

SERMONS

BY

BISHOP R. C. EVANS

London, Ont. :
ADVERTISER JOB PRINT

1912



BISHOP R. C. EVANS

P R E F A C E

I offer no apology for presenting this book of sermons to the world. I do so because I feel it to be my duty, and because many of the church, and those not in the faith, have requested it at my hands. In sending them forth in this their second edition from the press. I am but exercising my inalienable right of "freedom of speech and the press."

These sermons were delivered by me, in the City of Toronto. Some of them from my own church pulpit, on Soho Street, the others from the stage of the Princess Theatre, being the Sunday evening sermons for forty-nine consecutive Sundays in the present year.

They have been circulated through the columns of the Toronto Sunday World, and have been read in many parts of America, Europe and the Islands of the Sea.

I am aware that as literary productions they are open to criticism. They were not delivered for mere critics, but with the hope that those hearing or reading them might be assisted to know God and serve Him.

Some may think that I have been too plain in the unmasking of Priestcraft, and churchanity. My answer to this is, my desire in presenting these sermons is that error may be exposed and the truth may be presented in such a way that knowing the truth the people may be inspired to worship God in the true spirit, and according to the truth.

I trust that any angry feelings that may be at first awakened may be overruled by a candid investigation of the facts advanced and the principles advocated.

Your servant, for Christ sake.

R. B. Evans

Toronto, Ont., Nov. 27th, 1911.

Character Building

PERMIT me to draw your attention to Matthew 20th chapter, 26th and 27th verses, where you will read these words: "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant."

I am constantly receiving letters, and men and women frequently come to my home heartbroken, sad, weary and discouraged, and life seems a burden to them. Yesterday afternoon I had a very peculiar experience, and in the language of another, in my soul I cried out, how can I answer the demands made upon these sin burdened people? How can I fill these empty lives that life may hold its fullest and best for them? In the midst of weakness, how can I find the secret of true power? In the midst of the sorrow and darkness, how can I fill these lives with happiness, peace, joy and satisfaction that is lasting? As I pleaded, and thought and read, I concluded to present to you to-night some answers to these questions, and that they may be of some help to you is my sincere prayer.

Envy Drives Out Happiness.

Selfishness is the crowning curse of humanity. It can never bring satisfaction. No matter what we acquire as the result of selfishness, we are still dissatisfied. In a word, the man who has spent his life hoarding up wealth has known but little happiness, and to-day he is sad because he has suspicions that he is not the richest man in the world, as his stocks have gone down and his neighbor's up. You have the finest house in the city, but to-day you learned that the architects are at work and that another man is going to have a better house than you. Here you are dissatisfied.

Again, you have the fastest horse, but to-day comes the message that another has beaten it by the third of a second and you are in the blues. You have reached the zenith of power, but whether it be in political or church organization, even within the sacred precincts of the church, envy and jealousy will seek your overthrow. You are not satisfied. You are the best dressed woman on the street you think, the leader of fashion you are told, but someone else comes up to put you in the shade, and you are not satisfied.

Human selfishness is ever craving, snatching, grabbing and figuring, but the day passes, the sunshine has gone, and your night is starless, your life is empty and hope has given way to despair. You may chase happiness, but you cannot overtake it. The shortest, yea, the only road, to true happiness is to kill selfishness and make someone else happy.

Live For Others.

We find our lives in losing them. That may sound strange to you, but the Master said he that seeketh to save his life shall lose it. He that loseth his life for My sake shall find it, and I will say that that does not only mean the natural life, but if we lose ourselves in the great desire to help others, we will find help streaming in upon us from every quarter. If we crucify our selfishness, our desire for personal prominence and aggrandizement, in the uplifting of others, we will find to our heart's content the truthfulness of the statement made by the Master: "It is more blessed to give

than to receive." In this matter giving doth not impoverish, but maketh us rich indeed. The world never loves a miser, whether he may be a miser with regard to his silver or his gold, or a miser in a higher sense than that. He may be a miser in that he does not extend his kind words and perform kind deeds for his fellowmen. We have built monuments for heroes, for unselfish men and women who threw themselves into the thickest of the fight to save the nation, to save the home and to save the community. Everybody, no matter what his life may be, loves the unselfish man or woman. And hence, when we begin to forget ourselves, everybody begins to remember us and speak benedictions over our head, and so if we would be happy, we must make others happy. If we would help the world, we must lose ourselves and as heroes and heroines rush in to assist by throwing out the life line over the dark waters of human struggle, and help to rescue those who are going down in the vortex and the storm. Selfishness is the root of all the evils in this world. Selfishness hurled Lucifer, the son of the morning, down from heaven and made him the king of devils in hell. Selfishness has brought discredit among men and women, nationally and ecclesiastically. Nations have been destroyed, millions of lives have been lost on the train of selfishness. Homes have been destroyed and friends have become separated and estranged by this curse, selfishness.

Thoughts are Everything.

Now how are we to overcome this? I want to say to you that the greatest, the most potential instrument that we can bring to bear in the building up of character is thought. It all starts with thoughts. Thoughts are things. Thoughts are forces; the most powerful in the universe. What shall be the character of our thoughts? If we are jealous, if we give way to hatred, to malice, to rage, to anger, we are having what some would call a brain storm, or as others would say, we are in a mental thunderstorm. They sour our whole disposition, ruin our lives, blast our hopes, destroy our prospects and make us utter failures in ourselves, and we are helpless in the way of assisting others. I have heard people say, "Oh, the milk is sour this morning, I guess it was the thunderstorm that did it." Yes, and when you permit yourself to become angry, or shall I say mad, you sour your disposition and ruin your life. But you might object to the word mad, but I will not apologize for it. I have seen men and women get so angry that they were really mad. I mean by that crazy, irresponsible for what they did or said. Now suppose they were raging and tearing away for a moment or so, you would then say they were in a fit of anger; you must overlook it. But suppose that moment grew into hours, days, weeks and months, would you not conclude that I had used the proper word, mad, or crazy, for you would have them put in the asylum for the insane. Now, some people are only crazy a moment, some are crazy five minutes, some are crazy an hour, and some are crazy for a lifetime.

One act performed under this insane condition may divide friends for life, may wreck homes, may blast hopes, and a whole life may perish, yea, many lives may be destroyed by reason of the word spoken or the acts performed during the insanity of one hour. And thought was the foundation for all this battle and war that terminates in death in this life, and goes on to reach a settlement some time, somewhere, after the tears of ages have been shed in the great beyond, which we call eternity.

Love Must Be Tended Well.

There are other thoughts upon which we build, the palaces of love, sympathy, pity, kindness and patience and these palaces we erect by the power of our thoughts. We build our own home in which we are to dwell, whether it is a home of malice or love, or harshness or of pity. Life is a

mirror, we reflect ourselves. The looking-glass only flings back the reflection of the thing before it, and so if I allow my thought to run in the train of malice, of hatred, of jealousy, of envy, of lust, if I am living in that element, then I will talk about it. My thoughts will be clothed with words, and words will divert to actions, and so I am building the house of my character. I may build it in such a way that many people may not know how I am living. But God knows, and there are men and women who may know.

It is a fact that your thoughts are photographed in the very expression of your face, the very intonation of your voice, your very walk is read and understood by some men and women, and so we read in the second Epistle to the Corinthians 3:2-3, "Ye are our epistles, written in our hearts; know and read of all men."

So thought is the foundation of our character. And let me say here, there is a difference between character and reputation. Character is what you are and what God knows you to be. Reputation is what people say you are. Reputation is not always a true guide, because your friends sometimes give you a reputation that makes you appear better than what you are. Your enemies frequently give you a reputation which makes you appear a good deal worse than you are. The character is the thing you build, the house you erect for yourself, and the thing you are and that God knows you to be, and that which will bring you a reward of joy, gladness, and celestial bliss, or the reverse. I may have an enemy and it may not be my fault as Paul said, "Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth," Gal. 4:16. Frequently the utterance of that which is a true statement and which is made for the benefit of those who are out of the way is not taken in the right spirit, and so we are told that wise men learn by the things that other people suffer. Fools learn by the things they suffer themselves. So that we frequently become or make enemies as Paul says because we speak the truth.

If I have an enemy he need not always be my enemy. Love transforms the enemy into a friend. Send him love thoughts. Let him hear kind words. Speak to him in a friendly way, and love him, for the fires of love will always melt the frost of hatred. Now we have not always done that and so our enemies continue to be our enemies. We sometimes may say, "Well, it is not always our fault." That may be the truth at times, but if we will do as Jesus did, and as Jesus instructed us, we may very often make a friend out of an enemy. The words of Christ are so sublime on this matter that I shall give them to you just as they appear in the record: "Ye have heard that it has been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy, but I say unto you love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Matt. 5:43-45.

This is supported by Paul, "Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him. If he thirsts, give him drink, for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Rom. 12:20-21.

You may suffer long, but that recipe will bring about the desired cure. Offences must come the Master said, but woe to him by whom they come.

Estrangements Are so Easy.

How shall you settle that? By committing one wrong to do battle with another wrong. I believe the law of the universe that like beget like, and if you think kindly and act kindly, you will be sure to influence your most bitter enemy, for he may not have become your enemy because he wanted to. He is a victim of circumstance. He has been the victim of his thoughts

as you may have been the victim of your thoughts. The devil is a cunning general, he has had thousands of years of experience. Without the Spirit of God to help you, he can deceive you. He has a trick up his sleeve for us all. What better trick can he play than to cause me to speak unkindly, or you to perform an unkind act by which two lifelong friends shall become estranged and darkness shall take the place of light, suspicion the place of trust. Two hearts are broken and two lives are ruined. The good work both might have performed is never accomplished, and all this wreck and ruin was the result of thoughts.

Well could the poet write these most truthful lines:

“You never can tell what your thoughts will do, in bringing you hate or love,
For thoughts are things, and their airy wings are swifter than carrier
doves.

They follow the law of the universe—each thing must create its kind;
And they speed o’er the track to bring you back whatever went out from
your mind.”

If you fling out kind thoughts there is sure to be an echo. You will hear something kind. Just like in the glass you see a reflection of the thing that stands before it, and I believe that if we will make up our minds to live in the element of tenderness, of pity, of love, of kindness and forbearance towards others who may perhaps have fallen on the slippery path, that in time we shall be rewarded. God says, “if you from your hearts forgive not your enemies, neither will your Father in heaven forgive you.” That is quite clear, and with what judgment you judge, you shall be judged, Matt. 6 and 7 chapters. If you have no pity, expect none, neither from God nor man. If you have no patience with those who are out of the way, expect none, neither from God nor man. If we are not willing to pardon those who went astray, do not expect pardon. God says He will not give it to you, and man frequently refuses to do the same.

Pure in Thought as Angels Are.

I want to show you from the Bible that thought is the real foundation for the building up of character. Matthew, 5th chapter, 8th verse: “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.” My friends that doesn’t only mean that after the resurrection and at the millennium we shall see Christ. If we are pure in heart the very flowers in bloom will have a sweeter fragrance, the daisy by the wayside will emit an aroma sweeter than before. With this purity of heart, that is your thoughts what they ought to be, you will see God, and if you observe a weakness in your brother or sister it will fill your eyes with tears, your heart with tenderness and your voice with pity, and so the Lord said to us, “Human weakness calls for pity.” In the darkness that besets us in human life, we are all looking for pleasure. The man who gets drunk—intoxicated—does it so he can feel fine and have a good time. Men who go out to steal virtue, break hearts, make desolate homes, do so because it gives them what they call pleasure. That is the abnormal condition they are seeking—the same thing the good seek, that is happiness, but being abnormal, they seek it in the wrong direction. When man has become pure in heart, he seeks pleasure, but he secures it through the channels of sweet thoughts, kind words and pure actions. The normal condition brings him true happiness, and to be pure in heart enables us to see God in all His potentiality, in the wild, white-crested billows of the storm-tossed sea, or in the gentle zephyrs of the evening breeze; on the hill-crest or in the valley; in the dew-drop upon the morning glory or in majestic splendor of the Niagara. Yes, the pure in heart shall see God.

Self-Made Men.

Proverbs 23:7, make this statement so full of meaning: "For as a man thinketh in his heart, so he is." That is to say if your heart is filled with envy, malice and jealousy and selfishness, that is the kind of a man you will be. People will learn it by your talk and conduct, but if you are on the right side, your thoughts will be filled with tenderness, pity, sweetness and purity, and that is the kind of a man you will be. It will beam out of your eyes, and they will hear it in your voice. They will discern it in your business affairs with men, and they will discern it in all your life, as a man thinketh, so he is. That is why the Lord tells us in Proverbs 24:9, "The thoughts of the foolish are sinful." Why are they sinful? Because they are foolish, because they are wrong. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, says to bring your thoughts into communion with Christ, so that if you can bring your thoughts to the ideal to which Christ intended you should, you will not only be a benefit to others but a blessing to yourself. God, speaking through Jeremiah 6: and 9, says: "I will bring evil upon these people, even the fruit of their thoughts." In the old law, the law of Moses, a man could beg, he could seek to purchase virtue and the moral chastity of a woman, but if the crime was not actually committed he could not be punished, but under the gospel law, Jesus makes the man's thought to bear and so He tells us, Matthew 5:27-28: "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery already in his heart." There is your thought. God knew well Christ understood correctly that thoughts were vehicles that carried our words and gave birth to acts. We may be able to say nobody will know my thoughts, but do not forget that God knows your thoughts and reads them, and there are some men who can read them.

The Little Corporal Knew Men.

Napoleon said once, "I know men." Napoleon was not the only reader of character. All your character is written in your face. That is why you say, "Oh, isn't that a lovely woman. What a good looking woman she is." You do not mean handsome, or pretty, or a face that is made up of paint and powder. But there is something in her smile, in the glance of her eye, in the very lines of her face that speaks louder than thunder that her thoughts are pure, her desires clean and she is an influence for good. You know men and you know women that when they look into your face or they come to your house, or you grasp their hands, there is something within you that says: "Oh, I wish I were a better woman, or I wish I were a better man, or I wish I were living the life that that man or woman is living." That is the exhibition of virtue, of the true way a man or woman should live. While there are others who from their looks and words tell an entirely different story, and you would not feel safe with them alone. You think you can hide your thoughts sometimes but God always sees them.

It Would Be Some Spectacle.

There is nothing that shall not be revealed, and oh, what a spectacle it will be when all the revelations of secret thoughts shall be made known. You may think that your secret thoughts will never be discovered, but listen to what the Bible says upon that point: "Thou understandest my thoughts afar off." Ps. 139:2, and the prophet informs us that "A book of remembrance was written before Him (God) for them that feared the Lord and that thought upon His name." Mal. 3:16, and Paul knowing that our thoughts are to bring us their fruitage in kind, said, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there

be any praise, think on these things," Phil. 4:8. These things being true, and the world needing so much help, from right thinking people, ask yourselves the question, "What kind word can I speak, what kind act can I perform, who can I assist?" Lose yourself by helping others, and you will find your better self developing. We live in the atmosphere of our own creation, if you love you will be loved.

Now there is another thought I want to bring to your attention. Suppose I am planting a garden this morning, I go out a week from to-day, and I see that some of the seeds have come up. No sign of the rest. A little while longer this rose is blooming, but not a bud on the rest. What do I do? Do I curse the other and dig it up? If I do I am a foolish man. Let the elements of time do its work and the flower that bloomed to-day will be dead, while the bud that has not been formed yet will be in full bloom when the other is passed away. And so it is with men and women. Some learn more quickly than others. Some develop character more rapidly than others. But should we look down upon these slow ones? No. Let us help them, for I have known grand characters that have been very slow to develop. Shall I say that they should be ostracised because of this slow growth? No, human weakness calls for pity. I want to try and take more care of the man or woman who is weak than I have done. I want to try and have more patience with the man or woman who has gone astray. There will come a time when the sun will beam down upon them and the blessing and fragrance of kind words and deeds will bring life to those who have fallen by the wayside if we will only have the patience to stoop down and help them.

