties overlap;
And steep the hill, and rugged, too,
The Right must always take
To win the prize the Good pursue,
But seldom overtake;

Though Life appear a venture vain,
Success elusive prove;
And yield us mocking for our pain,
And hatred for our love;
'Tis better to have braved the blast,
And bravely sought to serve,
Though reaping nothing at the last
But residue of verve,

And moral wealth in will to try,
And grace to fail, beside,
Which Life's reactions, flowing by,
Deposit with the tide.
For these are but the discipline
By Providence decreed,
The tender, gracious, regimen,
For all whom Truth hath freed,

By virtue of the Righteousness
Which flowed from Virtue's side,
Deity's crimson gift of Grace,
The sin of men to hide.
Failure and forfeiture thus seemed
To mark the Life Complete,
And Earth, Heaven's greatest Triumph, deemed,
But absolute defeat.

Beyond the rise and set of sun,
Where Time shall be no more,
For all who well the Race have run
And reach the other shore,
Wisdom and Justice shall appraise
The worth of every deed,
And in the Eternal's word of praise
Faithfulness find its meed. —T. T. S.

"The only reason why so many are against the Bible,
is because they know the Bible is against them."

—G. B. BOWES.

The Gospel Witness

and

Protestant Advocate

Published every Thursday for the propagation of the
Evangelical principles of the Protestant Reformation and
in defence of the faith once delivered to the Saints.
\$3.00 Per Year. Postpaid to any address. 10c Per Single Copy.

Editor

T. T. SHIELDS

Associate Editors

W. S. WHITCOMBE, M.A. (Tor.)

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

S. S. Lesson and Exchanges

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

Address Correspondence:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada

Telephone RAndolph 7415

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada

ADDRESS ON BRITISH ISRAELISM REPRINTED

In this issue we reprint, with the date of its delivery, an address given by Dr. Shields a few years ago on the question of British Israelism. It is reprinted here for two reasons. One, because that subject has been discussed in two recent lectures in the English Bible Course on Thursday evenings, by Dr. Shields. While the lectures were not by any means the verbal reproduction of this address, the argument followed was substantially the same. The further reason for reporting it is that the supply of the original address has been exhausted.

We reprint it without any alteration, giving the date of its delivery, so that it may be understood by our readers.

ABOUT OURSELVES

As we write these lines, our fair city is being blanketed by a heavy fall of snow, which we fervently hope will prove to be winter's last-dying struggle. But whether that be so or not, we were waiting this morning at the door of a shoe store before opening time to purchase a pair of rubbers. Our friendly storekeeper informed us that since last July, the price of these humble but necessary articles of wear had increased by 60 per cent! Such unseemly haste in raising prices rouses our ire as it does that of our readers. But what is one to do, rubbers are not luxuries but necessities.

Of course, this is an old story to housewives, though it never loses its poignant interest for them. And then, there is the ever-increasing price of printing and publishing, which adds to the burdens of editors. The price of a subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS does not cover the actual cost of printing and mailing. We receive no money for advertisements. Hence we are dependent upon the generous support of our readers in order to meet our bills. We thank those who have already come to our help in this missionary enterprise, and we would remind those who intend to do so that our financial year ends with this month. If you have not already done so, will you sit down NOW and answer the Editor's letter?

—W.S.W.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

If Professing Christians Were To Practise Their Religion—What Would Follow?

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, March 11th, 1951
(Electrically Recorded)

"They feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations whom they carried away from thence."—2 Kings 17:33.

IT IS interesting and instructive to observe, as I have frequently reminded you, that the warp and woof of human life is really ever more the same. Human nature is the same, sin is the same, our great adversary is the same; he does not change. And so we have a proverb to the effect that history repeats itself; that is to say we can read mirrored in the pages of history the record of our own time. Men do again what their fathers did. There are very interesting principles in religious psychology involved in the text which I have read.

Samaria was the capital city of the Northern kingdom, the kingdom of Israel, and it was also the name of the area, the province if you like, in which the capital was situated. Israel had been entirely removed from Samaria! "The Lord removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets. So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day." There may have been a few scattered remnants somewhere in the hills that escaped the clutches of the Assyrian conqueror; and it may have been that in the succeeding generations of Samaritans there was some Jewish blood mingled with the people who took the place of the exiled Israelites, but the Jews refused to recognize the Samaritans as having any kinship with them, and so had "no dealings with the Samaritans". So then, Samaria, by the king of Assyria, was depopulated. Then we read that later he sent men from Babylon to take the place of the Israelites which had been carried away captive—men "from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim," and other places. They were sent into the evacuated territory, and established in Samaria. But in the beginning of their dwelling there—they were foreigners, and strangers to the land,—they had a very difficult time, for their people were destroyed by lions, and I suppose by other wild beasts of prey, and they concluded that the reason for that was that these foreign immigrants, these "displaced persons", who had been put there to take the place of other "displaced persons", were suffering because they knew not "the manner of the God of the land". And they so reported to the king of Assyria. So he sent an Israelitish priest into Samaria to teach these heathen people the ways and the manner of Jehovah, and he taught them the manner of the God of the land.

But, while they listened to his teaching, "every nation made gods of their own, and put them in the houses of the high places which the Samaritans had made, every nation in their cities wherein they dwelt." There follows a list of the names of the gods they made for them-

selves, each separate people making a god after their own liking. Then, the record says, having thus been instructed by an Israelitish priest, "They feared the Lord, and served their own gods." They professed one thing; they practised another.

There is more than ancient history in that story. There are still people whose daily lives, whose common practices, have no relation whatever to the religion they profess. There are many who profess to be followers of Christ, to be the devotees of "Christianity", who have a religion that is devoid of any ethical content. They go to church on Sunday and sing the songs of Zion, but serve the world, the flesh and the devil between Sundays. I am sure you will acknowledge that that is true in countless thousands of cases; it is indeed the rule rather than the exception, for people to profess to fear the Lord, but serve their own gods.

I.

Let us, if we can, ANALYZE THIS PROFESSION OF RELIGION, THE PROFESSION OF FEARING JEHOVAH.

These people were foreign importees; they did not really belong to the people of God; they never had so belonged. They were heathen, and were addicted, and had long been addicted to idolatrous practices. But now they were placed in Samaria instead of the children of Israel. Now I submit that that is very common in our day. The enemy has largely depopulated the professing church, of spiritual Israel, of people who have really been born into the kingdom of God: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." These people who were brought into Samaria were brought there to take the place of the Israelites, who had been carried captive to another land. My dear friends, that is what the enemy of our souls has done with the professing church of our day on a world-wide scale. There is a gentleman coming to Toronto who is President of the National Missionary Association. He discounts all the essentials of the Christian faith, but he comes to instruct missionaries on the philosophy of missions. The World Council of Churches is just a world-wide organization which would bring men "from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and elsewhere, to occupy the church of Christ; and these leaders, like Bishop Oxenham, and men of his ilk, are like the Jews of Nehemiah's day who had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and Moab, whose children spake half in the speech of Ashdod." I will not offend your ears by quoting the epithets which some of these men apply to the

God of the Old Testament. Many, perhaps the majority of our theological schools are just the same. I know them from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Gulf nearly to the Arctic Circle; and except for newly established smaller institutions, there is scarcely one of the older theological institutions that is not a citadel of paganism today. But they have taken the place of the Israelites who have been driven out.

But they found in Samaria that *it did not pay altogether to abandon the profession of fearing Jehovah.* They were suffering grievous losses, and so they said, "We must keep the name." Some years ago I met a man here from Glasgow. He had been the owner of some sort of departmental store in the city of Glasgow, and he named a particular street where these larger stores were situated. He said, "Every one of them has a Scotch name, it is a Mac, or an Alexander, or something else, but distinctively and unmistakably Scotch." He said, "I was one of the last to sell out, and they came to me and offered me cash for my business, but stipulated that they must still be allowed to use my name." And he said, "Nearly all the departmental stores of that street in Glasgow are owned outright by Jews, but they do business under Scotch names." That is a clever ruse, isn't it? That is exactly what the Devil has done; he has stolen and captured Christian institutions all over the world, but they retain their Christian name, they still try to do business in the name of Christ, though the Son of God is no longer a partner in the business.

The king of Assyria sent a priest to teach them the ways of the Lord. What an extraordinary thing! A heathen king appoints a priest to teach a lot of pagans the ways of Jehovah! We have that. I got two letters the other day from the Canadian West, and they were both from ministers of one of the principal Denominations of this country. One of the letters was overflowing with gratitude for blessing received. The other was from a minister of the same church, who somehow or another had received a copy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and he was boiling with rage. He told me how capacious his waste basket was, and that he was not in the least interested in literature of that sort, no matter where it came from. It was quite evident from his letter that he was one of those who was a nominal Christian, but who knew nothing at all about the doctrines of the Gospel. Where was it I heard it, was it in the opening prayer?—it struck me forcibly; I have read it a thousand times, and know its significance—"That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." For the life of me I do not know why a man would desire to teach in a Christian institution who was not out and out a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ.