Power of Circumstance.

Now a few words in regard to the doctrine of environment. You tell me that you are discouraged by reason of your experience. Some men are favored with better conditions than others. Well, I grant that, but do you know as I read books and become acquainted with men, I am losing a great deal of faith in the doctrine of environment. Adam and Eve, created fresh from the hand of God, in personal conversation with the Almighty, were tempted by selfishness, and went down. Men have been born with a silver spoon in their mouths only to die in the gutter; and as I heard one man give utterance to this statement this morning: "This gospel found me in the gutter and it has made me what I am." A water-lily would not grow in a splendid garden, nor in a silver streamlet of running water, but the lily finds its birth in stagnant water, in black, dirty loam, but it does not always stay down there; it rises above the mud and scum and stagnant water and blossoms to adorn your palaces.

One child is surrounded with filth, poverty, ignorance and crime; yet, like the lily, he rises above his environments and becomes a saint and proves himself to be a perpetual benediction to humanity. Another, with all the privileges of a good home and college education, fills the world with trouble and criminality and dies in the gutter. Adam was the father of two boys—one was a saint and the other a murderer.

I heard a man tell a good story on this line. Two boys parted to make their way in life; years flew by with flying footsteps. One became a drunkard; he wrote to his boy friend: "Jim, I have run the pace; I am sinking fast; I am about all in; you will know the reason. Early environment and heredity. You will remember that my father was a drunkard." The friend wrote, saying: "Jack, sorry to learn of your condition. I presume your two beautiful sisters are both drunkards, and they, too, have run the pace and are all in." Jack replied as if insulted, saying: "Why do you speak that way about my sisters? They are both moving in good society; pure as angels." Jim replied: "Pardon me, Jack, old chum; but

I thought as you blamed heredity and environment for your fall, that your sisters had gone the same way—THEY BEING YOUR FULL-BLOODED SISTERS HAD THE SAME FATHER THAT YOU HAD.”

Lay the Foundation Now.

And I want to show you from this that sin comes from within, out. Character-building starts inside, not outside. Your temptations come from within. If I was given to drink and was asked to have a glass of whiskey, that would be temptation; but if it was something I did not like, there would be nothing in it. Thoughts give birth to actions. Acts repeated form habit. Habit determines character and character determines destiny—thought-destiny. May God help us to be unselfish and kind and tender, patient and loving in thought, word and deed, then will the spirit come to us like a cherishing fountain and we shall be the salt of the earth and the light of the world.

Jesus From The Cradle To The Grave

PERMIT me to call your attention to the 52nd verse of the 2nd chapter of the gospel as written by St. Luke, where you will read these words: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

The subject of this discourse is One who has endeared Himself to earth's children by ties that death cannot sever. He is considered by many as the hero of every struggle, and while we represent Him this evening as a humble ambassador, we wish to try to reflect some points that were prominent in His character and that won for Him the respect and love of the world which knew Him best. We desire to-night to present Jesus to you in His humanity. It has been taught that Jesus was conceived and born under such peculiar circumstances that He was altogether different from other people, that the weaknesses that were placed upon the sons of men were unknown to Him; that He was God and therefore could not do wrong, had no desire to err, and that it was impossible for Him to transgress law. It seems to me that if this were the proper position to occupy, Jesus would cease to be the example for us to follow. If on the start He was so far ahead of us in the race for immortality and eternal life, it is unreasonable for anyone to expect that we would ever reach the zenith by His side.

We have thought that the people of the world have oftentimes been discouraged when they have been commanded to come up and reflect the character and imitate the life of Christ. In their humanity, in their weakness, in their darkness, in their blindness they were expected to do that which a Divine One accomplished; but when we reflect upon the life of Jesus from the cradle to the grave, we see a different picture from that which has been represented to us in the years ago.

Birth of Christ.

Jesus was born a baby, a real, true baby. Those of you who wish to turn and read the history of His entrance into this world—read the love story that found its birth in the barn of Bethlehem—will discover that that baby was born as other babies; surrounded by poverty as other children. It is true that the conception of Christ is considered a mystery, that, we must lightly pass over to-night; but suffice it to say that priestcraft has thrown a mystery around it that the Bible has never warranted. While we admit that Jesus had no human father after the flesh, yet we believe His conception was the result of law known to God. Let us illustrate: When we desire bread to eat, we know there is a law by which we may obtain it. We prepare the soil, we sow the seed and wait for the rain and dew and mellow rays of the moon and the kisses of the sun to do their work, and by-and-by it grows and ripens and we harvest it, thresh it, grind it, bake it, and we have bread. When we desire wine from the grape, we have to plant the vine and watch it grow, and take the fruit and prepare it according to law; but when Jesus was here and wanted bread and desired wine, He understood a law by which He could call the elements together and organize them, by which He could accommodate the guests at the Galilean marriage feast, and the thousands spread upon the hills over against Bethsaida. He understood a law by which He could organize matter and produce bread and wine. So God by a higher law brought into the world that same One who is called the Holy One of God; but His birth

was as other children, and He lived as other babes, with all the weaknesses that accrue to the infant life.

Professor Huxley in the *Agnostic Annual Herald* for March 2, 1910, says regarding conception: "As for virgin pro-creation, it is not only clearly imaginable but modern biology recognizes it as an everyday occurrence among some groups of animals."

We are conscious that some ridicule the idea that Christ represented in life was once a babe, that He was troubled with the croup and the whooping cough, and the measles, and all that; but we think there is no holier picture painted than the pure and holy woman holding in her chaste and loving arms a child, the fruit of love. Some one has said that the man who would throw discredit upon Jesus because He was once a baby throws a shadow across his own mother that endured much to give him a name and place among humanity. I see wisdom in God sending Jesus to this world in the weak and helpless form of an infant child. It teaches me the lesson, that I, though weak, may become strong; that I, though ignorant, may become wise; that I, though a child of earth, by obedience to law may become an heir of heaven and joint heir with Jesus Christ, a ruler and a judge, not only of the world, but of angels; for is it not written: "Know ye not that the saints shall judge angels?"

A Real Boy.

We now present to you Jesus as a boy; a real, live boy. I want to try to bring Him close to you to-night. While I am conscious that the history is almost silent upon Christ's life as a lad, yet we have some few points that give us an idea of His boyhood days. They are found in the chapter already cited for your consideration. The story says that when Jesus was about twelve years of age, He was taken with His parents to Jerusalem while they worshiped according to the custom of the time, and after the religious ceremonies had concluded, they went back to their village home; and while journeying thither, after three days had glided by, they missed Him, and the mother's heart began to throb with anxiety for the child who was absent, and all along the white caravan rang the cry, "A child lost. Have you seen my Jesus? Light blue eyes and light curly hair, about twelve years of age." But He was not to be found until they reached the temple, and O, what a wonderful revelation burst upon them as they gazed upon that meagre form, surrounded with all the lawyers and the doctors in that wonderful temple, hearing and asking questions.

There is a thought that we want to reach right here. Jesus made interrogation honorable. He asked questions. He had to learn; He grew, not only in stature, but in wisdom and knowledge. That is all the way we have to do, friends. All that you know some one has told you; either in earth or heaven you have received the information that you are in possession of; either by revelations of God contained in the books or given by the Spirit, or else through the instrumentality called man. You all have had to ask questions, and the man who thinks he knows it all, doesn't know enough to know that he doesn't know anything about it. Jesus asked questions.

But when they would remonstrate with Him because of His seeming negligence of the family, here comes the statement that reflects the biography of Christ's life: "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" O wonderful child! At twelve years of age that boy had acquired an education that called for the surrender of all His powers to His heavenly Father. He had learned to lavish His first, best, and truest love upon His heavenly Father at that early date. O! what a wonderful lesson here! Why was it? "O," says one, "because He was so peculiarly environed by the power of God." Let me tell you, the scriptures say that

He took not on Himself the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham, and became like His brethren in all things.

Secret of His Power.

Let me draw your attention to one thought here: The secret of Christ's power was His purity of life. His high regard for God's law, and these principles were stamped upon Him by the early teaching of His mother in the little school in Nazareth.

It has been said that you should not keep a child under the shackles; that you should not circumscribe him; that you should not seek to control for his interests; but let him taste the bitter that he might in time to come appreciate the sweet; that you cannot put old heads on young shoulders; that we all have a right to sow our wild oats. Do you not know that the Bible says: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap?" Oh! what are you sowing, you boys, you girls? Are you sowing wild oats? Don't you know you will reap a harvest of woe, of disease, a harvest of tears and wretchedness and weakness if you sow wild oats in youth? To-day the world is crippled because of the sins of the past. Learn this lesson; that, if you would be pure as a man, if you would be powerful as a man, wise as a man, learn to be pure, study to be powerful, seek to acquire wisdom while yet a child.

Parable of the Wise Man.

I offer a conjecture here that one day while working in that carpenter shop on the side of the hill over against His little village home, there arose a great storm and that He could see out of the door as the storm clouds were rising and the winds were howling, and by and by the torrents of rain came down, and with a mighty rush, freighted with wrecked matter, it hurled down the valley until it struck a house on the other side that was nice, grand, beautiful to gaze upon; but when the debris that had been gathered by the fierce torrents of the storm beat upon that house, it fell and ruin was the consequence. But on the other side He gazes upon a little home, perhaps not grand in its architectural design, but yet it was solid, built in the proper way, and when the storm beat upon it, it fell not, but it stood like the sturdy oak amid the tempest; and in years afterwards He was able to draw a picture from life when He said: "Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came and the winds blew, and beat upon that house and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell." I believe He told the story as it was imprinted upon the tablets of the past.

Jesus as a Man.

We hasten on to Jesus as a man, a real character, a real figure who acted His part in the great drama of life upon the stage of humanity; one we see envined by all the trials and temptations, and tears and darkness, and the sickness and gloom that has come to the sons of men; not a figure that came from heaven to represent divinity without having trial, but as a man with all the human propensities. Isaiah, in talking of this character, tells us that He "was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." "He was bruised for our iniquities," and for the transgression of His people was He stricken, and with His stripes we are healed. He understood the pangs of hunger; He endured the tortures of poverty; He knew something about the burning fever of disease; He was cognizant of the weaknesses of life as

He traveled here in His ministerial work and labor. In verification of this assertion let me cite to you the awful scene in the wilderness of Judea immediately after His baptism. He fasted forty days. What for? To overcome the weaknesses that were upon him and that God's Holy Spirit might rest upon Him and fit Him for the stupendous work that was devolving upon Him to perform. And it was said that afterwards He was an hungered. Isn't that one of the traits of our character in this life? Do we not get hungry when we have nothing to eat for a few hours, or a few days, or a few weeks? That was what was the matter with Jesus.

His Baptism.

After His fasting, after His baptism, and after His going forward to the sons of men and confessing His dependence upon the divine storehouse, confessing that He should comply with the conditions prescribed in the law that God gave for the amelioration of the sons of men and the bringing of them up to the condition of the children of God, you remember that some then thought He was so good that He did not need to keep the law, and one by the name of John had said, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" But Jesus with all that holy humility that ever shone out in His life and character, that made Him so grand and pure, remarked: "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." I submit for your consideration that if the Stainless One could not comply with the conditions and fulfill all righteousness without being baptized, that you, or I cannot. Why was He baptized? He took not on Himself the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham, and became like unto His brethren in all things. Do you not know that Jesus Christ had to die and that it would have been amen to Him if He had not complied with the conditions by which He might obtain the first resurrection?

Ministerial Work.

We present Him to you now in His ministerial work as a man. Watch Him as He goes down into Samaria with the rest of His disciples, and while He is journeying there, without purse or script, oftentimes with men so hungry that the disciples plucked food from a corn field that they might appease their hunger; O! how life-like that is! By and by they traveled along the dusty roads and Jesus gets weary, and sick, and weak, and they come to the famous place called Jacob's well. I want you to notice the evidence of humanity here. He said in effect something like this to the twelve: "You are strong and robust, while I am weary and weak, and the mission of life seems hard to bear. While I sit here you go into the city and buy meat." It seems to evidence the fact that He was so weary, and sick, and hungry that He could go no farther, and that they that were stronger than He went into the city to buy meat. The scriptural statement is: "Jesus being weary, he leaned upon the well." Is there a lesson here for you and me? While He is reclining upon that wellcurb, a woman appears, a poor child of earth. She needs help. He anticipates her wants, and though weary, and sick, and tired, with the great magnanimity that ever characterized His actions He began at once to administer to her the grandest and best of all earth's gifts. What a lesson to the elders to-day as they go out; oftentimes weary and sad, they think it is not worth while to preach when there is such a small congregation. Listen, if you will, to the sermon of sermons; one woman the congregation, Christ the elder, and as you think of this to-night, never refuse to tell the story of Jesus and His love wherever a human ear will bend to hear your statements.

Another Scene.

I draw your attention to one other scene in the history of Christ's life as a man. When the time came for Him to be offered up and He realized that His hour was come, after that farewell supper, that last goodbye—after the singing of that mournful hymn, He left them. There was a time when He said, "You three come with me while I go out there," and He took three of His beloved disciples yonder with Him; but after reaching the garden it seems that there came upon Him an awful loneliness; He wished to be alone. Have you ever been in that condition when you did not seek the society of men, when the hour came and you desired to be alone with God? That time occurred in the history of Christ's life, and so He remarked, "You remain here while I go yonder and pray." Do you not know that Christ longed to live? Do you not know that He desired to live, that He plead for life? Are you not in possession of the knowledge that He was only about thirty-three years of age, in the prime of life, with all the possibilities of manhood before Him? Is it any wonder that He should plead for His life when we remember that in His humiliation His judgment was taken away? He could not see all there was before Him. I apprehend that if Jesus had fully comprehended his mission He would not have prayed so fervently that God would spare his life. But God permitted Him to be tried to the very centre of His being in order to prove the possibilities of humanity, and the result was that when He recognized that the time had come He would have to forfeit His life, He saw and felt His weakness, and He plead for power: "O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," were His words; but it was not possible; it had to be done, else the scheme that was devised in the mind of a great God would have been thwarted. And, by and by when the struggle came, three times did He fall upon His face, pleading that heaven would spare His life, and when God had tried Him enough what was the result? He sent an angel to strengthen Him. I do not know what the result would have been had not that angel arrived. Have you the right to surmise that under similar circumstances you may be divinely assisted? I believe you have. I believe God Almighty has said that "angels are ministering spirits sent forth to minister unto those who shall be heirs of salvation," and that if you will only keep your heart, and mind, and body set to do the will of God, there is no trial too severe for you to pass through. Heaven will defend and strengthen you, and if it is necessary will send angels from the courts of glory to minister to your wants. I know that some of our friends think that angels have ceased to appear to man, that they have nothing to do with the sons of men now; but they have a vocation, and it is that they should minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation; and when Jesus needed their kindly ministrations they came. When men, all through life's history, require their kindly assistance, heaven sends them and they minister to them. Our God is unchangeable, consequently we believe that in this great age when it is so near the winding up scene, if we require angelic ministrations it will come just as it did then.

One More Trial.

When Jesus had been tried and tempted and was proven true, He submitted to the conditions and was taken to the cross; but it seems that that was not enough. One more trial had to be met, and it would seem from the history that on the cross darkness enveloped Him until He again thought He had been forsaken, and God wrung from Him the saddest, bitterest cry of despair that ever rent the air of this world: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Was He forsaken, friends? He

thought He was. No, He was not forsaken; He was only tried. When you get into similar conditions and you are called upon to crucify some things that you so dearly love in life; when you are called upon to lay aside those whose loving smiles are the sunlight of your lonely existence; to bid farewell to home and loved ones and go right forward, if you learn that it is your duty to do so, never fear; your heavenly Father will never forsake you, He will stand by you and protect you. When that trial was over, Jesus revived. He seemed to take in the situation, and then He could say, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and, trustful to the last, having brought His own will in subjection to His Father's, He could say, "It is finished."

Now, this is the life of Christ from the cradle to the grave. Time will not allow us to enlarge upon it further, but suffice it to say that Jesus Christ has proved the possibilities of humanity. He was our pattern, our guide; and though He was God manifest in the flesh, yet in His humiliation His judgment was taken away, and not until He arose did He enjoy the glory that He had with the Father before the world was. In human weakness He struggled on beneath the gloom of earth life that He might be a pattern to you and me and show us the grand powers, and privileges, and possibilities of humanity. As the Rose of Sharon He will bloom until the fragrance of His holy life will be wafted over the worlds, and all will honor Him.

How Can A Man Be Born Again?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the third chapter of the gospel as recorded by St. John, where I read from the 1st to the 7th verses inclusive: "There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. The same came to Jesus by night and said unto Him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto Him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again."

Agree On Second Birth.

Every phase of Christianity believes that Jesus spoke the truth when He said: "Ye must be born again." Every denomination that makes any claim to represent the Christianity of the New Testament agrees in the essentiality of the second birth, and I am glad to agree with my fellow men in this regard. I am very happy when I can agree with anybody, but it is many years since I covenanted with God that I would never compromise His word to obtain favor from man. While we all agree as to the essentiality of the new birth, where the churches differ with us is in answer to the question propounded by Nicodemus, How can a man be born again? Now that is the question we are going to answer to-night or let Christ and the apostles and the history of the Christian church make answer.

Agree With Christ, Not Men.

I am told that I am uncharitable because I differ with my fellow religionists. But what is charity? I must either agree with Jesus Christ and differ with those who differ with Him, or I must agree with them and differ with Him. Now I take the position something like Paul did when he said over here in Romans iii., 3 and 4, "For what if some did not believe shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect. God forbid. Yea, let God be true but every man a liar." I. John, 2:4, says: "He that saith I know him and keepeth not his commandments is a liar and the truth is not in him." That is where I have stood for thirty-four years. The man that differs with Jesus Christ is wrong, whether he is sincere or not, and if he knowingly differs with Jesus Christ by saying one thing, and Christ the other, then I conclude that Jesus is telling the truth and the other individual—well, I won't use the strong term liar as John did—but I will just say that he is perambulating around the suburbs of veracity and economizing the truth.

One of the feathered tribe is trying to get a little notoriety by advertising that when I differ from a man I call him a liar. Suppose that is true. I am in pretty good company. When Jesus found people economiz-

ing the truth He said: You are a liar. I have already quoted to-night what John, the most tender, loving, affectionate disciple declared: That the man who pretended to love God and did not keep His commandments was a liar. Now of course the gentleman that makes an attack upon me would never have done that if he had been better acquainted with Jesus Christ or John the Revelator. That is all I care to say with regard to him because his aim is to advertise business and I don't want to advertise business on Sundays.

Three Conceptions.

There are three conceptions, three births, three kingdoms, and to me it seems foolish for an individual to expect to enter any of these three kingdoms without complying with the conditions governing under the law. First, the conception which terminates in the natural birth, the first birth. We are conceived under a well-defined law ordained by the Almighty. We are born into this world under a well-defined law ordained by the Almighty. That is the first conception and birth, that brings us into the kingdom of this world. Jesus says, as I have read in your hearing to-night. Ye must be born again in order to enter into this second kingdom, the kingdom of God's dear Son. In order to be born there must be conception preceding birth, or the analogy is faulty. So we are conceived into the element of water when we are buried with Christ by baptism. Going from the original condition into the element of water represents a conception. Coming from the element of water into the element of air represents a birth. And when I speak of the element of water I will refer later on to the other part of that birth and that baptism which under certain conditions in the Bible are referred to as the doctrine of baptisms (the plural). But when stated in the unification of the second birth it is referred to as "the one baptism." The third conception is when we enter the grave. The third birth into the third kingdom is when we emerge from the grave in the resurrection morning in the Kingdom of God triumphant, when Jesus comes to claim His own.

Now, to me, we cannot be born into this world only by the well-defined law called the natural law of conception and birth. We cannot enter into the Kingdom of God only as we comply with the law as stated by Jesus Christ under the second conception and birth. Ye must be born again, referred to by Himself. Nor can we enter into the millennial glories. It is appointed unto man once to die and after that comes the resurrection in to the kingdom of God's dear Son. Now I think that this really should be plain. We enter each of these kingdoms by being born into that kingdom according to the well-defined laws governing each kingdom. I know that you can say that it is a miracle, this second birth. Well, the first birth is very miraculous. There are very, very, very few, if any, that can tell us all about the secrets of conception and birth, and we sometimes have a fashion of saying something is a miracle just because we are ignorant of the laws by which the effect is produced. But I may be pardoned if I say to you to-night there is no such thing as a miracle with God. That is to say all that God does is accomplished by well-defined laws, and while we may be ignorant as to all the completeness of those laws and say that they are miracles, we say that for want of a better term.

Man-Made Preachers.

Now, I believe that we should stand for the laws of the second birth just as Jesus taught it, and anything that takes form in opposition to that I denounce as un-Christian. The idea of telling me that if I stand up and acknowledge that I am a sinner and sign a card promising to be good, or shake hands with some good preacher or some fine singer, that my title

is clear! Well, it may get \$35,000 in four weeks, but it will never be approved by the Almighty. I want to be earnest in this matter. I believe that the man-made preachers are leading the people astray and are doing more harm than good because under this big hallucination men start in search of the new life. When the music has died away, when the sound of the drum is no longer heard in the land, when the evangelist is making his thousands in the next town, they wake up to the realization that they have not obtained that which God has promised in the record and they fall away, and to renew that earnestness, that zeal and that confidence in God is next thing to an impossibility. And hundreds and thousands of people are in that condition to-day and you are required to put up \$30,000 or \$40,000 to warm them over again, and the thing has been so small this year that the chief pusher refuses to tell how many. We are told that if that \$35,000 is not raised it will be a disgrace to this city. To me it will be a sign that I have not worked in vain for seven years here and that the people, some of them at least, are about ready to refuse to submit to the "in-and-out." There is not so much guilibility in Toronto as there used to be and so you have been informed right on the start, and they have kept their word pretty well. You have not heard a great deal about fire and brimstone. You have not had much of that excitement this year. Why? Because for seven winters here we have been showing up that man-made theory till it won't hold together any more, and so they are trying another system. My work has not been in vain here. My sermons are being read by many, many persons who would not like you to know that they would read the sermons of such a character, but it is having its good effect just the same. And I a heretic because I refuse to believe in the nonsensical contradictory statements of men as to how we are to be born again. But in place of that I stand persistently for the way, the truth, and the light as expounded by the Master of man Himself.

How To Be Born Again.

If Jesus Christ did not know how to tell people how this second birth was to be brought about, then save your money. You cannot hire anybody else that can tell you. Now then, let us go to the record, let us look at it fair even though it takes away your darling creed, your traditions or your preconceived ideas, even though it robs you of that peculiar hypnotic, mesmeric hallucination that is brought on by the wave that is thrown over you. Let us look to the word of God. Listen: Ye must be born again. That is admitted, it is imperative. Second: How can a man be born again. That is the question. Suppose I say go to the penitent form, do you feel it now dear sister? Is that the answer? Suppose I say come here into the confessional box and fix it right. Is that the answer? Come up and sign this card and shake hands with Brother So-and-So. Is that the answer? Now, if these were correct answers I would just as soon have it that way as any other way. But what is the answer? Listen as it falls from the blistered lips of the Man of Sorrow, as it came from the mouth of Him who spake as never man spake, as it comes to you like a melody from the far-off glory land, as it is expounded by God's own Son:

"VERILY, VERILY, I SAY UNTO THEE EXCEPT A MAN BE BORN OF WATER AND OF THE SPIRIT HE CAN NOT ENTER INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD."

"Oh, well," says one, "I don't believe that. You are just lugging in baptism and making baptism essential to salvation." "Oh, you don't believe baptism is essential, eh? Kind of a joke, eh. Just something to fill in the time. Saved just as well without it. Thousands went to heaven

and never submitted to baptism at all." If that twaddle is true what are you going to do with the words of Jesus Christ? The Bible speaking of that says: "The grass will wither, the flower thereof will fade away, but the word of the Lord will endure for ever, and this is the word by which the gospel is preached unto you." What will you do with these words then when He says: "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved but he that believeth not shall be damned." For of course the man that refuses to believe certainly will not be baptized. The promise is made only to the man that believes and is baptized.

What the Lexicographers Say.

To show you that Christ is not alone in this doctrine of the new birth I want to read you the history from the leading men just after Christ as to what this "born again" means. "We bring them to some place where there is water and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated, for they are washed with water, that is baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. For Christ says except ye be regenerated you cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, and that we shall obtain forgiveness of sins in which we have lived by or in water, and this washing or baptism is called the enlightening." (Justin Martyr, First Apology.) He wrote about 140 years after Christ. "When Christ gave to His apostles the commission of regenerating unto God He said unto them: "Go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," (Irenaeus), writing about 167 years after Christ: "We, after the example of Jesus Christ are born in water. The act of baptism itself is carnal in that we are plunged in water, but the effect is spiritual in that we are freed from sin." (Mosheim on Baptism, chapter 1, page 7): "The expression being born again was not first used by our Lord in His conversation with Nicodemus. It was well-known before that time and was in common use among the Jews when our Saviour appeared among them. When an adult heathen was convinced that the Jewish religion was of God and desired to join therein it was the custom to baptize him first before he was admitted to circumcision, and when he was baptized he was said to be born again, by which was meant that he that was before the child of the devil was adopted into the family of God. This will satisfy every reasonable man who desires only the salvation of his soul." (John Wesley, sermon on John 3:5 and 7, volume 4, page 30): Not a Methodist minister in Toronto believes John Wesley on that. "To be born again is to be regenerated and to be renewed, to receive spiritual life. See John, 3rd chapter." (This is taken from Webster's Dictionary): "By water, here"—John 3: and 5—is evidently signified baptism. Thus the word is used in Ephesians 5:26, and Titus 3:5.

This doctrine was not unknown to the Jews and is elsewhere in the New Testament called the new creature. See 2nd Corinthians 5:17, and Galatians 6:15. (This is taken from Barn's Notes on John 3 and 5): "Baptism was in the Mexican Empire a religious ceremony which in Yucatan was called Zihill, signifying to be born again, and the Nuhua nations freely admitted that it would cleanse the soul from all sin." (History of America before Columbus, volume 1, page 67): "The banquet at baptism was called the descent of God and the baptized were spoken of as born again." (Faith of the World, page 294.)

Now I wish to be careful in presenting this quotation to you. It comes from John Wesley and he was such a firm believer that baptism was the new birth that he actually claimed that new born babies were born in sin, and could not be saved unless they were baptized, that is, born again. "It is certain our church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy

are at that time born again, and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants is based upon this supposition." (Wesley sermon, volume 4, page 38) : "Infants are born again, therefore saved, by baptism." (Wesley sermon 45, volume 1, page 405). I shall say no more upon that matter as next Sunday night all the evidence on the infant baptism question will be presented.

Nobody Born in Sin.

Now I wish to be understood in this. I do not believe that infants are under the sin of Adam. They suffer some of the consequences of Adam's fall but none of the guilt. Therefore, while I agree with Mr. Wesley that baptism is the new birth, I do not agree with him that infants have to be born again. But more about that in the next lecture. Now back to the Bible, Ephesians 5:26: "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." I give you Mr. Wesley's note on that verse: "Washing baptism, having cleansed it from the guilt and power of sin by the washing of water in baptism." (Wesley's notes on Ephesians 5:26.) And remember every Methodist minister before he is ordained declares that he believes Wesley's notes on the New Testament. Consistency thou art a jewel. In Titus 3 and 5 we read: "Saved by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here you see where one calls it "regeneration" the other calls it "born again," but the two are synonymous declaring that they are saved by it, and in this quotation, as also in the one found in John 3: 1 and 7, both the water, and the spirit are referred to as having a part in the new birth. First Peter 3:21, I believe. If you read this text carefully, you will see that he refers to the new birth—the essentiality of water baptism. I might just say that he is here preaching on this thought that the people should obey the gospel, that is, have faith in God, repent of their sins, be baptized for the remission of their sins which would entitle them to enter into the ark. He says: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Now it does not say that the people were saved by getting into the ark. It says in this quotation they were "SAVED BY WATER." The like figure whereunto even BAPTISM DOTHS ALSO NOW SAVE US. Right here let me puncture a thought that has been expressed regarding that. They say you don't conclude the quotation, for it goes on to say "not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." Surely we don't claim that baptism puts away the filth of the flesh. But I submit that if you can't get the answer of a good conscience toward God without it, does not your Bible say if your conscience condemns God is greater than your conscience. So if your conscience does not answer according to the law of God they will condemn you until you are baptized by immersion for the remission of your sins and I hope they will continue to condemn you until you come to the church at Soho Street and ask for the Christian baptism.

In order to be born of the water we must first be buried in the water. I have already argued that there must be a conception, a burial before the birth and so Paul, writing in the 6th Romans makes the following statement: "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism unto death that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also, should walk in newness of life." Here is the new life. In being dead to sin, we are buried in the watery grave. That is dead and buried. Now, coming from the watery grave into the element of air represents a birth which brings us into the new life. Now, that our sins are pardoned by God in the keeping of these commandments I read you from the very same chapter: "Being then made free from sin ye became the

servants of righteousness." It does not say you were made free from sin when you stood up and told the people you loved Him, or when you signed a card or shook hands with somebody, but when you had faith in God, when you repented of your sins when you wished to make your faith alive by your works testifying that you believed in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. So we die to sin and are buried with Him by baptism into death and raised with Him to a newness of life.

And my brethren the promise is if you have been planted in the likeness of His death ye shall also be risen in the likeness of His resurrection. But if no death, then no resurrection; no planting, no growth. Now, just one point of history to prove that this burial of baptism referred to in Romans really means immersion. McKnight, a distinguished moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly of Scotland says: "In baptism, the baptized person is buried in water as one put to death with Jesus Christ in order that he may be strongly impressed with a sense of the malignity of sin and incited to hate it as the greatest of evils." Commenting on Romans 6:4, he says: "Christ submitted to be buried under water by John and to be raised out of it again as an emblem of His further death and resurrection." I could quote a hundred authorities supporting this contention, but this will suffice I trust for the present.

Now to the two baptisms being one. Hebrews 6:1 to 3, tells us of the doctrine of baptisms (in the plural, two baptisms). Ephesians 4:1 to 6, speaking of this great Christian baptism, this wondrous faith that is destined to ameliorate the condition of every sinner that will embrace it, says: "There is one Lord, one faith, ONE BAPTISM." What is that one baptism? One that has been referred to by Christ in the 3rd chapter of John and by several others cited to-night; the baptism of two in one. "Well," says one, "how can two be one?" Let Jesus settle that, Matthew 19:6, speaking of the marriage relation says: "Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Now, that is a reference to marriage and let me say whatever God hath joined together man has no right to put asunder. I and my father are one, one in thought, one in sentiment, one in desire. So a man and woman fall in love, whatever that may mean. I don't think anybody can learn to love. I think love is an epidemic and you cannot vaccinate the heart. Love has a cementing influence. I think it is Shakespeare who tried to define it as "Two souls with but a single thought, two hearts that beat as one." So in this great question of the new birth. You must be born of water and of the spirit. That is the new birth, that is doctrine of baptism of water and Spirit which is the ONE BAPTISM.