A few years ago, in the old church, a young man, sitting down there somewhere to my right one evening in an after-meeting, rose and gave a glowing testimony respecting his hope in Christ, and he announced that he was a graduate of McMaster University. It was a fine testimony: I didn't see him for a few years after that, but he turned up again, and waited to see me. He said, "I have spent these intervening years in post-graduate work at Chicago University." He said, "I love to hear you preach. There are two men I love to hear preach, you are one, and the other is Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick!" I said, "That is interesting, but I should like to have a talk with you, and learn of some of your experiences at Chicago University." Let me pause to remark

that the great Hebraist of Chicago University of a generation or so ago was Dr. William Raney Harper, and one of the great proponents of the philosophy of Modernism was Dr. Shailer Matthews. So in a class one day a student asked Dr. Harper, "Dr. Harper, what is orthodoxy?" He said, "It is what Dr. Shailer Matthews preaches in a Southern Baptist pulpit." Southern Baptists are Evangelicals. Well, this same Shailer Matthews—this is a thoroughly authentic story—preached in one of the most rigidly orthodox churches of the Southern Baptist Convention, and he preached on "Paul's View of the Atonement." When he had finished the congregation was delighted, and someone said to Dr. Shailer Matthews some time afterward, "I heard great reports of your visit to such a church. They said, 'He preached on 'Paul's View of the Atonement,' and there was nothing wrong with it; he is perfectly sound.'" Shailer Matthews said, "Of course, I preached on 'Paul's View of the Atonement,' but it isn't mine." Do you think I exaggerate? I knew these institutions, and know their record well.

This young man to whom I have referred came to see me, and he told me that he had gone all the way to the end of the Modernistic road. I said, "You have accepted Shailer Matthews, and all that he teaches?" "Well," he said, "there is one criticism I have to offer of him, he is too conservative; he isn't Modernistic enough to suit me." And after a little talk I said, "Let me state a hypothetical case, and I want you to give me an answer. Imagine, if you can, my being invited to some prominent Unitarian Church, an institution that denies the Deity of Jesus Christ. And try to imagine my accepting the invitation, and I preach. I preach on the example of Christ, the ethics of Jesus, or something upon which everybody can agree, and when I have done the congregation say, 'Why, that is fine; that is just what I believe.' Then suppose they were to come to me and say, 'We should like you to become our minister,' and I accept their invitation, and I become Pastor of a Unitarian Church. For a few months or a year I content myself with speaking of the humanity of Jesus, His teaching, and so on, those things upon which moralists and humanists will all agree; and it would be quite easy to find something to occupy our thought for an extended time. Meantime, you must imagine my being particularly agreeable; I endeavour to be as agreeable and as winsome as I know how, until the people say, 'We like him, we really like him.' They invite me to their homes, and I mix with them socially, and they say, 'He is a fine fellow.' Then when I have established myself in their affections and confidence, little by little I introduce my evangelical principles into my preaching. I suggest that Jesus is something more than a man, not merely a super-man, but more than that. And after a while I discuss the philosophy of His death, and in somewhat diluted form present the atonement. They do not object. I do not label it, and they like me, and they are willing now to accept most of what I say. And little by little I preach my Evangelical Gospel, until I come to an insistence upon the new birth, the Deity of Christ, the inspiration and authority of Scripture, and they do not rebel. After I have gradually trained them in that fashion, I tell them something about baptism, and little by little I convert that Unitarian Church into a Baptist Church.

"Meanwhile I have been receiving a salary as a Unitarian preacher. I am there supposedly to propagate Unitarianism, but gradually I have come to propagate

the very opposite." He looked at me smilingly, and I said, "What, Mr. So-and-So, would you have to say about the ethics of such a procedure as that?" "Why," he said, "I should say you were eminently wise; you were absolutely right." "Quite right," I said, "to profess one thing for a while in order to be able to preach and practise something else later?" "Why," he said, "that is specifically what we are taught in Chicago University, that we are to go to evangelical churches, we are to preach like evangelicals, and little by little subvert the faith of the people, until we have destroyed it altogether." He said, "We think that we have something better than the old-fashioned Christian faith." I said, "You may think so, but in my view, you have an abominable religion that has no ethical content at all."

I am not discussing a theory; I am telling you what a student and a graduate and post-graduate told me in my own vestry—that that was what they were taught. I know that is true. And it is the same thing here. The priest went, and he taught them, but it was not a matter of heart knowledge. They feared the Lord professedly, they accepted it all, but they were still pagans at heart, and while they attended the priest's lectures, they spent their spare time each one making his own god. So you see, there are people who use the Christian vocabulary, with an entirely different content.

My friend, the late Dr. A. C. Dixon, related an experience he had while crossing the sea one time on the same ship with a man who was Dr. Fosdick's predecessor, and who was at one time a Professor of Homiletics, I think, in Rochester Theological Seminary. Prior to that, in his evangelical days, the man I refer to, had been minister of Green Ave. Baptist Church in Brooklyn. Dr. Dixon and this other man had been neighbours; now they found themselves on the same ship together. One day Dr. Dixon sat down beside this man on the deck. They were good friends, and they talked about former days, and Dr. Dixon said, "So-and-So, we have drifted a long distance apart since the old Brooklyn days." "Oh," said he, "I do not think so." "But you do not believe the things you used to believe. For instance, you do not believe in the Divine inspiration of Scripture." "Certainly I do," he said. "You do not believe in the Divinity of Christ." "Certainly I do." "You do not believe in the vicarious atonement." "Of course I do.—But," he said, "I believe in the Divine inspiration of a lot of other books beside the Bible; and as a matter of fact, Dixon, I think all men are Divine; and as for the vicarious sufferings of Christ, of course they were vicarious, but I believe in the vicarious sufferings of a mother for her child, of a nurse for her patient, and a doctor for his patient." And so he used the very terminology of Christian orthodoxy to signify the very opposite:

That is what Modernists generally do, and because I call attention to their deliberate deception, I am esteemed an extremist. But you see, such teaching effects no radical change of heart. They pay lip service to the Gospel of Christ, call themselves a Christian institution, and many of them turn out men that destroy the faith.

II.

THESE FOREIGN OCCUPANTS OF SAMARIA GAVE THEMSELVES TO PAGAN PRACTICES; they "served their own gods."

What is idolatry? You say, "Do not talk to us about that, we are not idolaters; there aren't any idolaters in

this country." But "covetousness," the Scripture says, "is idolatry." An idol is only an objective representation of a man's own thought of God. The natural man does not know God, he receives no revelation from God, but he tries to imagine what God is like, and he carves an idol, which is representative of his thought. This building for instance, before it was erected was all drawn out in a plan. We have nearly six hundred plans of this building, it took about six hundred plans to build it. There it was in blueprints. You could put the plans in your bag and carry it with you — it was just an idea, that is all. By and by that idea was formulated objectively into this building. And the same is true of idols. "They did not like to retain God in their knowledge," and "God gave them up to a reprobate mind"—"a mind void of judgment," the margin says, then they imagined what God was like, with the result that they "changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man," they made Him like a man first of all, "and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things." There is not much evolution there, is there? First they conceived of God as like a man, then as like birds, then as fourfooted beasts, and at last they got Him right down into the slime, and worshipped "creeping things" as God. What wonder that idols are usually such grotesque creations, the ugliest things in the world! Why? Because man's natural thought of God is just as ugly as the Devil himself can make it, and "every imagination of the thoughts of (men's) heart was only evil continually." Leave a man to himself, and he first of all drags God down to his own level. "I wouldn't have such a God." Why? "I want a God that will do as I do."

An idol may have no objective representation at all; it may be but a thought. But it is anything put in the place of God. What have we today? It is a day of idolatry. And he is an idolater in practice who substitutes human reason for Divine Revelation. Said Naaman, "Behold, I thought . . ." The Psalmist said, "I hate vain thoughts." Our business is to think God's thoughts after Him. But nowadays, instead of bringing human reason, and all that relates to human life, to the standard of Divine Revelation for appraisal and correction, the Bible is brought to the bar of human reason, and everything that the puny mind of man cannot understand he throws overboard; it cannot be of God, because it is bigger than he is. Such practice is common in our theological institutions, and a great many other places.

He also is an idolater in practice who substitutes human standards of conduct, for Divine precepts. They ask not what God has said. I ask you, how many men who are church members, who profess and call themselves Christians, when they go into the office or the shop, or wherever they work tomorrow, will stop to ask about this and that and the other thing—"Is that right in the sight of God?" They do not think of God. "This is what my competitor does, and I will do the same." Comparatively few bring the word of God into all the relationships of life. They may profess fear of the Lord, but they serve their own gods.

They worship idols also who put human conceptions of righteousness for what has been revealed. What is righteousness—do you know? I do not, and I do not think you do. There are those who say it is a matter of majority opinion; what the majority believe to be right is right, but that there is no absolute righteousness. You remember what the Lord Jesus said, that when the Holy

Spirit should come, "He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment," and in that particular He said, "Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more." In other words, He said, "I am the only Exemplification of righteousness this world has ever seen, and when I am gone the world will not know the meaning of righteousness." The righteousness of God is seen only in Jesus Christ. Therefore He said that the Holy Spirit must come and teach what was right, for it is the only way by which any one of us can know. But instead of that, the question is, What do you think? What do I think? Hence we have "conferences" galore to pool our human wisdom, to decide what we ought to do, and very often with shut minds, not even bothering to ask, "What saith the Scripture?" Again works are put in the place of Divine grace. Grace is almost a forgotten word. A Baptist preacher said to me, "I think I preach the grace of God, although I never use the word." In some churches, the hymns are about all you get. They profess to fear the Lord, and so they sing the hymns of Zion, but when it comes to the preaching, very often the preacher spoils it all. I do not mean to say he necessarily disseminates poison, not that; what he says may be true, so far as it goes, the essentials of faith are omitted; and men are exhorted to save themselves, to lift themselves up to heaven. Thus faith in the wisdom of men, is substituted for the power of God.