Paul, speaking of that wonderful baptism says in the 3rd Galatians: 27-29: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ, and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." You get into Christ or into the kingdom of Jesus Christ by this one baptism of water and of the Spirit, the second birth. You cannot get into the kingdom of God unless you are born of water and the Spirit and the man or several men that say you can, are deceivers, and John writing of deceivers said: "He that abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God." He may have a few thousand dollars but he hath not God. "Well," says one, "I think that is not charity." Well, don't blame me. That statement is in the Bible. "Well," says one, "you have proven that water baptism is immersion. What are you going to do about Spirit baptism? You can't prove that is immersion." "Oh, yes I can. I will show you that I can."

Galatians 5:21, "If we live in the Spirit, let us walk in the spirit."

Revelations 1:10, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." Revelations 4:2, "And immediately I was in the spirit." Acts 1:5, "John truly baptized with water. Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Now notice the word "baptized" as used there in connection with water, the same word as used in connection with the Spirit. The word rendered "baptized" here is from the Greek word "baptizo" from the Hebrew word "taval." Scholars tell us that baptizo and taval mean immerse, hence water and Spirit baptism is immersion. But let us look at this closely. We have had this immersion in the Spirit, then we will perhaps have something more tangible. Acts 2:1-4, I could quote it, but I want you to see it just as it is: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." Filled all the house where they were sitting. It strikes me my brethren that if you were sitting in this house to-night and water was poured down through this hole in the roof until the water filled the house, I think you would be very securely immersed in it. But let us go a little further. Luke 24:49, is perhaps still plainer on this: "And behold I send the promise of My Father upon you, but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem until ye be ENDUED with power from on high." All admit that this endowment was the Holy Ghost. Every church admits that so I won't argue on it. Dr. Ditzler says: "This word 'endued' is taken from the Greek word 'enduo.' This word means definitely to 'immerse.'" (Dr. Ditzler in Stavis Ditzler Debates, page 1.) Casaubon says: "To baptize is to immerse and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized for the house in which this was done was filled with the Holy Ghost, so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it, as into a fish pool." (R. Fuller, page 72.)

Archbishop Tillston says: "And the sound from heaven filled the house." This is that which our Saviour calls baptizing with the Holy Ghost as those who are buried with water which is the proper notion of baptism.

Neander, perhaps the greatest church historian, says: "Baptism was performed by immersion as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Ghost." (Christian religion, volume 1, page 310.) Curtlerus, in his Institute of Theology says: "Baptism in the Holy Spirit is immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit. For he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured out is as it were immersed into Him." (R. Fuller, page 19.) Bishop Cyril, who lived about three centuries after this baptism took place, and who resided in the city where this baptism took place, says: "As he who is plunged in the water and baptized is encompassed by the water on every side so they who are baptized by the Holy Ghost are also fully covered." (Pengilly, page 75.)

At the risk of being dry and tiresome to-night I have read to you the direct statements of the Bible, the lexicographers and the church historians, all proving that water baptism and Spirit baptism is immersion, is the second birth without which Jesus says we cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Oh that the great God would give to me the righteous desires of my heart that I might see the fruitage of my toil and sacrifice in this city by seeing the scales of tradition, priestcraft and superstition fall from your minds and that you may receive with meekness the engrafted word, that you may be born again from an old existence into the new life. I thank you.

Infant Baptism

PERMIT me to draw your attention to three verses found in the 15th chapter of the Gospel as recorded by St. Matthew, where you will read these words: Third verse, "But He answered and said unto them, why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" Ninth verse, "But in vain they do worship Me teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." Thirteenth verse, "But He answered and said, every plant which My Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."

A Tradition of Men.

The subject under consideration to-night is "Infant Baptism," and while I desire to be emphatic and plain I wish to state my convictions upon this subject so that when I stand before my God I shall not be ashamed of having defended the truth against the traditions of men. I want to say just as emphatically as I can that the doctrine of Infant Baptism is a direct reflection upon the atonement of Jesus Christ, and there is no man living can point to one verse in the Bible where God or Christ or the apostles ever baptized a baby. Infant baptism is one of the traditions of men referred to in the text. By its introduction the church transgressed the law, made void the commandment, and as Jesus said, "By the tradition of the elders you have made the commandment of God of none effect," and in the latter part of my text He said, "Every plant which My Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." I am going to get after that weed to-night. I am going to show you the Bible in contra-distinction to the tradition of men, and having presented to you what the Bible and the history says upon the question, then I shall leave it for you to decide as to whether you will believe in infant baptism or not. It is alleged that the Bible does teach infant baptism and gives instances where infants were baptized. Now I deny that allegation and I am going to read you every quotation that I can call to mind that I have ever heard used in support of infant baptism. That is fair, I think, if I give both sides of the question.

Supposed Proof.

Turn your attention to the 16th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where it is alleged that infant baptism was performed. The first case is the Phillipian jailor. In the 16th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 25 to 34, the story of the Phillipian jailor is told. All I care to say about it is that when you read it you will discover that they who were baptized on that occasion, heard the Gospel, believed the Gospel and rejoiced when they were baptized. Common sense will tell you that an infant child can neither believe nor rejoice in the Gospel. That, certainly, has reference to matured minds.

The next case, 16th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, from the 14th to the 40th verse, tells of Lydia and her household being baptized. I have often thought that it was rather unkind to lug in infant baptism there for we have to suppose a great deal. First, we have in all kindness to Lydia to suppose that she was married, for the Bible does not give a hint of it. Secondly, we have to suppose that she had at least one child, and at the time of this baptism that that child was present and was baptized. The Bible does not say a word about it. The Bible does show that she was

what we might call to-day a drummer, a commercial traveler, far distant from her home in Thyatira, busy up here at Phillipi selling dry goods, a seller of purple and fine linen. It was Sunday afternoon, a bright summer day, She, with her company of servants, had strolled down to the riverside to spend the afternoon and Paul and his companion in labor spoke to the people on the shores of those waters. The record shows that they heard she and her household were baptized. That is to say, in those days there were neither railroad nor steamboats, and commercial travellers then had to travel with the aid of camel. They would tie their great boxes on the camel's back and in every town those boxes had to be taken down and untied and the goods shown, and the woman could not, of course, by herself attend to those camels and to those boxes, and as a result she had servants, the "women" and "brethren" referred to in this story, to travel with her to assist her, and they were with her in this park this Sunday afternoon, and with her they heard the Gospel and were baptized. Not the slightest hint of a baby present.

A little further on we read in the 18th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 8th verse, that Crispus believed on the Lord with all his house and were baptized. It seems to me that I don't have to take any time to prove there were no babies there, because it says that they who were baptized were believers, not babies; you cannot get them to believe. Sometimes I have a hard time to keep them quiet, let alone trying to make them believe. Acts 10:1-48, we are told of Cornelius and his household being baptized.

Therefore, the infant sprinkler assumes that babies were there and were baptized, but just to be as brief as possible let me say, the babies in that case heard the Gospel, believed it, were baptized, received the Holy Spirit, spoke with tongues and glorified God. Pretty old babies, don't you think? In 1st Corinthians 1:16, we read of Stephanas and his household being baptized. All I need to say in this case is that by a reference to 1st I. Corinthians, 16:15, we are told that they addicted themselves to the "ministry of the saints." Pretty old babies that immediately upon their baptism could be addicted to the ministry of the saints. Well we pass on.

We are told by infant sprinklers that the Bible distinctly speaks of little children. "Yes," Now I am going to take the trouble to read you what it says about these little children that were in the church. 1st John 2:1, "My little children I write unto you that you sin not." Do you believe that John the Divine wrote that to the prattling baby? Did you ever write to a little infant saying, "My little children I write unto you that you sin not?" Again 1st John 2:12, "I write unto you little children because your sins are forgiven." These babies were old enough to have sinned, to have received pardon, and to be able to read written communication regarding the matter. 1st John 2:13, "I write unto little children because ye have known the Father." Any infant baptism there? 1st John 2:18, "Little children this is the last time ye have heard that Antichrist will come." Now I submit to you, my friends, that I have never been able to work up a stretch of imagination big enough to make me think for the smallest part of a moment that anyone of these—said to be strong—texts in favor of infant baptism, has even a shadow of infant baptism in it. Now, it is a strong indication to me that common intelligence would never have thought that any of those quotations supported infant baptism unless that intelligence was cramped by priestcraft and churchianity.

Now, so far as I know these are all the direct scriptures that are said to give evidence regarding infant baptism unless, perhaps, the 2nd chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and the 38th and 39th verses, which I once heard

urged in support of infant baptism. It reads like this: "Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost for the promise is unto you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." That is when the children hear the Gospel, believe it, and repent of their sins. God will give the children the same blessing he gave their fathers; that is, the remission of their sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. That is all that can be tortured to mean. No support whatever for infant baptism.

Pre-Requisites of Baptism.

My next thought is the pre-requisites of baptism. Mark 16:15, Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," showing that belief is a pre-requisite of baptism. In Acts 8:37, the story of the baptism of the eunuch is told. The eunuch is going along in his chariot reading the Bible, when Phillip, one of the servants of Christ, approached the chariot by the command of God. He is invited up and discourses to the eunuch upon the scriptures that were then in his hand. After having preached to him the Gospel the eunuch said, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" and Phillip said, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest," showing again belief to be a pre-requisite to baptism. Again Mark 1:4, "John came preaching in the wilderness of Judea the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Here the people had to repent anterior to their baptism. Belief and repentance, pre-requisites to baptism, therefore, infants are not to be baptized.

Not Guilty of Adam's Sin.

My next point is to prove this statement: that we suffer some of the consequences of Adam's fall, but not the guilt. Now, I want you to notice this very carefully, for here we divide from almost every phase of the Christian church. I say, almost, for there are a few notable exceptions. We take the position that we do not suffer the guilt of Adam, but we suffer some of the consequences from a physical standpoint. At the risk of being a little dry I am going to crave your indulgence while I read you two or three verses. Romans, 5th chapter, 12th verse, "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned." Now, here you are told that death was the penalty for the first sin. Death. Fifteenth verse of the same chapter, "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace which is by one man, Jesus Christ hath abounded unto many. Eighteenth verse: Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. Here the story is told that because of one man's offence, Adam's transgression, sin came into the world, and death by sin, not eternal damnation, would follow as the result of Adam's eating the fruit, but death. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." We suffer that consequence, we have to die.

Now to show you clearly that the baby takes no part in the guilt, we are told clearly here in Romans 4:15, "Where no law is there is no transgression." The baby has broken no law. What is law? We are told in the Bible sin is the transgression of the law. The baby has committed no sin. Therefore, it is not a transgressor. First John 3:4, says: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law." Now there is the transgressor, not the baby, but the man who transgresseth the law." He is the sinner. I hope this is clear to you. "Well," says on, "it came down from father to

son." I want to hit that so hard that you will not believe it any more. I draw your attention to Ezekiel 18:20, and here are the clear words, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." That seems like fair play. Jeremiah 31, breathes out this same thought. It is so nice that I think I had better read it to you. Speaking of the Gospel of the Covenant, the new Covenant it reads, "In those days they shall say no more, the fathers have eaten a sour grape and the children's teeth are set on edge but everyone shall die for his own iniquity. Every man that eateth the sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge." That sounds fair. The idea that because Adam had an apple or something else several thousand years ago that a baby is born with the wrath of God upon it and that it will be damned to all eternity unless somebody puts a little water on it! "Ah," you say, "Surely nobody believes that." Let me say, fearless of successful contradiction, that is the foundation of infant baptism, and you know last Sunday night I invited you to go to your minister to get him to give you some quotations from the Bible that prove infant baptism and I will await them with pleasure.

According to the creed the baby is born under the wrath of God. Did Jesus teach that? Listen: "Suffer little children to come unto me for of such is the Kingdom of God." Luke 18:16. Again, Matt. 18:2, speaking to his own disciples. He said, "Except you be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven." Here, the Master makes the baby the emblem of purity. Your creeds make the baby the emblem of depravity. It is not that I wish to speak unkindly of any man's faith, but necessity is laid upon me. Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel and every plant that My Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up, and I am taking part in the exposition of the errors of the church with the view to get the church to abandon those errors and come back to Christ, back to the Bible. There are many good, honest, beautiful characters in the church, but, oh, how much grander and greater and more beautiful and more powerful would we be if the clogs of tradition, priestcraft, superstition, false doctrine, were to be abandoned, and we were to just preach the Christianity of the New Testament. I make no attack upon any truth that any church teaches, I wish to love and admire, protect and defend, every semblance of truth in every denomination, but I wish to be an uncompromising enemy to the tradition that has made the Commandments of God of none effect.

Misrepresent the Bible.

Now my next point will be to show you that men have misrepresented the Bible on this doctrine of birth, sin and infant depravity. They tell us that David said in the 51st Psalm, "We are all born in sin and shapen in iniquity." That quotation is not in the Bible. What did David say? You will find it in the 51st Psalm from the first to the fifth verses, wherein he was confessing his awful crime, for he was guilty of crimes so dark, so filthy, so wonderfully inhuman, cruel and vile, that I shall not take time to relate them here to-night. He was guilty of the most cowardly, deceptive, cruel and lustful crimes that were ever committed by human being, and in this chapter he is confessing his crime. (And I might say in parenthesis if you want to read all about that crime read 2nd Samuel, 11th chapter, 1-26). David in the 51st Psalm is confessing this crime and in it he makes this statement: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me." That does not say we are all born in sin and shapen in iniquity. David was only confessing himself and his parentage, and when you have to fling a shadow on the

virtue and chastity of your father and mother and your own birth in order to lug in infant baptism you are mighty hard up for proof. I am not willing to do that. I am willing to admit that David told the truth when he said that he was in that condition. All you have to do is to read the history of concubinage and polygamy that existed in the days of Jesse and David, and you will get an inkling of what David meant when he showed that his father before him was not all that he should have been, and therefore he was pleading with God not to expect too much from him.

The Proof.

Now I have made some strong statements here. I made some of them the other night, and by mistake they were not published, and letters came flocking in. "Why don't you give the proof you said you would give from the church books?" So I promised to give them and I betake myself to that task now, and by way of introduction let me say if I mention what your church teaches and give you chapter and verse for it—if it is bad, if you are ashamed of it, don't get angry with me, don't jump up and run away and say, "That's a bad man." Just sit here and say, "That man is proving that my church is guilty of misrepresenting God and Christ and the Bible, and it is no longer the Church of Christ to me. I will go where the blush of shame will not come upon my cheeks when my church books are referred to." I hope you will take it in this way.

Origin, one of the early church fathers says, "None is free from pollution though his life be the length of one day upon the earth. It is for that reason, because of the sacrament of baptism, the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized." Wall's History of Baptism volume 1, page 65, Lackey's History of Rationalism says, "The whole body of the fathers, without exception or hesitation, pronounced that all infants who die unbaptized were excluded from Heaven." I made the following quotation a little while ago and it was denied. I make it now with emphasis and you will not deny the authenticity of my authority. I quote it from the Encyclopoedia Britannica. "The Roman Catholic Church allows midwives in cases of danger to baptize a child before the birth is completed. A still-born child that is baptized may be buried in consecrated ground." I am told that baptisms of this character have been performed in Toronto. I have got the documents if I am called in question.

Council of Trent, "Thus the children born of baptized parents have need of baptism because they inherited from Adam original sin which can only be effaced by the water of regeneration in order to obtain eternal life." * * * "Through the grace conferred in baptism original sin is wholly remedied and effaced."

Catholic Catechism published in Quebec by Milner: "Q. What is baptism? A. The sacrament which cleanses from original sin, makes us Christians and children of God and heirs to the Kingdom of Heaven. Q. Is baptism necessary to salvation? A. Yes, without it one cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Q. What is original sin? A. The sin we inherit from our first parents and in which we were conceived and born children of wrath." "Oh, well," says one, "that is from the early fathers of Roman Catholicism." Yes, now I draw your attention to the daughters of Rome, some of the Protestant churches, and do not get angry, be sweet. Article 9 of the Church of England Prayer Book says, "Every person born into the world deserveth God's wrath and damnation." A little further on on that same page it says, "There is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized." Now, I will give you a Church of England Catechism: "Q. What is your name? Who gave you that name? A. My godfather and my

godmother. (In parenthesis let me ask, did you ever read of a godfather and a godmother in the Bible?) My godfather and my godmother in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." A little further on it says, "It is certain by God's word that children that are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." What is the antithesis of that? That children who are not baptized as aforesaid are damned.

Let me read to you a prayer that is offered at the baptism of every baby in the Church of England. It was offered for myself down here in Montreal and they say I kicked and squealed, and I have been kicking against infant baptism ever since. "Dearly beloved, for as much as all men are conceived and born in sin and our Saviour Christ saith none can enter into the Kingdom of God except he be regenerated and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost, I beseech you to call upon God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ that of His bounteous mercy He will grant to this child that which by nature he cannot have, that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost and received into Christ's Holy Church and be made a living member of the same." Let me ask if all this is given to the baby in his baptism what will become of the one that does not get baptized? Now, you may breathe a little easier and we will put the Presbyterians on the carpet.

"Q. What effect had the sin of Adam on all mankind? A. All mankind are born in a state of sin and misery. Q. Can any one go to heaven with this sinful nature? A. No, our hearts must be changed before we can be fit for heaven. Q. Why should infants be baptized? A. Because they have a sinful nature and need a Saviour." (Catechism, for children, written for the Presbyterian Board of Education, page 12 and 13, published in Philadelphia.)

Here is another catechism: Q. Are you guilty for Adam's first sin? (I would say with my last breath, No), but the answer here is, yes. Q. What estate is man born in now? A. An estate of sin and misery. Q. Brought you sin into this world with you? A. Yes. Q. What do you call it? A. Original sin. Q. What is this sin? A. The sin that is conceived in me by my parents from Adam. Q. Are you both guilty and filthy by this sin? A. Yes. Q. Is your nature both corrupted and defiled by it? A. Yes. Q. Is original sin enough to damn you though you had no more? A. Yes. Q. Is not original sin the spring of all actual sin? A. Yes. (This is taken from Mother's Catechism by the Rev. J. Willison, published in London.)

Little children are asked to memorize this, that they are born in sin and that sin in which they are born is enough to damn them though they had no more, and we are asked to regard that as Protestant Christianity. Could a man who loves Jesus Christ and knows anything about the atonement of our Lord pass that by without condemning it?

One more, and this time from Toronto. Q. What is original sin? A. It is the sin in which I was conceived and born. Q. Doth original sin wholly defile you? And is it sufficient to carry you to hell though you had no other sin? A. Yes. Q. What are you then by nature? A. I am an enemy of God, a child of Satan and an heir of hell. Just imagine the baby just born this minute an enemy of God Almighty, a child of the devil and heir of hell! Who said that? The Rev. J. Brown, Presbyterian, published in Toronto. It is a wonder Toronto did not slip in the bay.

John Calvin, the head Presbyterian of all, in his institute, volume 1, says, "Reprobate infants are vipers of vengeance which God holds over the flames of hell until they turn and spit venom into God's face." While I am reading that I think of the mothers that endure much to give their baby a name and place among humanity and then they have to listen to that;

that the very frown of God is upon their baby's brow, born children of wrath, heirs of hell, enemies of God, children of the devil, and without baptism they must go to the pit.

Now just one more church. John Wesley is said to be the father of Methodism. Listen to their papa. "Infants are born again, therefore saved by baptism." Sermon 45, volume 1. "If infants are guilty of original sin then they are proper subjects for baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism." A little further on he says, "It has been already proved that this original stain cleaves to every child, or man, and that hereby they are children of wrath and liable to eternal damnation." Further on he says, "That we are all born under the guilt of Adam's sin and that all sin deserves eternal misery, was the unanimous opinion of the ancient church." Still further on he says, "And the scriptures plainly say that we are shapen in iniquity and in sin did our mother conceive us." I have shown you that Wesley here misrepresents the scriptures. The scriptures plainly say no such a thing. This is taken from a treatise on baptism by John Wesley, volume 6, from pages 12 to 22. John Wesley further says in Sermon on New Birth, Sermon 65, "Everyone born into this world bears the image of the devil. Being born in sin, we must be born again. Everyone born of woman must be born again." Now I could quote you dozens of pages of this kind of literature that stained and scarred the face of the church and made infidelity run rampant through the world, for no man with a sense of justice could endorse what either the Catholic or Protestant churches teach with regard to infant damnation, the father and mother of infant baptism.

Now I am going to give you a few statements from the early history as to the origin of infant baptism.

Dr. George E. Steitz, in his treatise on baptism in Herzog's Encyclopaedia, volume 15, page 431, asserts that "Among scientific exigists it is regarded as an established conclusion that not a trace of infant baptism can be discovered in the New Testament." You will all believe that after my effort to-night. Dr. Schaeff, in his History of the Catholic Church, chapter 4, section 37, says, "The apostolic origin of infant baptism is denied, not only by the Baptists, but also by many pseudo-baptiste divines. The New Testament contains no express command to baptize infants." Corcellus, a Presbyterian in his Religious Institute, says, "The baptism of infants in the first two centuries after Christ was altogether unknown, but in the third and fourth was allowed by some few. In the fifth and following centuries it was generally received. In the former ages no trace of it appears, and it was introduced without the command of Christ."

Neander, in his Apostolic Age, volume 1, page 140, says, "It cannot be proved that infant baptism was practised in the apostolic age."

Dr. Bledsoe, a Methodist, in The Southern Review, vol. 14, page 334, says, "With all our searching we have been unable to find, in the New Testament, a single expressed declaration or word in favor of infant baptism." He says again, "Before the time of Tertullian, A. D., 200, the practice of infant baptism is nowhere distinctly mentioned by any writer of the church." On page 336 he says, "However strange it may seem the fact is that the first father or writer by whom the practice is noticed condemns it as having no foundation either in reason or revelation." Dr. Lang, the renowned German commentator in his History of Baptism says, page 101, "All attempts to make out infant baptism from the New Testament fail. It is utterly opposed to the spirit of the apostolic age and the fundamental principles of the New Testament." I close with his pungent remark, "Would the Protestant church fulfill and attain to its final destiny the baptism of

new-born infants must be abolished. It cannot in any point of view be justified by the Holy Scriptures." Now, I could produce hundreds of writers on this matter, all agreeing that because the church began to teach that infants were born in sin and that they would be damned if they were not baptized, that they finally adopted it as the tradition of the church and when the Protestant church came out to protest it, it did not protest enough, but carried from the bosom of their mother, the Church of Rome, this tradition which Jesus declares, "By your tradition you have made the commandment of God none effect. But every plant that my Heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up."

Baptism and Circumcision.

Some have said that baptism took the place of circumcision. I have not time to dwell on that to-night, only to say that there is absolutely no proof for it, for Christ and the apostles and thousands of Jews that had been circumcised when they obeyed the Gospel were baptized. Again, circumcision was a bloody and a painful rite performed upon a male child, and has in no way any reference whatever to infant baptism. Now, why do I make these remarks about infant baptism? Is it because I think there are no good people in these churches that believe in infant baptism? No, there are good people inside of every church and outside of all the churches, but it is a tradition, it is a weed which has no place in Christianity, and we are just dividing the weeds from the good plants. This church is on record on the question of infant baptism. I will give you our position. "Every spirit of man was innocent in the beginning, and God having redeemed man from the fall, men became again in their infant state innocent before God." (Doctrine of Covenants, page 238, section 90). Again "Little children are holy, being sanctified through the atonement of Jesus Christ." (Doctrine of Covenants, page 182, section 74). "He that saith that little children need baptism denieth the mercies of Christ and setteth at naught the atonement of Him, and the power of His redemption." Book of Mormon, page 540.

Now, in conclusion, let me say that I am a firm believer in both water and spirit baptism, but I believe that a person must have faith first, then repent of their sins, and as babies are not capable of having faith, therefore, they have no place in baptism. I thank you for your attention.

Pouring, Sprinkling, Immersion

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 28th chapter of the Gospel as recorded by St. Matthew, 18th and 20th verses, inclusive: "And Jesus came and spake unto them saying, 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and, lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world. Amen.'"

Three Different Words.

From this commission men claim the right to baptize the people. One man will sprinkle water upon them and call it baptism; another will pour water on them and call it baptism; another will immerse them and call it baptism. Now, which is correct? They cannot all three be right, because Paul declared in Ephesians 4 and 5, there is but "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." If some one came along here preaching two Lords, two faiths, one diametrically opposed to the other, how soon would we fly to the scriptures and say, "There should be no division among us. We should all speak the same thing and be of one mind." Should we not use the same cry with regard to baptism? Remember that the same verse says, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.

Dr. Benson once said, "What can be more absurd than to imagine that the doctrines or rules of practice which relate to man's everlasting salvation should be delivered in such ambiguous terms as to be capable of many meanings." The apostles were inspired to write the words as they fell from the lips of the Master of men. Matthew wrote in Greek and when he came to this part of the discourse of Jesus—the commission to go and baptize—he used the Greek word "baptizo." Now, upon that word depends the question, did Christ command them to sprinkle, pour or immerse. It is an axiom in logic that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another. Now notice this carefully. The Hebrew word "taval" is rendered in the Greek by the word "baptizo." When the Jews translated their scriptures into Greek, whenever they came to this word they rendered it "baptizo," and when our translators came to this same word they rendered it by the English word "dip." It follows, therefore, since "dip" in English, "baptizo" in Greek, are equal to "taval" in Hebrew, they must be equal to each other. The translators of the King James Bible testified that the Hebrew word "taval"—the equivalent of the Greek "baptizo"—signified to "dip." "Taval" occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament. In the common version it is rendered "dip" fourteen times and "plunge" once.

Voice of Authority.

Now, let us go to the authorities for a moment on this question. Maimonides, a great Jewish authority, says, "Whenever in the law of Moses washing clothes or flesh is mentioned it means nothing else than the dipping of the whole body in the bath; for if anyone dipped himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness. (Helch Mikva, chap. 1, sec. 2.)

Dr. Kleeburg, a renowned Jewish rabbi, says that "taval" means to immerse, to dip. It never means to sprinkle or pour." (Leonsville, debate, page 62). Now, we come to the word sprinkle itself. In Hebrews, 10 and 22, we read, "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." Remember here that it is the heart to be sprinkled, not the body. It has reference to the type and anti-type. As the blood of bulls and goats was sprinkled under the old law so our hearts would be touched by the divine influence of the love of Christ which would lead us to have our bodies washed with pure water. The word "washed" here is taken from the word "louo." Almost every lexicographer defines the word to "immerse."

In Hebrews 9 and 10, we have another statement: "Which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation." Now, the diverse washings under the law was to give way in the gospel economy to the "one baptism." I have already discoursed to you several Sundays ago on the washing and dipping of Naaman, the leper, 2nd Kings, 5th chapter, bringing in an abundant array of authorities, both from the Bible and from the lexicographers and church historians, that the dip there referred to immersion; that the washing or louo referred to immersion; so that the divers washings referred to immersion, and they were to be superceded in the New Testament in the gospel law by the "one baptism," which I will try to prove to-night to be immersion.

Sprinkling Never Commanded.

Now, I admit that there are sprinklings and washings referred to in the Old Testament. There are eight sprinklings of blood, three of blood and oil, two of blood and water, oil, three mixed water and oil, Four—in all twenty, and there are eighteen bathings. In those sprinklings there are only six in water. Now, notice this. The water is never unmixed; it is mixed with blood or in the ashes of a red heifer. God nowhere in the Bible commanded any man to sprinkle clean water on any other man, woman or child. "Well," says one, "what are you going to do with the quotation in support of sprinkling as found in Ezekiel 36:24 and 25?" Why I am going right after that. I have no disposition to forget any of these pet passages, nor refuse to examine them. I have nothing to lose, my friends. If sprinkling was the proper mode I would just as soon have it that way as any other way. What difference would it make to me?

We will read the two verses referred to. Ezekiel 36:24 and 25, "For I (notice the pronoun I, referring to God Himself), for I will take you (Israel) from among the heathen and gather you out of all countries and will bring you into your own land. Then will I (God) sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh and I will give you a heart of flesh." Do any churches to-day who sprinkle either babies or adults claim that as the result of this sprinkling they are taken away from the heathen countries, and placed in Palestine? This sprinkling, remember, is to be done in Palestine. It is not to be done by man; it is to be done by God Almighty. When it is done the results will be, "They are to be made clean from their filthiness." Do you claim that sprinkling in your baptism to-day cleanses you from filthiness? Does it cleanse you from all your idols? Does it give you a right spirit? Does it take away your stony heart and give you a heart of flesh?

Ezekiel delivered this prophesy B. C. 587. Israel's return to Jerusalem under Zerubabel was B. C. 536. When the prophecy was fulfilled, fifty-one years after Ezekiel had the prophecy. Zerubabel with 50,000 Jews returned to Jerusalem and rebuilt the walls. Nine years afterwards Nehemiah, the prophet, went to Jerusalem and rebuilt the temple. The land became fruitful when Christ came; the temple was still standing. That is the strongest text they claim in favor of sprinkling. It has no reference to Christian baptism.

One Way, Only, Right.

Now, we sometimes hear the argument in a kind of begging the question way, that it don't matter which mode—sprinkling, pouring or immersion—is used, they are all synonymous. Now those words are not interchangeable at all as the following will prove. I cite you to Leviticus 14th chapter, 15th and 16th verses, where you will find these three words separate and distinct, "And the priest shall take some of the log of oil and pour it into the palm of his own left hand. And the priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." Here are the three words used, separate and distinct, so that they do not mean the same thing.

Let us see: Hebrew, Yatesaq; Greek, cheo; English, pour; Hebrew, nozia; Greek, raino; English, sprinkle; Hebrew, taval; Greek, baptizo; English, dip. Now, there are these three languages represented and giving to you these three words: Dip, pour, sprinkle.

History of Sprinkling.

Now, I want to give you the history of sprinkling. Dr. Wall says: "The first case of effusion is that of Novitian in A. D. 251, while reclining in bed from sickness received what they called clinic baptism. This is the most ancient case on record." If this celebrated author is to be believed the first case of sprinkling in Christian baptism was 251 years this side of Jesus Christ. How are you going to lug that in as a Christian ordinance? Eusebius, the father of Church historians, relating how aspersion or sprinkling water upon the individual was applied in baptism in the case of Novitian says, "Who aided by the exorcists when attacked with an extended disease and being supposed at the point of death was baptized by aspersion in the bed in which he lay. When he recovered from disease did he partake of other things which the rule of the church prescribes, nor was he sealed in conformation by the bishop, but as he did not obtain this how could he obtain the Holy Spirit?"

Bishop Smith of the Protestant Episcopal Church, says, "We have only to go back six or eight hundred years and immersion was the only mode except in the case of the few baptized on their beds when death came near." (This was called clinic baptism, as I have already stated.) "But in regard to such cases it disqualified its recipient from holy orders in case he recovered. Immersion was almost universal six or eight hundred years ago, and was both primitive and apostolic. There is no case of baptism standing on record for the first three hundred years, except the few cases of this baptism clinically, that is lying in bed." "If any one practice of the early church is clearly established it is immersion." (Bliss' letters on Baptism, page 24).

Now, let me show you the first law that was made on this question of sprinkling. The Monks of Cressy, A. D. 745, inquired as to whether it was lawful in case of necessity, occasioned by sickness, to baptize an infant by pouring water on its head from a cup or the hands, and Pope Steven III. made the following reply, "Such a baptism performed in such a case of necessity shall be accounted valid." Apud, Labbei Concilia, Tom 6. Bas-

nage, speaking of the foregoing, says, "This is accounted the first law against immersion." The Pontiff, however, did not endorse immersion except in the case of extreme necessity. This law, therefore, did not change the mode of dipping in baptism, and it was not until the year 1311 that the legislature declared immersion and pouring to be indifferent. (Robinson's History on Baptism, chap. 33).