Mr. Whitcombe read tonight the one hundred and fifteenth Psalm, about the idols that people make for themselves of silver and gold: "They have mouths, but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not: They have ears, but they hear not: noses have they, but they smell not: They have hands, but they handle not: feet have they, but they walk not." And it is said, "They that make them are like unto them." We become like unto the god we worship, and when men bow down to the dictates of human reason, to human conceptions of what is right, and depend upon human efforts instead of Divine Sovereign grace, they become like their mental idols.

I venture to believe, dear friends, that *this principle explains the universal moral decline throughout the world.* What has made Britain drop? The fact that many churches in Britain, with many glorious exceptions, so far as the great Denominations are concerned, are trying to do without God as a Factor in human life.

It is true of the Established Church, and the same is true of the so-called Free Churches; there is very little Gospel left. And with what result? Look at Britain today compared with what she used to be.

And why have we steadily declined in morals in Canada? We deplore the prevalence of juvenile delinquency, and divorces, and I know not what else. Many blame the homes. Yes, in some measure, very likely the home is blameworthy; but the chief criminal in all this is the professing church of Christ. Perhaps you will not like that, but I cannot help it; I am sure it is true. Modern Christianity so-called is a disguised humanism; God is scarcely a factor in it. He is an ideal and an abstraction; while the conception of a new birth, a new creation, the coming into a human life of Divine power, the indwelling of the creative Spirit of God—I do not say it is unknown; praise God for every place where it is proclaimed, but in very many cases the programme that is offered to poor bankrupt humanity is a programme by which men are exhorted to save themselves.

III.

AND ALL THIS IN DEFIANCE OF HISTORY: "After the manner of the nations whom they carried away from thence." Idolatry had failed their predecessors. Look at Samaria. What was it? Jeroboam had set up a calf of gold in Dan and another in Bethel, and taught the people to worship idols, until at last the nation was utterly destroyed, and Israel was carried away; and Hosea the prophet exclaimed, "Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off." Your god has done nothing for you but destroy you. And the very gods after which they made the pattern of the gods they now made were the gods of the nations who had themselves been destroyed by their idolatry.

Now tell me, what has Modernism ever done for the world? Find me a Modernistic church where people are soundly converted and made new creatures, where the drunkard is made a sober man, the thief an honest man, the self-centred, selfish mortal who lives for himself alone, made into an unselfish servant. Where do you find it? You do not find it. Modernism cannot do it; Modernism has no dynamic.

Some years ago a Japanese student from Tokyo came to Toronto to attend our prayer meetings. He was taking post-graduate work in New York City, and he came here just to attend our prayer meetings. He told me this, He said, "I have been to many of the services in New York, and except in their form, in principle they differ nothing from the temples of Japan. We have ethical systems. Confucius will tell us what we ought to do, and what we ought to be, but Confucius is dead, and he cannot enable us to do what we ought to do, or to be what we ought to be. Our religions are mere ethical systems." He said, "I have gone to church after church in New York,"—and he named them to me,—and he said, "It is just exactly what one hears in Tokyo. There is the picture—'Be that, be that,' but oh, there is no power given to these poor bankrupt human natures to be what we ought to be." But still people go on.

I told you perhaps, but let me repeat it. It is often with me, I see it again and again. I stood for an hour or so on the bank of the Ganges in India, and I saw the people going down and bathing in its filthy waters. Then I saw them standing in the very waters in which they had bathed, dipping up the holy water in their hands and drinking it. There were terraces down to the river, and little houses of different sorts built along these terraces—idol shrines, some of them. I stood beside one. The idol was to my right, and here was a platform, and on the platform a Hindu of some description, with eyes closed, his legs crossed, and his arms folded across his breast, and he was mumbling a prayer. Sitting there by the hour praying and praying, saying something to somebody, to an idol god. Then I saw one of these devotees buy some holy rice, and come and press it in between the lips of the idol beside me, just push it in, feeding their god. Then they went on with their prayers. I waited for a few minutes. The trees round about were swarming with sacred monkeys, hordes of them, and presently a monkey hopped down and on to the head of the idol, and took the rice out of its mouth, and ate it himself. You would have supposed that that would be enough to convert anybody from idolatry, wouldn't you? But they went down and put more rice in those lifeless lips. Still going on. That is the pity of it. Men do not learn the lessons of history. We refused

to learn the lessons of the first war, and so we had a second one. Now the whole world is half inclined to refuse to learn the lessons of the second war. So generation after generation persist in making the same mistakes, and worshipping the same gods that can do nothing for them but destroy them all.

During the first war I went to London a little ahead of my engagement, and I went to hear a famous preacher whom I knew very well, one of London's famous preachers, but a semi-Modernist. Not an out and out Modernist, but Modernistic. He had been one of Spurgeon's opponents; he was an old man at the time I heard him. I heard him preach on "The Christianization of the Social Order". I forget what his text was, but that was his theme. Our business was to Christianize the social order, and here he was in the midst of a flaming world, where from all sides he was being told that his whole conception was a fallacy, that you cannot Christianize an unregenerate society. Individuals must be saved by being born again. There is no other way. You cannot make men honest by law.

I am half inclined to write a little article on the "Queen's Park Pantomime". Please pass it on to them with my compliments. What an aggregation of simpletons we have there! They seem to be devoid of ordinary common sense. A little while ago they passed an "anti-discrimination" law. I suppose it won't do any harm, if they want the King's Printer to print such rubbish. But there isn't anybody in the world that can enforce it. If I were an employer of labour I would employ whom I liked. I must not discriminate! I am a Protestant, but if I had a job I would be compelled perhaps to employ a Roman Catholic. Well, I would if I wanted to; I should have no special objection if he were qualified for the position. I agree with the principle, but it is sheer asininity to put that principle in legislative form, and to assume that there is any power on earth that can enforce it. It cannot be enforced; it is just a sheer waste of time. Good election talk, perhaps, but that is all. Now they have another bill—equal pay for women. All who agree, hands up. I agree. I am for the principle. I think some women are worth a great deal more than men; I would pay them more. But there will be a hundred dollar fine for an infringement of that law. The only sensible thing they did was to limit the fine to a hundred dollars; if they had made it five cents it would have been still more sensible. You cannot enforce it; it never will be enforced. They are only littering up the statute books with a lot of legislative nonsense. But that is the kind of legislators we have now.

Suppose now all churches were to get back to the simple Gospel, and really seek the conversion of men, to get men really converted to God; their hearts changed, and so that a man will really know the Lord. His desires are changed, and his whole outward life gradually takes on another color and another form; his heart refuses certain joys of which he had formerly been very fond. He is a different man altogether. Multiply him by a thousand, and give a community a church made up of a thousand such people, who always ask about everything, "What is the will of the Lord?" and, diligently studying His word, endeavour, by His grace, to practise the precepts of the holy Gospel. Let us have churches like that, where membership in the church becomes a certificate of character, so that people will say, "You say he is a member of such and such a church? All right, that is all I want to know; I know what they stand for.

They all stand for it, and anybody that does not conform they soon leave them." Suppose we had that? What then? Oh, my dear friends, people would soon begin to ask, "What is this strange thing?"

I heard of a man, he is gone to glory now, but he was a very godly man, and he lived in Chicago, and his name was a most common one, but I shall call him Thomas Blank. He was a wholesale fruiterer. An official of a certain Chicago Church told me this years ago. A man came into that church one week night, and he said, "Can you tell me, does Tom Blank attend this Church?" The official said, "I don't know, it is a large church, and we have a great many people of that name, and I dare say some of them may be called Thomas. Why do you ask?" "Well," he said, "the man I mean has a place down at the market, he is a fruit man." "Oh, I know of whom you speak, you mean such a Company——?" "Yes, that is the name." "What do you want to know about him?" "Well," he said, "I will tell you. I have worked for him for twenty years. He never preached to me, but the other day I said to a fellow workman, 'What makes our boss so different from other men we meet? I never met anybody else quite like him; what makes him so different?'" "Why," said the man, "it is his religion." "His religion?" "Yes," he said, "didn't you know? Our boss is a Christian." "Where does he go to church?" He told him where he thought he went, and that was why the man asked this official of the church about him. Then the official said, "What did you come for?" He said, "Just this, I want the same kind of religion my boss has, and if he got it here, I would like to come and get some of the same sort." Ah, yes, it has become necessary for us to redeem the very name of Christian, from its idol associations, so that the world about us will come to know that it means something to be born again, to be washed in the blood, to walk in fellowship with the risen Saviour. May He make us all Christians indeed, and worthy of the name we bear.

Let us pray.