What Dictionaries Say.

Now let us hear from the encyclopedias on this matter, just as briefly as I can make it. Brandt's Encyclopedia says, "Baptism was originally administered by immersion." Without reading the others, let me say that Zells, Edinburg, Shaff, Herzog, and Britannica Encyclopedias all admit the same thing: that immersion was the original Christian mode of baptism and that sprinkling was introduced hundreds of years after Christ had ascended into Heaven. Dean Stanley stands in the front rank. At one time he was chaplain to Queen Victoria. He visited Russia and the East, and his history of the Eastern church is now the standard authority on that phase of church questions. * * * He said: "There is no question that the original form of baptism, the very meaning of the word was a complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters, and that for at least six centuries at least any other form was little known or regarded except in the case of dangerous illness and an exceptional and an almost monstrous case. To this form the Eastern church still rigidly adheres. (History of the Eastern Church).

Now, I want to go to the lexicographers on this question just for a moment or two. William Grenfell in his New Testament Lexicon says, "Baptizo means to immerse, submerge, sink." Thomas Sheldon Green in his New Testament Lexicon says, "Baptizo means properly to immerse, to cleanse." John Pickering, "Baptizo, to dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink." John Calvin in his Institute says, "The word Baptizo signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was performed by the ancient church." Martin Luther, "Baptizo is a Greek word and may be translated immersion as when we immerse something in water that it may be wholly covered." I could read to you for an hour on this question, but I close this part of it by reading from Dr. Charles Anthon, professor of Knox College, Columbia, New York, in a letter to Dr. E. Jalmer, March 24, 1843, "The primary meaning of the word baptizo is to dip or immerse and its secondary meaning, if it ever had one, referred in some way or other to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, pouring, etc., are entirely out of the question. (Fuller on Baptism, page 52).

Now, dear friends, we are told that Christ authorized his servants to baptize. Those servants wrote in Greek. They used the word "baptizo." I have presented to you the lexicographers, the church historians and the word "taval" in the Hebrew; "baptizo" in the Greek and "baptize" in the English, and they all agree, and every respectable lexicographer on the earth agrees that these words mean to, dip, plunge, immerse, and that they do not refer to sprinkling or pouring.

Now, you wonder why I am so firm upon this. I want to show you one great reason. It is time that some one spoke out. John Wesley in his "Notes on the New Testament" on Romans 6 and 4 says, "We are buried with Him by baptism into death (alluding to the ancient method of baptizing by immersion) that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

I hope that every Methodist in this audience will take notice of this, and if you have not got them all here, tell it to them. You have heard what Wesley says of Romans 6 and 4, and Colossians 2 and 12. Now, let us see

what the Methodist Conference said in Toronto of these two passages. At the general conference of the Methodist Church, held in Toronto, Ontario, in 1886, a sub-committee was appointed to revise the discipline of the church. The following is noticeable: "The committee recommend that the passages from Romans 6, 3 and 4, and Colossians 2 and 12 be eliminated from the baptismal service, as they do not refer to water baptism and are therefore misleading in this connection." (Carried). And they are now taken out of the Methodist discipline. Here is Methodism against John Wesley himself. Here is Methodism against the church historians, against the lexicographers, against the Bible. Is it not time that somebody spoke out, especially when the first page of the Methodist discipline shows that every Methodist ordained must admit that he believes in John Wesley's "Notes on the New Testament." That very discipline that was revised has that statement in it. Well, what shall we do about this? Hundreds of them have said to me, "Well, I don't know anything about our discipline. What do you quote discipline to me for?" Brethren, the time has come in this day of priestcraft, superstition and idolatry, that men must begin to read, to think and examine for themselves, not put their brains upon a shelf and allow a preacher to do their thinking for them. The time has come that Christianity should speak with one voice. The Bible, speaking of Christianity says, "See that you all speak the same thing. Be of the same mind, having one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and that there be no division among you, for God is not the author of confusion but of peace as in all the churches of the saints." Who is the author of all this confusion? If God is not, who is? I leave that part with you.

The Bible.

Now to the Bible. Mark 1: 4 and 5, "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the River of Jordan, confessing their sins." "Oh," says one, "we believe that, we admit they were all baptized in Jordan, but that does not say whether it was sprinkling, pouring or immersion." I have proven to you that wherever the word baptize is found in the Bible there it is taken from the Greek word "baptizo" and means to immerse, so that it does mean immersion. Second, the reading of it indicates immersion. Let us see. You tell me that sprinkling and pouring are words used interchangeably with immersion. Let us apply this now and see if we can make good grammar and common sense out of it. Let me just place the word sprinkle where the word baptized is used. "And all Jerusalem and Judea round about Jordan came out to John and were sprinkled of him in the River Jordan." Just imagine John taking a handful of people and sprinkling them in Jordan! That doesn't read right. Well, let us try the word pour. "And all Jerusalem and Judea round about Jordan came out to John and were all poured of him in the River Jordan." Now place the word immerse or dip or plunge there. "And all Jerusalem and Judea came unto John and were immersed of him in Jordan, dipped in Jordan, plunged in Jordan."

Matthew 3:13 and 17, "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee from Jordan unto John to be baptized of him," not sprinkled of him, not poured of him, but immersed of him. I read the 16th verse. "And Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway out of the water." I want to ask the audience, do you think that Jesus had as much common sense as you have? "Oh," says one, "yes, He was the divine personification of wisdom and goodness and holiness," True. Now, if you wanted a little water poured on your head would you go a hundred miles to the river to have somebody

pour a little water on your head? No. Why no one with any common sense would have that done. I would stay in the house and have it done out of a teacup or something. And yet you want me to believe that Jesus did it. Worse and more of it."

Against Common Sense.

I have a little book here written by Rev. W. A. McKay, B.A., of Woodstock, and published in Toronto. The front page contains a picture of Jesus standing up to the waist in water in the Jordan and John leaning over pouring some water on him. Would you do that if you wanted to have somebody pour water on your head? Where is the necessity of standing up to your waist in water to have a little water put on you, either by sprinkling or pouring? Now the record says we are buried with Christ by baptism unto death. Does pouring represent a birth? Does sprinkling represent a burial? But when we are taken from the element of air and placed in the element of water that represents a burial. When we are taken from the element of water and placed in the element of air that represents a birth, and so, "Born of water," "buried with Christ by baptism." Now, if you would not go to the river and stand up to your waist in order to have a little water poured on your head you can never make me believe that Jesus would do such a nonsensical trick as that.

John 3:23 says, "And John was also baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there."

Acts 8:3, 6 and 9, gives the story of Phillip and the eunuch where the eunuch is converted and asks for baptism, saying, "See, here is water. What doth hinder me to be baptized?" Phillip said, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." And according to the Scriptural statement, "they both went down into the water, both Phillip and the eunuch."

Objections Answered.

Well, now for some objections. We are told that in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles that 3,000 people were baptized at one time, and that there was not water enough in all that part of the country to immerse them and that there was not time enough for the apostles to immerse them in that one day. Is it true that they did not have time to immerse them? Let figures answer. Two thousand and two hundred and twenty-six people were immersed in one day by six administrators, only two baptizing at a time. They took six hours to do it. The above was published in Calcutta January, 1883. This baptism took place at Oongole, India. Baptizing at that rate twelve administrators could have baptized 4444 in six hours, one-third of them baptizing at a time, or if all of them worked for six hours at that rate would have baptized 13,332. For the twelve apostles to baptize 3000 they would only have to baptize 250 each to accomplish their work. Rev. R. R. Williams, president of Ramapatam Seminary, baptized 700 persons in one day without leaving the water. Rev. T. E. Wilson of Munsey, Indiana, immersed 87 persons in 127 minutes. This was taken from the London Echo, July 14, 1899, so that you see that the 12 could very easily have baptized the 3000 if there were 3000 to baptize. It does not state that 3000 were baptized. But if 300 were baptized, and by the 12 only—250 to be baptized by each apostle—it was the third hour of the day. (Acts 2, 15), that means 9 o'clock in the morning, the twelve starting in at 9 o'clock and taking two minutes to baptize each person could have had the work done by 5:20 p.m. But the Bible does not say that 3000 were baptized on that day. It says, "Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized," and the same day there were added into them about 3000 souls, but it does not say the whole 3000 were baptized that day. There may have been hundreds of them baptized anterior to that

but the church being organized at Jerusalem that day they all made their statement, brought in their certificates of baptism, perhaps from Christ, perhaps from John or the apostles or the 70. We do not know how many were baptized that day.

Now, we are told by both Methodist and Presbyterian authorities that there was not enough water in that country to do the work. They did not have sufficient water and the Rev. Mr. Mackay makes the argument that the pools around Jerusalem were used for drinking purposes, and that the people would not be permitted to get into these pools for immersion. That was not the Jewish idea of cleanliness. Well, now let us examine that for a minute. You would almost believe that the hundreds of thousands of people living in Jerusalem did not know anything about water and that water was scarce there. Let me read. The pool of Bethsaida was 300 feet long and 130 feet broad; the pool of Upper Gihon, 316 feet long and 209 feet broad; the pool of Lower Gihon, 555 long and 275 feet broad; the pool of Siloam, 53 long and 18 broad; the King's pool, 15 long and 6 feet broad. Let Jesus speak on this matter. Perhaps He knew just as much about these pools as did Rev. Mr. Mackay. John 5:1-7. Now, there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a pool which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethsaida, having five porches. I may just say that this chapter says that sick people gathered round the pool and an angel was said to come down and trouble the waters and that the people would get into the pool and be healed. And Jesus coming along one day found a man that had an infirmity thirty-eight years, and Jesus saw him lie and knew that he had been a long time in that case and said unto him, "Wilt thou be made whole?" "I have no man when the water is troubled to put me in," he answered. And yet these men will tell us that these pools around Jerusalem were just for drinking purposes. The first one was the pool of Bethsaida, John 9:7. Now this is the pool of Siloam, "Go wash in the pool of Siloam." He went straightway and washed and came seeing."

"The baptizing spot where John baptized has been minutely examined by many intelligent and credible travellers who tell us that here the River Jordan is of considerable width, the waters turbulent, the bottom rock, and close in to the shore the water is six or seven feet deep. Unless men and women in John's time were twice as tall as at the present day, I contend that dipping persons in the Jordan was altogether impracticable, and unhesitatingly conclude that they were only affused or sprinkled with the water of it." (Dipping, not baptizing, by Rev. W. Thorn, pages 18-19.)

Rev. Mr. Mackay, in his "Immersion a Romish Invention," says: "Nor can we for a moment suppose that the enraged people and authorities of Jerusalem who had just crucified Jesus would have put the reservoirs from which the people of Jerusalem were supplied with water for drinking, cooking and other purposes, at the disposal of the hated followers of Jesus for plunging 3000 persons into them, such were not the Jewish ideas of cleanliness or decency." "Thus there were two customary places at which the Jordan was fordable, and it must have been at one of these, if not at both, that baptism was afterwards administered by St. John and by the disciples of our Lord, and it is believed that the place where our Lord was baptized was the upper ford." (Wm. Smith's Dictionary. Article Jordan).

Is Baptism Indecent?

Now, I close this examination with one thought. Those who do not believe in immersion now declare that that act is not only a Romish invention without any support whatever in the Bible, but that it is indecent. Decent men and women will not submit to being baptized by immersion. This is quite a charge and so I will read you the statements. "The fact is

that this old water-logged hulk of immersion is one of the greatest pieces of nonsense and superstition ever heard of. (Rev. T. L. Wilkinson, in his debate, page 67). "Again, I repudiate the miserable dipping business with all the emphasis of my soul. I tell you it is a superstition, it was born and bred in the lap of superstition, and it is not fit as a mere matter of decency to be imported into decent society." (Page 103). Page 34 of Dr. Mackay's work says, "We deny the dipping altogether and sustain the denial by the absence of fact and precept, and the pronounced impropriety of the age, as to the dipping of females into water, publicly by men, it will not do to say that those who practiced the dipping of females by men in the water see no impropriety in it. Females were dipped naked into water for a thousand years, and they who did it saw no impropriety in it. * * * and the fellings of the millions to-day is against the becomingness of the public dipping into water by men."

I could read for an hour but just think. It is tantamount to saying that those who have been baptized by immersion have not a sense of decency or propriety. Is it not time that somebody came out and told the facts regarding this matter? If immersion is wrong, let it be examined. If it is the scriptural mode, then for the sake of the Christ we love let us abandon the church and the parson that declares it indecent, that declares it to be unscriptural and that declares it to be a Romish invention, born in the lap of superstition. This matter ought to be settled, but the funniest thing of all is this. Go to one of these men and they will say, "We will baptize you by sprinkling if you want to; by pouring if you say so, and by immersion if you insist upon it. They would not mind then stooping down to do something indecent if you insist upon it. It is a Romish invention without any support in the Bible whatever, but they will do it if you insist. I tell you when the salaries are at stake some men will do almost anything. Now, I ask you if the Methodist Church took it out of their discipline as being a statement deceptive and misleading, why in the name of common honesty, why would any of them immerse you even upon your request.

I trust that those of you who are convinced that it is your duty to render perfect obedience to the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God as found in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, will come up and hear us in our church at Soho street where we are baptizing nearly every week and where we will instruct you more perfectly that you may learn the law of God and that you may rejoice in the promises that He has made as found in the text that if a man will properly believe, repent and be baptized by proper authority that He will be with him always even unto the end of the world.

The Two Lepers

WHEN I remember that the night is dark and stormy, and that thousands of dollars are expended to bring the greatest talent of the American pulpit and the sweetest singers of the American continent to divide themselves in a number of churches to carry on what is prophesied to be the greatest revival of the age, when I stop to think that this is true concerning our city to-night and then gaze upon the immense congregation before me I feel deeply grateful.

The subject to-night is entitled "The Two Lepers." My text will be found in 2nd Kings, 5th chapter, 13th verse, and reads as follows: "Wash and be clean." Leprosy was considered in olden times to be supernatural in its origin, a direct infliction of the Almighty and a type of spiritual defilement or sin. This may be supported by the scriptures themselves, for we read in Num. 12:10 how Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron was cursed with leprosy in a moment because of her sin. In the chapter from which we have selected our text we learn that Gehazi was instantly, by the command of the prophet stricken by the Almighty with this same dreadful malady.

The Story of Naaman.

Now the chapter from which I have selected my text contains the narrative that may be briefly stated like this:

Naaman, the great Syrian captain is presented to us in all his glory and potentiality. Then, like a death note, after describing the greatness of the man it is said "He was a leper." A little slave girl of the Hebrew race had been brought to his home as a servant for the family. She was a little Former Day Saint, it would appear from the narrative, and while she was far from home and loved ones, perhaps a purchased slave, she had not forgotten the power of God and the love of God, and she straightway bore testimony to this love and power of God by saying, "Would to God that my master was with the prophet in Israel and he would be recovered of his leprosy." This reached the ears of the great Syrian captain, and as it is said that drowning men catch at the straw, so he made an effort to reach the prophet. It is said that he had ten talents of silver, six thousand pieces of gold and ten changes of raiment that he was going to present to the prophet in order to secure his favor. Now, I want you to notice the immense value that is represented in this case. A talent of gold is \$29,160.00; a talent of silver, \$1,944.00; a shekel of gold, \$9.75; a shekel of silver, 75c. Now add this together, see the immense sum he was going to present to the prophet. Six thousand sheckles of gold, representing \$58,500 of our money. I have used the word sheckles where the translator used the word "pieces." History says "sheckles"; ten talents of silver, \$19,440 of our money. The immense gift valued altogether represents \$77,940, to say nothing of the ten suits of clothes. A gift like that would tempt a great many men to change the doctrine, the principles of the gospel to suit the pew. We have read the warning many times in the Bible where men preached for money, divined for hire and made merchandise of the people. Men have been paid to change their views, religiously speaking, and that is largely the result of a thousand different denominations, each contradicting the other.

Well, this great man goes down to the humble hut of the prophet, but notice there was no bowing and scraping before wealth in the case of the prophet. He had a message to deliver and it ran something like this: "Go, dip seven times in Jordan and thou shalt be cleansed of thy leprosy."

"Dip seven times in Jordan!" Immediately the great Naaman flew into a rage, the record says, and he said, "Are not the rivers of Abana and Pharpar better than the rivers of Jordan?" and he started homeward. Now when you stop to think of the river of Abana and the river of Pharpar, fed by the glittering silver streams that flow down the mountains, beautiful, gurgling, laughing, rippling rivers and then compare them with the dirty, muddy Jordan in that section of country, you would hardly blame Naaman. But the prophet had no apology to make for God's message. Neither was he permitted to deviate to the right nor to the left. It was God's prerogative to command and the man's duty to obey, and when he refused to obey, the prophet had nothing more to say. The prophet could afford to be independent in this case, but the leper could not afford to be independent. The prophet did not have the leprosy, it was the other gentleman.

Ready to Pay His Way.

And as he was journeying homeward his servant approached him and said, "Master, if the prophet had had thee do some great thing thou wouldst have done it. How much rather when he saith unto thee, 'Wash and be clean.'" All this sounds like a solar plexus. It struck right home, he could not deny it. Had he not come prepared to pay over \$77,000 to the man? He was ready to pay his way. We have thousands ready to do that to-day. If religion could be purchased the biggest villains on Wall street would pay millions for a seat in the highest heaven. We would have the great men who are crushing labor, who are starving young girls with small wages, who are causing poverty in almost every city, and crime because of that poverty and through which they become millionaires, trying to straighten up with the Almighty by building a library here and there, or giving very largely to the ministerial fund. But you discover in this case money could not buy the prophet to deviate the millionth part of an inch from the commandment of God. Neither could the money purchase the blessing of God, and I am glad of that. But when the great leper listened to the sermon a compunctious throb thrilled his soul. He knew he was guilty, he had been tried before the tribunal of his own conscience and the verdict was guilty. He had sense enough to stop the chariot and give orders "Right about face. Take me to the waters of Jordan." Now let us just imagine if we can in order fully to comprehend this story that one of our great statemen of Canada, Laurier or Mr. Borden or some other great and good man—for all these statemen are good men—let us suppose that he was smitten with this dread leprosy, this foul malady for which there was no cure so far as human agencies were concerned. Suppose that the notice is given out that this man is going down to the dock and that he is going to be immersed seven times in the murky waters of the Don in order to be cleansed of this foul malady. Don't you think that if that news was spread throughout Toronto that there would be perhaps 300,000 people flock to the banks to witness the ceremony. I can just imagine I hear the hoodlums yell "Look at the old fool. He thinks he is going to be cured by going down in that water. Down he goes, up he comes and he is just as bad as ever." And he repeats it six times without any visible effects. Says one, "If he was not a natural born fool he would quit that." But the command said, "Go dip seven times in Jordan." He went down the seventh time and the record says that he was healed, his flesh came upon him as pure as a little child and he immediately went to the prophet and said,

“Now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel.” Now what do you think healed that man? Was it the murky waters of Jordan applied to those running sores? Is it a fact that Jordan cured that disease that had baffled all the physicians of earth. Why, my friend, if there was any healing efficacy in the waters of Jordan, the Yankees would have been over there long ago and bottled it up and sold it for a dollar a bottle to all of you. What was it that healed that man? Now while you are thinking about that, I am going to present for your consideration the very method of that ceremony. I am going to show you that he was immersed right from the histories and I want to be very careful in this because it is a point that is contradicted by many different denominations. I am going to give you the Bible on it and the church historians and the lexicographers and leave it with you.

Dip. The word rendered dip in the new version is taval in the Hebrew and baptizo in the Greek. That is King James translation, the book I hold in my hand testifies that the Hebrew taval, the equivalent of the Greek baptizo signifies to dip. Taval occurs fifteen times in the old testament. In the common version it is rendered dip fourteen times and, pluge once. This is the Hebrew for baptism.

Isaac Leeser, he a Jew and celebrated scholar, renders 2nd Kings, 5, 14th verse thus: Then went he down and dived seven times in the Jordan according to the saying of the man of God.

Verse 10, he renders thus: And Elijah sent messengers unto him saying, “Go and bathe seven times in the Jordan and thy flesh shall be restored to health and thou shalt be clean.” Rachats (Wash) he renders bathe, and Taval, dip, he renders dived.

Spiritual Leprosy.

Now we are going to leave the physical leprosy which was an emblem of sin, and I want to draw your attention to the spiritual leprosy and its cure, and I want to be very careful upon this point for I want you to understand it clearly. You will discover that men are not born lepers. They contract the disease under the displeasure of the Almighty because of their sin, and as has been stated to-night are dead in the spiritual sense. The majority of the Catholic and the Protestant world would have us to believe that we are smitten with the curse of sin before we are born and they tell us that we are “born in sin,” that we are hell deserving creatures from our birth, and that the wrath of God rests upon the unbaptized baby, and that after the physician passes upon the case and declares that the mother must die before the birth of the child, or that the child must die before it is born, artificial methods are used to baptize that child or it may not be either saved in heaven or buried in consecrated ground in Toronto. There was a time when I used to speak to just two or three thousand people in this hall. That day is done. While I am speaking to the two or three thousand here, yet perhaps hundreds of thousands will read these words of mine, for The Sunday World reporter is taking down every word and thousands of copies of this sermon will go through England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, France, Germany and every part of the United States and the Dominion of Canada, and what I am saying to-night I expect to hold myself personally responsible for and I am ready to answer for, so that you see I am going to be placed in a bad position if I misquote anybody. So I am going to be careful, and right here let me say I do not want to hurt anybody. I am here to tell you that the creeds have slandered God and misrepresented the gospel in this question of infant baptism and while some of them are rather ashamed of it now and are not making it as prominent as it used to be it is still the doctrine of the Roman Catholic

Church and a great number of the Protestant churches, and it is a shame and a disgrace.

Now you tell me that I cannot prove that they teach that infants are born in sin and are hell deserving creatures. That is a great charge to lay, I admit it, and if I do not prove it to you from their own works to-night then I do not deserve even your respect or sympathy, but on the other hand, if I do give you chapter and page to prove my assertion, then will it not prove that my position is correct and their's an erroneous one regarding the question of birth, sin and infant baptism. To this task I cheerfully betake myself before you as my jurors.

Doctrine of Birth Sin.

In support of this doctrine of birth sin they tell us that David, the sweet singer of Israel, declared that we were all born in sin and shapen in iniquity, and I have said that David did not say that. Now the issue is a clear-cut one. Somebody is wrong. Who will be the one to decide this? Let David's words be heard. I claim they put words into David's mouth he never said. Though they give the chapter and the verse for it, I still declare it is not there. Now let me read you what David said. Draw your attention to the 51st Psalm. In order for you to correctly understand this, David had committed a nameless crime. In the stillly hours of night he had gone upon the house tops, and looking over to his neighbor's house he saw his neighbor's wife bathing upon the flat roof of her residence. The king sent for her; she listened; was tempted and fell. As a result an uninvited child was travelling earthward. Now to cover up the most hideous crime, David, remembered that her husband was out on the field of battle, risking his life for the protection of David's kingdom. Cunning, wicked David send a message to bring that husband home to cover up his crime. After he had had an audience with him and dismissed him to go home to his wife and family he was very much surprised the next morning to discover that the warrior slept on the doorstep of the king's palace. When the king remonstrated, he declared it was not fitting for a warrior to be at home in the bosom of his family when his comrades in the army were sleeping on the field. What did David do now when foiled in his dastardly work? He gave that man a letter to hand to his general of the army. The letter instructed the general to put this man in the front of the battle and when the danger point came to withdraw the forces from him and let him be killed. It was a cruel, cowardly murder, but the plan succeeded and the man was killed, and therefore never lived to discover the infidelity of his wife and the cruel treachery of his king. Read the story; 2 Sam. 11, 26. David thought he was all safe, but along comes the prophet of God. God holds his crime before him, and David in confessing his crime makes use of certain language that infant baptizers misrepresent in order to prove infant baptism, and now this is what it is. I want you to notice the singular in this reading. I want to show you this has reference to nobody else but David. It does not take the whole world in. It is David: "Have mercy upon ME O God; Wash ME thoroughly from iniquity. Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did MY mother conceive ME." Does that say we are all born in sin and shapen in iniquity? It does not hint at such a thing but just only does this. David, in making his plea for mercy before God practically says to the Lord, "You know I was born under unfavorable conditions. My father was an old man. You know that he was living in the days of polygamy and concubinage. You know my environment. You know my temptations. You know the hereditary taint upon my brow. Have mercy upon me." That is all there is to it, but in order to lug in infant baptism every mother is disgraced and she

is told to her face that the wrath of God was placed upon the brow of her baby who has never lisped a word. I denounce that as a doctrine that has absolutely no support from Genesis to Revelation.

Baptized Before Birth.

I can prove that in this city a child was artificially baptized before birth when the physicians and the nurses had declared that death must come before birth so that child could be buried in consecrated ground, and for something worse than I could read to this audience about it, I submit that you might read the Encyclopoedia Britannica on this question. That ought to be good authority for everybody in this audience. Now the Latter Day Saints do not believe in infant baptism. They do believe in baptism, but they believe that infants are born pure. Now I hope you all get this idea. I admit that we suffer some consequences from Adam's sin, but I deny that we are guilty of the same. Can you understand that? For instance, my father may have led a bad life and as a result I may be born into this world diseased, physically diseased. I bear the consequences of my father's sin, but not his guilt. That we bear some consequences of Adam's sin the Bible teaches, but that we bear his guilt the Bible does not teach. I submit Jesus as my authority, "Suffer little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," "and their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven." While the creeds make the baby the emblem of total depravity, Christ holds the baby up as an emblem of purity and says to those of mature age, "Except ye become as little children ye can in no wise enter into the kingdom." Says one, "Does not the Bible teach infant baptism?" I defy the face of human clay to show wherever God baptized a baby, wherever Christ baptized a baby, wherever the apostles baptized a baby, or wherever they told anybody else to baptize a baby.

Leprosy of Sin.

Coming back to the leprosy, the leprosy of sin. How is that cured? Why, we must have faith in God. That is the first dose of spiritual medicine we take to be cured of the leprosy of sin. The second dose is we must repent of our sins. What does repentance mean? "Cease to do evil, learn to do well, love righteousness and hate iniquity." And then what? Then we must be baptized by immersion for the remission of our sins. Says one, "I do not believe baptism is for the remission of sins." Don't you? "Oh, no sir, I don't believe baptism has anything to do with the remission of sins." No. Well, if that is the case you don't believe the Bible. Let me draw your attention to the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Thousands of people had assembled. They were listening in breathless silence to the words that fell from the inspired lips of the apostles. Under that teaching they were convinced that Jesus was the Christ and they cried out, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Did they reply, go to the confessional box? Go to the penitent form or sign a card and shake hands with Alexander? No. What is the reply? "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." It seems to me you do not believe that. Says one, "Now, Brother Evans, do you think water soaks sin out?" Do be consistent. Let me ask you a question, Do you think it was the water that soaked out the leprosy of Naaman? No. What was it? I have been thinking about it and have concluded that God commanded, as He had the right to do, and the man obeyed, as he had the right to do because he believed in God. Then the man showed his love and faith in God by obeying the commandment of God and God sent a blessing and the leprosy was

healed. Why not try that on baptism? What does the Bible say? There was a man sent from God whose name was John. John came preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Jesus endorsing his baptism, said, "The Pharisees rejected the counsel of God, not being baptized with the baptism of John." Jesus submitted to it Himself, declaring, "Thus it us becometh to fulfill all righteousness." Then He starts out preaching and His last great commission to His disciples was, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Go ye into all the world preaching the gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned." Here belief and baptism are put on equal terms.

Now in closing let me show you that this being made free from sin is brought about not only by being buried with Christ in baptism but after being dead and buried we must be born again. As Naaman came out of the water and his flesh came upon him as a little child, so we who are baptized by immersion for the remission of sins, are born of the water, coming out of the water just as pure as the baby, so far as the defilement of sin is concerned. Let me show you that and I will leave the matter with you. Jesus said: 3rd John, 5th verse, "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." No matter what church you join, no matter how well you can sing the solo, no matter with whom you shake hands, if you are not born of water and of the spirit you cannot enter into the kingdom of God, and if you say that is uncharitable just lay the charge at the door of Jesus Christ. Do not blame the bishop. Don't claim that I have misrepresented it. I have given you the words as they fell from the blistered lips of the Man of Sorrow Himself. If that is uncharitable then He is not charitable. If that is not true then He did not speak the truth. Do not blame me. I am here standing in defence of Jesus and the truth.

The expression being "born again" was not first used by our Lord in His conversation with Nicodemus. It was well known before that time and was in common use among the Jews when our Saviour appeared among them. "When an adult heathen was convinced that the Jewish religion was of God and desired to join therein it was the custom to baptize him first before he was admitted to circumcision and when he was baptized he was said to be born again, by which they meant—"He who was before a child of the devil was adopted into the family of God." This will satisfy every reasonable man who desires only the salvation of his soul." (John Wesley sermon on John, 3, 5 and 7, found in volume 4, page 30). John Wesley believed just as I believe on that score, so you discover he would make a mighty poor Methodist if he was in Toronto to-day.

Was The Thief On The Cross A Baptized Believer?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the gospel as recorded by St. Mark, 16th chapter, 16th verse, where you will read these words: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." You will now permit me to draw your attention to the story of the thief on the cross as recorded in Luke 23:39 to 46. The average parson takes the position that here upon the cross the thief first saw or heard of Christ, and was there and then converted; thus proving that conversion on the death-bed or the gallows is supported by scripture. This allegation we deny, and from the record will bring strong evidence to prove that the thief was acquainted with Christ and the gospel and that he was a baptized believer, enjoying the knowledge that can only be obtained by those who obey the gospel.

Now to the story. "And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on Him saying, 'If Thou be the Christ save Thyself and us,' but the other, answering, rebuked him saying, 'Dost thou not fear God seeing thou art in the same condemnation?'" I will try and present this case as though a lawyer were presenting it to a jury to obtain a verdict, and while I may not be able to give the day and date of the thief's baptism yet link by link I hope to form the chain that will prove that he was a baptized believer.

Thief Had Knowledge of God.

You will have already discovered there is a great difference between the two thieves and the first link formed is found in the words, "Dost thou not fear God?" Mr. Thief, who told you that Jesus was God? The parson says you never saw Him or heard of Him till this hour. Was Christ God? Let the scriptures answer. "Colossians 2, 9: "For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." But the thief continues—"And we indeed did justly for we receive the due reward of our deeds, but this Man hath done nothing amiss." Second link. "This Man hath done nothing amiss." How did he know that Christ was immaculately pure if he had met Him there for the first time? Let me illustrate:

A sick man is taken from the train, hurried to the hospital. The physician tells him he has but a few minutes to live. While pillowed up before the window, the gentle zephyrs blowing in to continue life, he sees the solemn march in the adjacent yard (which, by the way, is the jail yard)—a man, accused of murder is being taken to the gallows to be executed. Suddenly the dying man cries, "Stop the execution. I must see the sheriff at once." Upon the arrival of the sheriff the dying man declares, "I am dying; I have but a few moments to live. I feel the blood in my veins is being frozen by the icy hand of death, but with my last breath I testify to you I know this man whom you are about to execute for the crime of murder, and I swear to you he is innocent: in other words, 'he hath done nothing amiss.'"