We thank Thee O Lord for the reality of Christ. We thank Thee that so many in Thy presence do really know that Jesus Christ saves and keeps those who put their trust in Him. We pray Thee to bless our meditation, for Thy Name's sake, Amen.

BEHOLDING THE GLORY OF CHRIST

No man shall ever behold the glory of Christ by sight hereafter who does not in some measure behold it here by faith. Grace is a necessary preparation for glory, and faith for sight. Where the subject (the soul) is not previously seasoned with grace and faith, it is not capable of glory or vision. Nay, persons not disposed to it cannot desire it, whatever they pretend; they only deceive their own souls in supposing that they do so. Most men will say with confidence, living and dying, that they desire to be with Christ and to behold His glory; but they can give no reason why they should desire any such thing—only they think this somewhat better than to be in that evil condition which otherwise they must be cast into forever, when they can be here no more. If a man pretends to be enamored of, or to greatly desire, what he never saw nor was ever represented to him, he but dotes on his own imaginations. The pretended desires of many to behold the glory of Christ in heaven, who have no view of it by faith while they are here in this world, are nothing but self-deceiving imaginations.

—JOHN OWEN.

IS BRITISH-ISREALISM SCRIPTURAL?

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, April 28th, 1940

(Stenographically Reported)

"Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?"

I BEGIN the discussion of the subject announced for this evening as I have begun the discussion of other contentious subjects, with an apology which is an explanation.

A pastor, in the scriptural sense, is not a mere church official, the leader of an organization, or a business executive; a pastor is a shepherd of a flock, and as such he is also a teacher. "He gave some pastors and teachers." A pastor should exercise his pastoral office by faithfully teaching the people of the Lord. As a shepherd, he must carefully watch over the flock. It is his duty to protect them from their natural foes; and, at the same time, to lead them in good pastures where they will be fed, that they may grow up into Christ. One who is a mere hireling and not a shepherd will not care much about the flock, but those who are given by the ascended Lord to His church to be pastors should emulate the divine Pastor, the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. When the Lord Jesus summed up His life's ministry in His great prayer in the seventeenth of John, He said, "I have given them thy word." That is the minister's commission, to give people the word of God.

I find myself in full agreement with the British-Israel position thus far, when in one of their official publications they say, "We believe in the infallibility of the holy Bible from Genesis to Revelation." I have the profoundest respect for people who believe the Bible to be the word of God. We may not always agree as to our interpretation, but we are agreed in respect to its authority. In this place, the Bible is the supreme court of appeal. But I would go farther and say, it is the *only court* of appeal. If we assume the Bible to be true, it must be in accord with truth, everywhere; for it is axiomatic that truth never contradicts itself. Therefore the truth of the Bible will find confirmation in all true history, and in the dicta of science, in so far as they are demonstrated to be true; and in Christian experience. But we do not believe the Bible because of these confirmations from without. They supply interesting and instructive collateral evidence of the truth; but we believe the Bible independently of any such collateral evidence: for the Bible stands alone as the transparent, self-demonstrable Word of God.

The Bible, therefore, is not only the rule of faith and practice: it is the *only rule* of faith and practice. So we begin, I trust, at a point of agreement.

I want to distinguish between the Scriptures themselves and all interpreters and interpretations of Scripture. The Bible is itself infallible, but I know of no human interpreter who is infallible. Therefore in all such disputed questions as this, I say what I always say: I do not ask you to accept my dictum, I want you to be like the Berean Christians; and search the Scriptures to see whether these things be so. If to-night I should question some interpretations of Scripture, please do not charge me with impugning the authority of Scrip-

ture itself. All questions of faith must be brought to the Scripture and settled by the Scripture alone.

That is the distinctive principle of Protestantism; and I think you will find, on examination, that nearly all heresies—or, if you do not like that word, departures from the truth—whether of ancient or of the present time, consist of one or two things: either the Bible-minus—as our Modernists friends would treat it, cutting it to pieces and deleting some parts of it; or the Bible-plus. You have that in Roman Catholicism. The Bible, plus the Church's interpretation. You have it in Christian Science, the Bible plus Mrs. Eddy's "Key to the Scripture". You have it in Mormonism, the Bible plus "The Book of Mormon".

I wish I could be sure that that is not true of British-Israelism, but I am not quite sure; for it does seem to me that in the teaching of some it is the Bible-plus the doubtful interpretations and alleged authority of the pyramid, of profane history, and of supposed archeological science. For myself, I will have nothing to do with any religious authority outside the divinely-inspired, infallible, and therefore supremely authoritative Word of the living God. If you appeal to another court than the Bible, that must be your responsibility, and it is not likely that we shall be able to reach an agreement. But I have always the profoundest respect for anyone, or for any company of people who recognize the Bible as their sole-religious authority—as I hope they would have for me—whether in my view they are mistaken in their interpretations or I in their view should be mistaken; and in such case we ought to find common ground in that we bring all our controversies to the one court; and if we sincerely desire to know the will of God, I have little doubt that ultimately, as we are found in the unity of the Spirit, we shall come into the unity of the faith.

The next question is, *How shall we interpret the Scriptures?* My subject this evening is a very large one, and I have no hope of compassing it all. I can only touch a few elementary things, a few foundation principles; and perhaps we shall return to it at a later date. But I raise the question, How shall we interpret the Scriptures? Is there any general principle of interpretation in the Scriptures themselves by which we may be guided? Does the Bible really interpret itself? The Bible consists of the Old and New Testaments. Are they independent of each other? Is either of greater authority than the other? Or are they they of equal authority, and therefore mutually complementary and corroborative?

I give you my position. To me, the Bible is one Book, one and indivisible. Genesis is as truly inspired of the Holy Ghost as the Gospels. Revelation is as truly the word of God as any other book; and even though I may not be able to understand many of its tremendous sayings as yet, I believe it to be the inspired word of God just as truly as any other part of Scripture.

What, then, is the theme of the Bible? What is it

about? Is it salvation, primarily? Is the Bible identical with the gospel? Is that the theme of the Bible? Is the Bible an historical record? Is it designed to teach us history? And what of its prophecies? Are they predictive? Do they foretell as well as forthtell? Is it the story of Israel after the flesh, or of those who are now called the Jews? Is the Bible given to us to teach us about the Church, about the Gentiles? I believe all and much more than this are included. But they are all incidental to the principal Theme, which is Jesus Christ, "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever".

I read a story years ago with which many of you are familiar, of a little boy playing with a pile of blocks on the floor. His father wanted him to learn the geography of his country, and had given him a map of the United States cut up into blocks. The little boy's task was to get all the blocks together so as to have a complete map of the country to which he belonged. But he often got California mixed with New York, and Texas with the Dakotas. The little chap did not know his geography well enough to put the blocks together.

He turned a block over, and found on it the eye of a man. Then he turned all the blocks upside down, and there was no map at all. But he discovered another eye, and presently a nose, a mouth, two ears, then hair—and gradually he put together the image of a man. The man was George Washington. He completed the picture, and being a wise little boy, he got a big card, and slipped it under the blocks, got another and put it on top, and said, "Daddy, come and help me turn this over." And when it was turned over, there was the map of the United States! When he got George Washington in his proper place, the map of the United States was complete.

We can never know what the Bible teaches until Jesus Christ is assigned to His proper place. Salvation? Yes. The gospel? Yes. Israel? The Jew? The Church? The Gentile? Yes; they are all there. But they will all be brought into proper relation to each other as Christ is put first. The whole Bible, I contend, from the beginning to the end—not the New Testament only, but the whole Bible—is the record which God has given to us of His Son. I have said it a thousand times: you cannot have Genesis without Jesus, and you cannot have Jesus without Genesis. He is in every book, and only as we assign Him His proper place shall we be able to interpret it.

What is that proper place? Let me quote to you the opening verses of John's Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men." Or again, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down"—on an earthly throne? On a throne in Jerusalem? In a coronation chair with Jacob's stone underneath it?—"sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance, obtained a more excellent name

than they." Therefore we must make Jesus Christ the standard of our interpretations.

When then is the relation of the two Testaments? The New Testament fulfils the Old, as Joseph Parker was wont to say, as the noonday fulfils the dawn: especially in respect to Jesus Christ our Lord.

I must pass over the many passages which I should like to quote contained in the Gospels which record the literal fulfilment of the many prophecies relating to Him, in the days of His flesh, showing how the Old Testament was fulfilled in the events of His life. I refer rather to His own express teaching, that He came "not to destroy the law, or the prophets. . . . but to fulfil." Again and again in one way or another, He taught that all things that were written in the law and the prophets and in the psalms concerning Him, must be fulfilled. Hence the cross at the place called Calvary, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets": "Thinkest thou not", said He in the garden, "that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" He declined to call for the legions of angels, in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled.

It is familiar to everyone who knows his Bible, that at the cross, in His resurrection, and in His ascension, the Scriptures of the Old Testament found their fulfilment. He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, and received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them. On all these things, I assume, we are agreed.

But now I ask another question. *Are there Old Testament prophecies which are entirely independent of any New Testament interpretation?* In the divine, prophetic, scheme of things, may we safely assume that at any point the New Testament is a mere parenthesis over-arched by some prophetic purpose which must or may be understood entirely apart from and independently of the New Testament? My own answer to these questions is in the negative. The New Testament is the culmination, the climax, of the revelation of the divine purpose, and that climax is reached in Jesus Christ our Lord. He "hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." Therefore the revelation of God in Christ is the ultimate word; and all revelations which preceded that Full-orbed Disclosure of the divine purpose must be interpreted in the light that shines from the face of Jesus Christ.

Paul in the second of Corinthians speaks of the veil which was upon the face of Moses. Moses was representative of the old covenant, of the Old Testament. When he came down from the mount, he had to put a veil on his face because of the reflected glory due to his converse with God in the heavenlies. And Paul says that in the reading of the Old Testament that veil is still upon the faces of some, "which veil is done away in Christ . . . we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." So that the mysteries of the Old Testament are unveiled, not in secular history—that may be in part corroborative, but such mysteries as there may be in the Old Testament are unveiled in the face of Christ; and in the light which shines from His face, we are to interpret the Old Testament.

The Bible may be believed without external confirmation, but I lay it down as axiomatic—had I time to take

any of these principles and nurse it, and pursue my argument, I think I could establish it by many citations of Scriptural proof—that *no interpretation of the Old Testament can be correct which is not confirmed and established either implicitly or explicitly by the New Testament*. That principle must be applied, not only to the theory of British Israelism: it must be applied, also to all millennial and other theories too. No interpretation of the Old Testament can be true that does not find its confirmation and establishment in the teaching of the New Testament.

That being true, let me proceed to an examination of a few of the main suppositions of the British-Israel hypothesis. Do not misunderstand me. In so saying, I do not for the moment deny its truth. Its advocates speak of "British-Israel truth". I do not speak of "British-Israel truth" because I am approaching it now as a religious hypothesis, which has yet to be proved to be true. I do not mean that others have not proved it, but we are attempting to examine it in the light of Scripture for ourselves.

What are some of the main contentions? I had a pamphlet put in my hands which I left on my desk, but I know what it teaches. God made promise to Abraham that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed; that his seed should be more numerous than the stars in the heavens, or the sands of the seashore. There are some people who are especially concerned about ten tribes, and some others who are particularly concerned about two. I once remarked what I now repeat: I do not know that there is much difference between having ten tribes on the brain or two tribes.

The Jews are not a prolific race, and the promise was given to Abraham that his seed should be as numerous as the stars. If you confine that promise to Benjamin and Judah, you have a problem on your hands to establish it. Our B.I. friends tell us that that explains the multiplication of the population of an island of five and a half millions in three or four centuries, to a population of nearly five hundred million within the British Empire; and if you add the United States, alleged to represent the tribe of Manasseh, I believe you have six hundred millions and over. Of course, not all in the British Empire are Anglo-Saxons. But whether you expect the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham of an innumerable seed through two tribes or twelve—keep in mind they are to be numberless as the sands.

You remember how Jacob's name was changed to Israel, the prince; how Jacob had twelve sons, who were therefore the children of Israel, the children of Jacob. You remember too that Joseph went down into Egypt, and there had two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh. Manasseh was the older, but when Jacob pronounced a blessing upon them, he crossed his hands and put his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, and his left hand upon Manasseh, and so he blessed them, putting the younger before the older, declaring that in Ephraim should Israel be blessed, saying, "God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh". Levi, when they came up out of Egypt, was separated from the other tribes, which were thirteen, Joseph being represented by the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh—Levi was separated and dedicated to the priesthood. When they settled in the promised land, they were all given a lot, a possession; but Levi was given no portion, but was entitled to receive a tenth from the others as he ministered to the Lord in the priest's

office. Ultimately the kingdom was established under Saul. David was the second king; Solomon was the third, Rehoboam, Solomon's son, was the fourth; and under Rehoboam the kingdom was divided. Ten tribes broke away, and elected Jeroboam the son of Nebat as their king. Judah and Benjamin remained faithful to the house of David, as did also Levi; and Jerusalem continued to be their capital; while the ten tribes set up their kingdom in the north, with Samaria as their capital. Thereafter there were two kingdoms, the house of Israel and the house of Judah.

Jeroboam introduced idolatry, and every succeeding king walked "in the way of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin", until at last idolatry destroyed the nation. You remember how Hosea is heard prophetically to cry, "Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off." The ten-tribed kingdom was carried away captive into Assyria; and years later—it depends upon what chronology you accept—one hundred and thirty-three years later or thereabout, Judah followed the way of her sister-nation, and was carried captive to Babylon, where she remained seventy years; and at the end of the seventy years returned to Jerusalem. But the ten tribes, as a national entity, never returned. They went to Assyria; they are spoken of by our British-Israelism friends as the ten "lost" tribes. Those whom we now speak of as Jews are said to belong to the tribes of Benjamin and Judah only.

Our B.I. friends go farther; and inasmuch as the ten tribes are alleged to have been "lost", they look and profess to find them together somewhere. They find—or think they find—historical corroboration of the theory that the ten tribes gradually made their way by various treks to the British Isles, and that we who come from Britain, are really the heirs of the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and that that is the explanation of the British Empire. They expect to see the British Empire used, because it is ancient Israel, as God's instrument for the wellbeing of the world. They tell us that King George is a lineal descendant of King David, and that the Irish branch of the Danites brought with them Jacob's stone which is under the coronation chair—I have seen it often, and touched it—the stone on which, allegedly, Jacob laid his head, is now under the chair where Britain's Kings are crowned. And so the Lord God of heaven Who said, "The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest", must needs use this bit of wood with a bit of stone under it, for a throne as having some place in the chain of prophetic fulfilment!

It is an interesting theory, but *Is there anything in the Bible to teach us to look for ten "lost" tribes?* The people of Israel were carried to Assyria in seven hundred and twenty-one B.C. or thereabout; Judah, to Babylon about five hundred and eighty-eight B.C. Israel was carried away captive about one hundred and thirty-three years before Judah; and from the time of Israel's carrying away into Assyria and the return of the tribes from the Babylonian captivity, there must have elapsed a period of two hundred or more years. That is to say, if you view the period of Israel's history from 721 B.C. when they were taken to Assyria, to the time of Judah's return from Babylon, you are viewing a period in the life of the ancient people longer than the history of the United States since the Revolutionary War. America was a con-

tinental country, with a small population at the time of the Revolutionary War. In a lesser time than that which elapsed from the Assyrian captivity to the return of the Jews from Babylon, the United States has grown to a nation of one hundred and thirty millions of people.

What became of the ten tribes? Are we to assume that there was some providential order which kept them together for a short time like so many sheep, and thereafter so ordered their migrations that some by one route and some by another, all arrived in Britain, their settlement being completed with the Norman Conquest, and that therefore Genesis has been fulfilled by the growth of the British Empire and by the American War of Independence, which set up a daughter-nation, identified as Manasseh?

What then became of the ten tribes during this period of nearly two hundred years? And what changes had taken place in the territory to which the ten tribes had been taken captive? The Babylonian Empire had succeeded the Assyrian, and Babylon took the place of Ninevah, and the region over which Nebuchadnezzar now bore rule was the very region over which Shalmaneser and Sargon reigned before him, only somewhat extended.

In the twenty-third chapter of Second Kings, verse twenty-nine, the king of Babylon is called "the king of Assyria." That is to say, the migration we are accustomed to speak of as the Babylonian captivity carried the tribes of Benjamin and Judah to a territory in which the areas to which the captives from the Northern kingdom had been exiled, were included; so that the tribes had every opportunity of mingling together in the lands of their exile. And that is precisely what the Scripture says they did. In Second Chronicles eleven-sixteen we read that even at the time of the division of the kingdom "out of all the tribes of Israel such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers. So they strengthened the kingdom of Judah." Thus the kingdom of Rehoboam included many who came "out of all the tribes of Israel." By which we may understand that many were too loyal to Jerusalem, and to the house of David, to follow after Jeroboam.

Then once more, during the reign of Asa, king of Judah, as recorded in Second Chronicles, fifteen: nine to fifteen, we are told that "he gathered all Judah and Benjamin, and the strangers with them out of Ephraim and Manasseh, and out of Simeon: for they fell to him out of Israel in abundance, when they saw that the Lord his God was with him. So they gathered themselves together at Jerusalem . . . and they entered into a covenant to seek Jehovah God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul."

It may further be pointed out that Cyrus and Darius I., as shown in Ezra IV. 5; V. 13; and VI. 22, are called indifferently, by the sacred historians, by the titles of "king of Persia", and "king of Babylon", and "king of Assyria". When one considers the growth of the United States of America from very small beginnings to a population of one hundred and thirty millions in a hundred and sixty years, one can form some idea of what may easily have occurred in the coming together of the twelve tribes in the lands of their exile in two hundred years, especially if it be remembered that the territory, represented by the two exiles was very limited, and all but identical.

Once more. *Our British-Israelism advocates insist*

that when the Bible speaks of the Jews it never means Israel in general, but only the house of Judah. Have they read the Book of Esther? Have they considered that the territory of Ahasuerus stretched "from India even unto Ethiopia, over an hundred and seven and twenty provinces"? Have they observed that Haman, who is described as "the Jews' enemy . . . sought to destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus, even the people of Mordecai"? Were these people scattered throughout the one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, of the house of Judah exclusively?

A careful reading of the Book of Esther will surely suggest that something more than the house of Judah is represented in the people who are called Jews.

Will you follow me as I read a few scriptures. I recommend you to study the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Both are of post-exile date. Ezra is a record of the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem; Nehemiah, of the rebuilding of Jerusalem itself. These two books relate to Israel's, or Judah's, post-exilic history.

Writers on the British-Israel contention always insist that "the Bible never confuses ten-tribed Israel with Judah;" that when the Bible means the ten tribes, it says, "Israel", and when it means the two tribes, it uses the term, "Judah". I do not so say, but I am prepared to proceed to my examination on the basis of their own oft-repeated declaration.

What have we in the second chapter of Ezra? As I read please keep this "B.I." distinction between "Israel" and "Judah" in mind. "Now these are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity, of those which had been carried away, whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had carried away from Babylon, and came again unto Jerusalem and Judah, every one unto his city"—then follows a list of names, which I omit, not because I cannot pronounce them, as some of you do, but because you would not remember them! At the end of that verse it says, "The number of the men of the people of Israel." I am taking the "B.I." position that whenever the Bible says, "Israel", it means Israel. Notwithstanding, when the tale is told of those who returned to Jerusalem, while there were men of Judah and Benjamin, and Levites also, this is said to be "the number of the men of the people of Israel."

I now read the fifty-ninth verse: "These were they which went up from Tel-melah, Tel-harsa, Cherub, Addan, and Immer: but they could not shew their father's house, and their seed, whether they were of Israel." Judah also was of Israel, there is no doubt about that. I would not press a verse like that, only I am taking my British-Israelite friends at their word, when they say that the Bible never says "Israel" without meaning Israel. I think it often says *Israel* when it means *Judah*; but these, whether of the ten tribes or the two, were unable to show their genealogical table, whether they were actually of the seed of Israel.

Then the seventieth verse: "So the priests, and the Levites, and some of the people, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinims, dwelt in their cities, and all Israel in their cities." Make a note of that, you "B.I.'s" "All Israel in their cities"!

In the third chapter: "When the seventh month was come, and the children of Israel were in the cities, the people gathered themselves together as one man to Jerusalem. Then stood up Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and his brethren the priests, and Zerubbabel the son of

Shealtiel, and his brethren, and builded the altar of the God of Israel, to offer burnt offerings thereon unto the Lord, as it is written in the law of Moses the man of God."

In chapter six, verses sixteen to twenty-two: "And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of this house of God with joy, and offered at the dedication of this house of God an hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, four hundred lambs; and for a sin offering for all Israel, twelve he goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel. And they set the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of God, which is at Jerusalem; as it is written in the book of Moses. And the children of the captivity kept the passover upon the fourteenth day of the first month. For the priests and the Levites were purified together, all of them were pure, and killed the passover for all the children of the captivity, and for their brethren the priests, and for themselves. AND THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, WHICH WERE COME AGAIN OUT OF CAPTIVITY, and all such as had separated themselves unto them from the filthiness of the heathen of the land, to seek the Lord God of Israel, did eat, and kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with joy: for the Lord had made them joyful, and TURNED THE HEART OF THE KING OF ASSYRIA UNTO THEM, TO STRENGTHEN THEIR HANDS IN THE WORK OF THE HOUSE OF GOD, THE GOD OF ISRAEL."

Chapter seven: twenty-seven: "Blessed be, the Lord God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the king's heart, to beautify the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem: and hath extended mercy unto me before the king, and his counsellors, and before all the king's mighty princes. And I was strengthened as the hand of the Lord my God was upon me, and I GATHERED TOGETHER OUT OF ISRAEL CHIEF MEN TO GO UP WITH ME."

Chapter eight: thirty-five: "Also the children of those that had been carried away, which were come out of the captivity, offered burnt offerings unto the God of Israel, twelve bullocks for all Israel, ninety and six rams, seventy and seven lambs, twelve he goats for a sin offering: all this was a burnt offering unto the Lord."

Chapter ten: one: "Now when Ezra had prayed, and when he had confessed, weeping and casting himself down before the house of God, THERE ASSEMBLED UNTO HIM OUT OF ISRAEL A VERY GREAT CONGREGATION OF MEN AND WOMEN AND CHILDREN: for the people wept very sore."

And mind, I am holding my British-Israelite friends to their declaration that the Bible, when it says, "Israel", always means Israel, and never exclusively Judah.

Let us look now at Nehemiah one: six: "Let thine ear now be attentive, and thine eyes open, that thou mayest hear the prayer of thy servant, which I pray before thee now, day and night, FOR THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL THY SERVANTS, AND CONFESS THE SINS OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, which we have sinned against thee: both I and my father's house have sinned." Two: ten: "When Sanballath the Horonite, and Tobiah the servant, the Ammonite, heard of it, it grieved them exceedingly that there was come a man TO SEEK THE WELFARE OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL." Chapter seven: seven: "The number, I say, OF THE MEN OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL was this."

They were not "lost": they had returned to Jerusalem; and Nehemiah was counting them. Again in the sixty-

first verse: "These were they which went up also from Tel-melah, Tel-haresha, Cherub, Addon, and Immer: but they could not shew their father's house, nor their seed, whether they were of Israel." (A recurrence of the verse already quoted from Ezra.) In the seventy-third verse: "So the priests, and the Levites, and the porters, and the singers, and some of the people, and the Nethinims, AND ALL ISRAEL, DWELT IN THEIR CITIES; and when the seventh month came, THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL WERE IN THEIR CITIES." Chapter eleven: twenty: "AND THE RESIDUE OF ISRAEL, of the priests, and the Levites, were in all the cities of Judah, every one in his inheritance." Twelve: forty-seven: "AND ALL ISRAEL IN THE DAYS OF ZERUBBABEL, AND IN THE DAYS OF NEHEMIAH, gave the portions of the singers and the porters, every day his portion: and they sanctified holy things unto the Levites; and the Levites sanctified them unto the children of Aaron." Thirteen: three: "How it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that THEY SEPARATED FROM ISRAEL ALL THE MIXED MULTITUDE."

Surely it is apparent that among the tribes that returned, and had a part in the rebuilding of the temple, and in the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, there were great numbers that belonged to all the tribes, for again and again "all Israel" are said to have been represented.

WHAT ABOUT ISRAEL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT? I venture the assertion,—and I challenge my "B.I." friends who know their Bible to controvert the statement. The pamphlet I had put into my hand this morning was entitled, "a challenge to thinking men". Without being unduly immodest, I lay some claim to being a thinking man; I accept the challenge, and I say to my B.I. friends, that from the first verse of Matthew to the last verse of Revelation, you cannot name a solitary passage which, by any sort of interpretation, can be made to suggest that ten tribes were "lost," and could not be found anywhere. The New Testament says absolutely nothing about the "lost" ten tribes, and in order to be a disciple of British-Israelism, you must abandon your New Testament. You cannot hold it and the New Testament together. Nor, for that matter, the Old Testament either. I shall presently proceed to the proof of that statement.

In one place in the New Testament is "the house of Judah" specifically mentioned, and in that instance it is mentioned in conjunction with the house of Israel. Hebrews eight: eight: "For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." They are both included, and that is the only reference to "the house of Judah" in the New Testament; but there are many, many references to Israel. ("Judah" is mentioned in the genealogical tables in Matthew and Luke; our Lord is said to have "sprung out of Judah"; in Hebrews; and Judah is mentioned twice in Revelation.) I can refer to only a few of them.

"I have not found so great faith," said the Lord Jesus, "no, not in Israel," when he referred to Israel in contradistinction to the Gentiles.

Did He mean the "lost" ten tribes? I do not think so. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Did He refer to the ten tribes only? When He spoke of a period of "regeneration", whatever that may mean, He said, "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." When they took Him to the cross, what did they say? I know it was

written over the cross, "This is Jesus the King of the Jews." But the mockers said, "If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him." Did His enemies mean that He had been called King of the "lost" ten tribes? They thought of Israel, not as represented by two tribes, but of all the tribes of Israel. Having been brought back, the remnants at least, merged in a nation after the captivity. Or again in another gospel "Let Christ the King of Israel descend now from the cross."

John the Baptist in the first chapter of Luke is said to have been "in the deserts till the day of his shewing unto Israel." Did he shew himself to the ten "lost" tribes? If so, must not John the Baptist, according to "B.I." have gone even to Ireland? And Simeon, the old man in the temple, was waiting—for what? "For the consolation of Israel." Was he consoled by news of the arrival of their vanguard in the distant isles of the sea? When He took the Saviour in his arms, he said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." When the two on the Emmaus road talked with the Stranger when their hearts burned within them, and told the story of Jesus of Nazareth, they said, "We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel." Did they mean by "Israel" the ten "lost" tribes? They used the general term. And when Nathanael came to Jesus, and Jesus said, "Behold"—listen: "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." Did He mean a member of one of the ten "lost" tribes? Said Nathanael, "Whence knowest thou me?" "Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel"—did he mean by Israel the "lost" tribes? Peter on the day of Pentecost addressed the assembled people in these words, "Ye men of Israel"—he included them all as "men of Israel". They came from many places mentioned in Acts 2:5-11, and include "Jews and proselytes", yet Peter called them "men of Israel". Then he led them to the great climax of his address as he said, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Did Peter mean, "Let all the ten 'lost' tribes know assuredly"? It is said of Christ that He was exalted "to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Even our "B.I." friends will not insist that repentance and forgiveness are restricted to the ten tribes. But they insist, "The Bible never confuses ten-tribed Israel with Judah."

When Paul was brought to trial, he said, "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain." What was "the hope of Israel"? What was the question in dispute? The resurrection of the dead—not the establishment of the British Empire. But he was bound "for the hope of Israel". Paul, in the tenth chapter of Romans, says, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved." In the last verse of the same chapter, "To Israel he saith, All day long have I stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gain-saying people." Are not the terms "Jews" and "Israel" used interchangeably in Romans nine? Does "all Israel" in chapter eleven mean ten tribes or twelve? Paul in the twenty-sixth of Acts said: Unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." He did not say, "Two of us we know, but we

do not know where the ten are"—"Our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come."

James addressed his epistle, not to two, nor to ten, but "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad."

Now we are told that *the British people are the heirs of the promise made to Abraham*. That is a very flattering hypothesis. Go to any village where there are five hundred people, and you will find somewhere among them an aristocracy, a few who are superior. How we love to boast of a little drop of blue blood! Mine is red! Ordinary red! And doctrine of racial superiority is dangerous.

What shall be said of *the idea of a temporal kingdom*? I recommend you to study the epistle to the Galatians—and of Romans too. Those chapters which have often been called a parenthesis—the ninth, tenth, and eleventh of Romans. You will find that the promise made to Abraham was made to Christ: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." The blessing of the Lord was to come on the seed of Abraham through Christ, and only through Christ. To the Galatians, Paul says, "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?"

My dear friends, there are to-day several forms of Judaized Christianity. British-Israelism is Judaized Christianity—JUDAIZED spelled in capitals, Christianity spelled in any type you like. There are many British-Israelite friends who have the firmest faith in Christ as their personal Saviour, and who teach the necessity of faith in the atoning blood, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost: notwithstanding, I believe the system is fraught with the gravest sort of danger.

Paul said to the Galatians, "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." "The children of the promise are counted for the seed." The promise that the seed of Abraham should outnumber the stars and the sands upon the seashore, finds its fulfilment, not in Israel after the flesh—two tribes, or ten tribes, or twelve: "Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the seashore innumerable." And John saw "a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues"; and they all sang the song of Moses and of the Lamb; and they all ascribed glory to Him Who died in their room and stead, a vast spiritual host saved by grace, regenerated by the Spirit, washed in the blood, made heirs of glory through faith in Jesus Christ. But what are we asked to believe? "Having by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high"—yet some would tell me that my glorious Lord is going to step down from that throne to a material throne in Jerusalem and reign over a temporal Jerusalem. Is it conceivable that He—who weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance, and can of the very stones raise up children unto Abraham, is interested in the preservation of a boulder on which Jacob is alleged to have slept for a pillow? I do not believe it. Such assumptions seem to me to be utterly childish.

There is another thing. I am proud of my British blood as anyone—and it is all British. Who can tell what Britain is? One man preaching to a congregation like this said, "You are just a lot of mongrels." I am

as proud of my British birth and lineage as anyone. Those of you who suffer the infliction of my occasional bursts of patriotism, know I shall never be shot for want of loyalty to the flag! But I am persuaded that that emphasis upon any kind of racial superiority is contrary both to the letter and the spirit of the gospel of the grace of God.

For what did Jesus Christ come? He came that He might break down "the middle wall of partition between us", between Jew and Gentile, "to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace." In Jesus Christ "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all." I shall never get to heaven because I was born in dear old England. I shall get there because, by God's abounding grace, this poor sinner was born again. I delight to believe that no matter who we are or whence we have come, or what our record, "this man—the Man, Christ Jesus—receiveth sinners".

Many advocates of so-called British-Israelism believe that. Some of them are among the dearest friends I have ever had; but I am persuaded that in respect to the British-Israel theory they stand on unscriptural ground. Nor have I ever seen any of them benefited by believing it, but many who seem to have been injured.

What is wrong with the world to-day? We have heard of Hitler's nonsense of the superiority of the "Aryan" race. From every point of view it is sheer unmitigated nonsense, but nonsense of a very vicious character.

There is something in blood. If you came into this world with clean blood, thank God. If you came into this world inheriting worthy qualities from your parents, be humbled by it, and thank God for it. Do not get on stilts and strut around, boasting of your superiority. Whether a man is red, or yellow, or black, or white: the grace of God is sufficient to save him. The multitude up yonder will be of all nations and peoples and tongues all of whom are washed in the blood.

Someone will say, "What then is the explanation of the British Empire?" It cannot be found in our natural birth, I am sure of that. I will take second place to no one in my admiration of the British Empire. I belong to it! "Britons never shall be slaves."

An American says Hitler is winning! Hitler is not winning. Hitler is already defeated. Britain rules the waves, and no nation who had the mastery of the sea was ever defeated. What is the explanation of the British Empire? Do not look for it in blood. Queen Victoria was asked for the explanation of the British Empire, and she pointed to the Bible. You do not need to trace your lineage back to Abraham to explain why. God has been pleased to make the British Empire His instrument. He has been pleased to make it a centre of light and holy influence that has reached all parts of the world. But He has been pleased to use us, not on natural but on spiritual grounds. If you assume it is on natural grounds, you are mistaken, my friend. Proud of being British? So am I! Notwithstanding, I marvel that God has used us. It is of His mercy that we are not consumed. We did well just now to sing Kipling's hymn:—

"For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard—
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord!"

But we are not the only ones who have been used of God. He has been pleased to use black men and yellow men and red men, as well as white men. He used Luther. I plead this evening for a spiritual interpretation of the Word of God. "Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" It would be a great descent, it seems to me, an immeasurable descent for the Son of God to come from Heaven's Throne forever established in the heavens to take the highest seat that earth could provide. Let us rather claim the blessing of Abraham through faith in Jesus Christ our Lord.

"Wide as the world is His command,
Vast as eternity His love;
Firm as a rock His truth shall stand
When rolling years have ceased to move."

ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THE HOPE REPORT ON EDUCATION

WE have before us reports of certain Roman Catholic meetings held in Ottawa. They are quite illuminating, and show the demands which Roman Catholics make. A special privilege granted after years of argument is, first of all called a right, and then enlarged and enlarged until the Roman Catholic Hierarchy demands practical equality for its religious schools with the Public School System.

We quote from reports of meetings of Separate School Supporters, and addressed by Dr. L. Charbonneau, Chairman of the Separate School Board, and Rev. Leo. J. Lesage, before an Ottawa Archdiocesan Council of The Catholic Parent-Teacher Association.

Dr. Charbonneau is reported to have said:

Dr. Charbonneau was particularly concerned with the group he called "Honorary Catholics"—those who wanted the blessing of the church when they were born, married and when they died but, who paid rates in 1950 to the Public Schools on an assessment \$6,500,000. He admitted a seven-mill difference in the tax rate was some "temptation".

The "Honorary Catholics" of whom Dr. Charbonneau speaks, are Roman Catholics who "want the benefit of the Church when they are born, when they are married, and when they die," but they don't want the Church's Educational System for their children.

Hence in Ottawa there is an Assessment of \$6,500,000. worth of property, the owners or tenants of which have asked that their taxes be diverted to the support of Public Schools, obviously because they feel the Public School System provides a better education than the Separate Schools.

Then the same speaker, quite unwittingly, shows how the privilege granted in 1867 has been presumed upon. Here is what Dr. Charbonneau said:

However, the Board chairman compared favorably the position of Separate Schools in Ontario with their position in other provinces and other countries. He was not an octogenarian but, he could remember when there was only one Separate School inspector in the province where there were now 28.

Dr. Charbonneau then refers to what he calls the "rights and privileges" granted. They were not "rights" then: they are not "rights" now. The Roman Catholic Church has no more right to have religious schools supported by public taxes than the United Church, the

Anglican Church, Baptists, or anyone else. Certain concessions were made as a privilege to avoid a row, and as George Brown said, as "a final settlement". But now they look upon the privilege as a right, and he puts the right before the privilege. Here is our further quotation:

He referred to the Hope Report as "another onset" on Separate Schools and said it was "unfortunate that the rights and privileges granted before Confederation and confirmed by the British North America Act" should be again attacked at this time. He was "hopeful" that right-thinking non-Catholic residents would not permit those rights and privileges to be undermined.

The following contemptuous reference to so-called "neutral" schools is made by Dr. O'Grady, Professor of English of the University at Ottawa. Among other things he remarked as follows:

There was no problem of religious education as long as children attended Catholic institutions, schools, colleges or universities. If they went for post-graduate work to a "neutral" university "we may hope and pray they won't run into a spiritual vacuum," he said.

We venture to say to Dr. O'Grady that it would be morally and spiritually more healthy for post-graduate students to run into what he calls "a spiritual vacuum", than to be forced to breathe the noxious gases of a Roman Catholic educational chamber.

From another report we glean the following item in which the speaker, Mr. Vincent Kelly, showed very plainly that the Roman Catholic Church is under no misapprehension as to the reason for Premier Frost's treatment of *The Hope Report*:

The recent Hope Commission report came in for some sharp criticism.

Cost \$250,000

Vincent Kelly, principal of St. Patrick's School, stated that after an expenditure of about \$250,000 the report has found its way into the waste basket."

Then he emphasized: "That shows the power of a Catholic teacher-parent group. Premier Frost is too wise a man to risk his future election by putting into effect that part of the Hope report which recommends a reduction in the Separate School curriculum."

The emphasis in the above quotation is ours. Please read it again, and it will be apparent that the Hierarchy holds a club over the head of Premier Frost, which amounts to a threat, that if the provisions of *The Hope Report* were implemented, "Premier Frost would risk his future election."

That is the crux of the whole business. A Commission which was a cross-section of the Ontario public, appointed by the Drew Government, after spending at least a quarter of a million dollars, and six years in its preparation, brings in a report, and the Roman Catholic minority demand that the Report of the small minority, and not of the overwhelming majority, shall determine the educational policy of the Ontario Government.

Oh, that we had in Queen's Park a leader with a group of followers who would be—we will not say Protestants—but impartial statesmen, and not pettifogging politicians, such as we have, who would deal with *The Hope Report!*

HAVE YOU ANSWERED THE EDITOR'S ANNUAL LETTER?

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 16 First Quarter Lesson 12 March 25, 1951

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

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

Lesson Text: Luke 24:13-31.

Golden Text: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures."—1 Corinthians 15:3, 4.

I. Christ the Traveller Unrecognized: verses 13-24.

The resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ is one of the most thoroughly authenticated facts of history; there are "many infallible proofs" that the Saviour who died for sinful man according to the scriptures also rose from the dead in fulfilment of the same scriptures (Acts 1:3; 2:25, 31; 13:33-35).

One of the indisputable evidences of the actual resurrection of Christ from the dead is the testimony of those who had known Him in the flesh. These recognized Him as the Jesus of Nazareth with whom they had held sweet communion in the past, to whose teachings they had listened and in whose miracles they had rejoiced. According to the Scriptural record Christ appeared on a number of occasions during the forty days between His resurrection and His ascension (1 Cor. 15:3-8). Luke, speaking by inspiration, records His appearance to the women at the empty tomb (verses 1-9), to Peter and John (verses 10-12), to Cleopas and his companion (verses 13-35) and to the assembled disciples (verses 36-48). The ministry of the risen Christ brought joy, peace, inspiration and blessing to His own, and if we could more deeply realize that our Saviour has risen from the grave and is alive for evermore, our lives would be transformed. May the living Lord touch each one!

It was toward evening on that memorable day when He rose triumphant from the tomb that He appeared to two of the disciples as they walked toward Emmaus, a village about six and one-half miles from Jerusalem. One of the disciples was Cleopas; the other one may have been Mary, his wife (John 19:25), or perhaps Luke himself. Jesus Himself drew near them, but they walked on in sadness, ignorant of the fact that their living Lord was by their side. Never do His disciples pass through experiences of sorrow, but Christ Himself suffers with them (Isa. 63:9).

The eyes of these disciples were heavy with sorrow. Their minds were confused, and their hearts were oppressed. They were so absorbed in their grief and disappointment that they did not realize the identity of the Stranger who had joined them (Exod. 6:9). Moreover, a mysterious change had been wrought in the person of the now glorified Lord; He appeared "in another form" (Mark 16:12). Those who walk along the pathway of life, unconscious of the presence of Christ, miss much.

The disciples thought that this was a stranger, one who could not understand the cause of their sadness, whereas they themselves were the ignorant ones. They had not believed the word of Christ (Matt. 16:21; 17:23; 20:19), consequently they were unable to understand His experience of death and resurrection.

GOSPEL WITNESS PUBLICATIONS

(Reprints)

"The Antichrist—His Portrait and History", By Baron Porcelli50
"The Greatest Fight in the World", by C. H. Spurgeon, 64 pages25
"The Prodigal and His Brother, or The Adventures of a Modern Young Man"	1.00
"Blakeney's Popery in Its Social Aspect", 312 pages	1.00

The Gospel Witness

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2 - Canada

II. Christ the Saviour Recognized: verses 25-31.

Jesus of Nazareth was truly a prophet, but He was more than a prophet. He fulfilled the prophecies describing One Who would open the eyes of the blind and preach deliverance to the captives, and they had hoped that He was the Messiah (Isa. 42:6, 7; 61:1-3; Lk. 7:19-23). It was His death that was the occasion of their stumbling (Matt. 16:21-23; 1 Cor. 2:13). They had erred because they did not know the Scriptures (Matt. 23:29). They failed to believe all that the prophets had spoken; they believed the portions which described the Messiah as a glorious King, but they rejected those concerning the Messiah as the suffering Servant of Jehovah (Isa. 53). They had not remembered that the pathway to glory leads through the valley of humiliation, and that to reach the Mount of Olives the Saviour must pass through Gethsemane and Calvary.

These disciples had indeed been foolish and slow of heart. Faith is not merely the assent of the mind to the facts of the Gospel, but it also involves the surrender of the heart and the obedience of the will. Cleopas and his companion had not believed in their heart that God had raised Christ from the dead (Rom. 10:9, 10).

Christ endorsed the teaching of the Old Testament (v. 27). From Genesis to Revelation the Bible speaks of Christ (Acts 8:32-35). When the Lord by His Spirit opens to us the Scriptures, our hearts will become aglow with holy fire. How much we need the illumination and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as we read the Scriptures!

As the disciples and their Lord neared the village of Emmaus, the Lord "made as though he would have gone further." He would not enter the home until invited, and waited until called upon to go in and tarry with them. Patiently still the Saviour stands outside the door of many a heart, knocking, seeking admission, but never forcing His way. He waits to hear those words "Abide with us." Mystery of mysteries is this, that we human beings have power to say "No" even to the Son of God! Urge the scholars to bid Him enter their hearts and lives, while yet there is time (Rev. 3:20).

It was at the table as He broke bread that Christ revealed Himself to the wondering disciples (v. 35). The communion table may be always the table of blessing, if the eyes of the Christian are open to behold the Lord (1 Cor. 10:16). Probably as the Saviour lifted up His hands they saw the nail-

FOR TORONTO READERS**NEXT SUNDAY IN
JARVIS STREET**

11 a.m.—Rev. W. S. Whitcombe

7 p.m.—Rev. H. C. Slade

SEE ANNOUNCEMENT IN
SATURDAY PAPERS

prints and knew Him, or it may be that as He blessed and broke the bread they recognized the re-enactment of the Lord's Supper as He had instituted it in the Upper Room on the eve of His arrest (Lk. 22:14-23). The record says, "Their eyes were opened, and they knew him." It does not say "They opened their eyes" for such a revelation must come from God (Acts 16:14). God must bring the sinner to a realization of his lost condition (2 Cor. 4:4-6) and lead him to a knowledge of Christ as Saviour. This chapter speaks of opened eyes, opened Scriptures, opened understanding, and lips that are opened for testimony (verses 31, 32, 45, 48).

DAILY BIBLE READINGS

Mar. 19—Christ Appears to the Women	Matt. 28:1-10.
Mar. 20—To Mary Magdalene	Mk. 16:9-13.
Mar. 21—To Peter and John	John 20:2-10.
Mar. 22—To the Ten Disciples	Luke 24:36-43.
Mar. 23—To Thomas and the Ten	John 20:26-31.
Mar. 24—To Seven Disciples	John 21:1-14.
Mar. 25—The Great Commission	Matt. 28:16-20.

SUGGESTED HYMNS

Abide with me. We would see Jesus. Show me Thy face.
When my life-work is ended. Face to face. Amidst us our
Beloved stands.

Look! Listen! Opportunity Knocks!

This paper is a printed missionary, and carries no advertisements. The regular issues contain 16 pages. The subscription price is \$3.00 for 52 issues. WITH EVERY NEW SUBSCRIPTION we will give one of the three following books as a premium:

1. **Blakeney's Manual of Romish Controversy**, by Dr. R. P. Blakeney, 316 pages.
2. **Popery in Its Social Aspects**, by Dr. R. P. Blakeney, 326 pages.
3. **The Prodigal and His Brother, or The Adventures of a Modern Young Man**, by Dr. T. T. Shields, 132 pages.
4. **The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional**, by Father Chiniquy, 144 pages.

All but "The Prodigal and His Brother" were out of print and unobtainable and were republished by THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

You may choose any one of the four as a premium. If you would like any or all of the other books, you may have them at one dollar each.

You may order the paper and one of the books sent you for a month's trial without sending any money. If you are not satisfied return the book or send us \$1.00 and we will charge you nothing for the paper for the month.

ORDER FORM

- (a) Please send to the undersigned for one month's trial THE GOSPEL WITNESS and Premium No. _____
- (b) Please send THE GOSPEL WITNESS and Premium No. _____ to the undersigned for which find \$3.00 enclosed.
- (c) And also books (or book) numbered _____ for which find \$ _____ enclosed.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____