I ask would a stranger bear such a witness if he there and then for the first time saw the supposed criminal? Even so we have the thief in his dying moments certifying that Christ was innocent, in the words "He hath done nothing amiss."

Knowledge Came From the Holy Ghost.

Third link: "And he said unto Jesus, 'Lord, remember me.'" Here we have the thief recognizing Jesus as the Lord, which proves he was in possession of a knowledge that the natural man could not obtain. First Corinthians 12, 3, distinctly says that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost. This is supported by 1st Cor. 2, 8, 14, where it shows the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God neither can he know them. And, further, that the carnal mind treats as foolishness the things of the spirit. Yet the parson would have us believe that this carnally-minded criminal had in his possession the most sacred knowledge regarding the Messiahship of the Son of Man.

Fourth link: "Remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom." By this statement the thief is shown to have a knowledge regarding the ultimate triumph of Christ that the average parson of to-day seems to be entirely ignorant of. The parson will tell us when we die we go straight to a place called heaven, far above the skies; or, if a sinner, to a place called hell, filled with fire and brimstone. The thief knew much better than that. He had, doubtless, heard Christ teach His disciples that He would come to earth again, and that His triumphant kingdom would fill the world, as the following scriptures will show: Matthew 6:10; In that memorable prayer they were taught to plead, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth." Acts 1:6, we find the disciples with this thought still in their minds, and they ask Him, saying: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Daniel 2:44, the Lord shows that the God of heaven would set up a kingdom upon the earth that should never be destroyed. This is further supported in Daniel 7, 27: "And the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heavens shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him."

Baptism Precedes Salvation.

Fifth point: Jesus now speaks to the thief, He says: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." If you will consult Luke 16, 24; Luke 23, 43; 2nd Corinthians 12, 4. "Abraham's bosom," so the Jews styled Paradise, the place where the souls of good men remain from death to the resurrection. When Abraham's children meet in Paradise they know each other. This is the seat of happy spirits in their separate state between death and the resurrection. (Wesley's Notes). Whatever your preconceived ideas may have been with regard to this statement made by Jesus to the thief, you will admit that His declaring that He would meet him on that day in Paradise is tantamount to saying he was saved, or born again; or, in other words, had obtained the remission of his sins, and was accepted as a child of God.

The Baptized Can Do No Wrong!

We are met here with a statement that this man was a thief and that this is prima facie evidence that he had never been baptized. Let us see how this will work. Suppose you have a watch. No other watch has the same number as yours. Perhaps your wife's picture is engraved on the case, or you may have other marks of identification. I am seen in your bedroom; your watch is found in my possession. I am found guilty by the judge. Before the sentence is passed I request the privilege of making a statement. I go down into my pocket and draw therefrom a well-worn paper and hand it to the judge. He reads thereon the certificate of my baptism having occurred 35 years ago, whereupon I say: "Judge is

not this positive proof that I did not steal that watch?" For all the parsons declare that the thief could not have been baptized because he was a thief. The fact is supported by scripture, that people after baptism very frequently do wrong. In support of this, I submit the following: Ephesians 4:28, Paul is writing to the church and says: "Let him that stole steal no more." Evidently some of the church members had been stealing. Second Peter 2:12 to 22, we read of awful crimes being committed by those who had been members of the church.

We are told that they had "eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin." They have "forsaken the right way." We read in John 6:66, that when Christ presented to His followers the doctrine of the Lord's Supper it caused a general apostacy and it would seem from the reading that a great many of His disciples went back to the beggarly elements of the world. The apostacy seemed so complete that Christ turning to the twelve apostles, said, "Will you also leave Me?" Peter informs us in Second Peter, 2nd chapter, that those who leave the church will be compared to the "dog returning to his vomit or the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." And so, if it can be proved that the thief was one of those who had apostacized, it would be but the scriptural way of saying that he acted like the sow when she returned "to her wallowing mire," or, in other words, that he would return to the old ways of his former life.

The Thief a Prodigal Son.

Jesus informs us in the pathetic story of the Prodigal Son, recorded in Luke 15:11-32, how he left home (the church) and went back into the world of sin, sinking to the lowest ditches of dissipation. And finally memory's hand reached backward to the dear dead years of his church relationship, and he decided to return. The story goes that the father met him, accepted his apology and restored him to favor, placing the best robe upon his shoulders, the ring upon his finger, and shoes upon his feet, declaring "this my son was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found." Here, I believe, is a perfect picture drawn by the Master hand, of the thief upon the Cross, who had gone back into the world, and upon the cross returned to his Father's house.

To show you the great probability in favor of the thief having been baptized, I submit the evidence found in Matthew 3:5 and 6. "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan and were baptised of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."

I would not argue that because the world "all" is used there that it means absolutely everyone in that country, but a great multitude was baptized. Who is to say that the thief was not one of that great multitude, and that he also was one of those who left the church as referred to by Matthew, already cited?

A Thief Before or After Baptism.

There are two positions that may be occupied on this question, either of which may be right. The first is the thief was baptized by John, or Christ, or some of the apostles, and was a reformed man. Let us suppose as many of our converts do now, he meets with the saints in prayer meeting. He there confesses that he had been a thief, that he was one who took part in the stealing of diamonds at the palace of Pontius Pilate, and that he now was saving his money, and in a short time he would go to Pontius Pilate and pay him for the diamonds stolen. As the result of a good, faithful life this man is enjoying the spirit of God, developing character and prospering in church circles. Let us suppose, as is frequently

the case, this man's prosperity excites the jealousy and envy of a less faithful member of the church, and he secretly seeks an avenue to destroy his brother. (This is not an imaginary matter, for there are many bleeding hearts who have suffered as the result of a cunningly-planned attack by those within the circle of the church.) We follow this green-eyed, jealous member. He enters the palace of Pontius Pilate, recalls the facts of the stolen diamonds and proffers the information that man who took part in the robbery can be found at the Wednesday night prayer meeting of the Nazarene's at Mark's dwelling on the back street, behind the temple. The officers find him there, and he is arrested, found guilty, and pays the penalty upon the cross. For you know the fact of his having been baptized would not secure him clemency at the hands of those who knew no mercy when dealing with the early-day saints. Hence this man may have committed the crime of theft long before his baptism.

The second proposition is that after his baptism, as already stated, he apostacized from the church, went back into the world of sin, was detected in the commission of crime, and, as the prodigal, returned home by way of the cross.

Thief Was Probably an Insurgent.

To show you that I am not alone in the thought that the thief was probably a member of Christ's Church before he met Christ upon the cross I submit the following by Doctor Kitto found in the Gospel Standard for February 16, 1903: "Some eminent writers are of the opinion that he (the thief) was in all probability not a thief who robbed for profit, but one of the insurgents who had taken up arms on a principle of resistance to the Roman oppression and to what they thought an unlawful burden, namely, the tribute money. They are of the opinion also that it is far from certain that his faith or repentance was the fruit of this particular season, (that is, the meeting of Christ upon the Cross). He must have known something of the Saviour, otherwise he could not have said: "He hath done nothing amiss." He was convinced of the Lord's Messiahship. Upon the authority of Kocher and others we can further say that it is a very ancient tradition that the thief was not converted at the cross but was previously imbued with a knowledge of the gospel."

Cannot Enter the Kingdom "Except"—

Now I wish to put Christ upon the stand as a witness in this case. God stated to Isaiah 55th chapter, 4th verse, "Behold I have given Him for a witness to the people." We will now ask Christ to testify regarding this doctrine of baptism, John 3:3-5, "Verily, verily I say unto thee except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Nicodemus said unto Him, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Jesus answered, "Verily, verily I say unto thee except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." I ask, if this testimony be true, that a man cannot enter the Kingdom of God without being born of water and of the spirit, did the thief enter that kingdom without the water birth? It will not do to say that this water birth does not refer to water baptism, for I have already in a former sermon given you a host of quotations from leading ministers and church disciplines that this very quotation is used in support of water baptism. Again, Acts 2:38, Here the disciples are meeting in an upper room. Christ prior to His leaving them promised to pray the Father that He would send them the Holy Ghost, and that remission of sins was to be preached in His name, beginning at Jerusalem, and that when this Holy Ghose came upon them He would bring to their remembrance that which Jesus had taught them.

The Holy Ghost falls upon them and they speak with other tongues to sixteen nationalities represented upon that auspicious occasion. Here we have God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost all engaged in this matter, and the word sent by God through the Holy Ghost to the disciples answers the most important question ever propounded by the sons of men. The narrative shows that a great multitude was converted to the great truth that Jesus was the Christ and they asked, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Here the answer.

"What Shall We Do?"

"Repent and be baptized, everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here is the law plainly laid down under the Father, Son and Holy Spirit through the accredited ministry that baptism is for the remission of sins unto those who have faith and repentance. The parson may say "I don't believe that baptism is for the remission of sins." Christ's reply to that would be, "He that believeth not shall be damned," (Mark 16:16.) Now that we are at Mark 16:15-16, let us finish it. Christ is about to leave His disciples and He gives to them the last commandment and the great commission whereby the world is to be evangelized. Hear Him. He says: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now, if we were to parse this we would say He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; principal clause. "He shall be saved." What person? That believeth and is baptized, no other. Let the parsons wriggle as they may belief and baptism are here placed upon a par, both essential to salvation.

Belief and Baptism Go Together.

It has been said by Paul, "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Some affirm this has reference only to the marriage covenant. We opine that while it has reference to the marriage covenant, it has reference to anything else that God has joined together, and we insist that when Christ here joins belief and baptism together, no creed on earth has the right to separate them, making one essential to salvation and the other, a non-essential. Christ never came to preach, and suffer, and die to establish non-essentials, and hence it is written: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Therefore, we take the position that the thief in order to be saved was not only required to believe, but to be baptized for the remission of his sins, thus making his faith alive by his works. For we are informed as stated in last Sunday's lecture that faith without works is dead.

The Thief in Hymnology.

Having proved baptism to be essential to salvation from a Bible standpoint, and admitting the thief was saved, we are compelled to believe that he was a baptized member of the church prior to the crucifixion. Now we will go to the good and popular sectarian hymn books:

"There is a fountain filled with blood,
 Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
 And sinners plunged beneath that flood
 Lose all their guilty stains.

"The dying thief rejoiced to see
 That fountain in his day;
 And there may I, though vile as he,
 Wash all my sins away."

If language is a science to convey ideas there is baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, and the thief submitting to it and receiving pardon according to that law. Let us see. Here is the fountain which we will call the baptismal font. The blood referred to is typified in the water. He plunges beneath the flood showing it to be immersion. He washes his sins away, therefore, baptism is for the remission of sins.

But where did they get the subject matter upon which they wrote this hymn? You will find it in Zachariah 13:1, and by the way, right in the hymn book this quotation is given at the top of the page and reads as follows: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened, to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness." If my hearers will read the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of Zachariah they will read something like this: The Jews are to be persecuted among the nations, yet they will prosper and finally return to their own land. Let us see how this is being fulfilled. To-day you see Isaac with a bag on his back crying aloud, "Bones and rags." The next day he has a little cart, and the following a horse and wagon. Soon he has a second-hand store and by and by he is a banker loaning money to the nations. If he can prosper amid the great oppression, what will he do when he reaches the promised land where under the blessing of God it yields three crops a year? But we need not look to the future, even to-day the Jew is the money-lender of the world. Well, Zachariah shows that the nations, depleted financially because of their wars and other extravagant methods of modernism, will make a covenant to go up and rob the Jew. They will meet in battle. The Jew is being defeated and is retreating in confusion, when suddenly the old battle-cry that inspired Israel in the days of her prosperity under Joshua is heard amid the depleted ranks. Inspired by an overwhelming force under the hand of this mysterious stranger who has suddenly made his appearance among them, the ranks are reformed—they offer battle to the nations, and under this leader's inspiring commands they win out. At the close of the battle they surround their new and strange commander. Someone recognizes that he is wounded and they say, "Whence received ye these wounds in your hands and feet?" Then shall the stranger extending his form in the shape of the cross reply, saying, "These wounds received I in the house of my friends." There standing before them Israel beholds the Messiah whom their fathers had slain. Then shall be brought to pass the prophecy uttered to Isaiah 66th chapter, that a nation shall be born at once.

It is shown to be a gospel work in that first they have faith in the new found Messiah; second, that they repent, in that every family will mourn apart; and third, that they approached the baptismal font which is opened to them for the remission of their sins. Hence we have the Jews returning to God by the way of the gospel and the cross, and accepting the principles of the gospel which their fathers rejected and which they have continued to reject, as Jesus said they would, till, in their distress, their eyes would be opened and they would say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Baptism Certainly Was Commanded.

The Latter Day Saints have obeyed the gospel as Christ and the apostles taught it, and they insist that no man nor set of men has the right to tamper with the word of God, to change the ordinance presented by the Christ nor to make the commandments of God of no effect. We take the position that the Bible clearly teaches the baptism of believers in water for the remission of sins, that it is a Bible doctrine, and that the creeds have fulfilled the prediction made by Christ as recorded in Mark 7th chap-

ter, wherein He says "Howbeit in vain do they worship Me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, for laying aside the commandments of God, we hold the traditions of men. Full well ye reject the commandments of God that ye may keep your own tradition." Baptism is certainly a commandment. By the modern teaching that it is a non-essential, they make that commandment as Jesus said, "of none effect." Now, brethren, if we are to be judged according to the gospel or by the word of God, do you not think that the safe plan is to render a perfect obedience to the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God, so that when we stand before the judgment bar we can look up into the face of the Judge and say: "I have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine that you died to establish, believing that you spake the truth when you said that the gospel was the power of God unto salvation."

We as a people prefer to stand by Christ and the word spoken even though by so doing we call down upon ourselves the ostracism and condemnation of the popular creeds, believing that in the judgment day if we walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called, with all lowliness and meekness, Christ will say, "He hath not been ashamed of Me, nor of My word," hence, before the Father and the holy angels He will delight to call us brethren, and to bid us enter into His glory. Having with Him carried the cross we hope to be entitled to wear the crown.

We are told if we suffer with Him we shall also reign with Him and so with Him we endure the contradiction of priestcraft, superstition, idolatry and man-made creeds, and hence we have our Gethsemane, our cross to carry, our Calvary to climb, our crucifixion to suffer at the end of which we hope with Him to live and reign. Having preached for you now for seven years, I call God to witness that I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God and while it may have called down upon me the denunciation of the clergy yet I am assured that God by His Holy Spirit has comforted my heart and inspired my mind and made me a blessing in His hands to many thousands. I am content to be ostracized by the society of "Churchianity" if I can at last by having kept the word of God finally enter into that sweet rest of which we have known so little here.

Permit me to say we have no disposition to limit the mercy of God toward the man upon the gallows or the deathbed, but we are not authorized to make any promises to the man who lives in sin to the last hour, but refer him to the Judge of all the earth who will do right.

Absurdity of Death-Bed Repentance.

Before closing permit me to cite to you another doctrine which is voiced in one of their popular hymns. It reads as follows:

"While the Lamp of Life holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

Let us reduce this to practical life. I have buildings on my land valued at \$40,000. The insurance agent tells me the danger of fire, the necessity of insurance, but I spurn him from my door, refusing to purchase a policy. By and by I have spent my money lavishly that should have gone to purchase insurance, but a lightning flash comes and my buildings are burned to the ground. In the morning I walk over the still hot ashes and I chance to strike a burning ember. I look up the road and there I see coming the insurance agent. I call loudly. "Come at once, let not a moment be lost." He hastens to my side. I bid him write a policy immediately for my buildings. He inquires what building, and I reply, these buildings. The poor fellow looks at me as if I had gone insane, crazed by my heavy loss. While he pities me he has no authority to misrepresent

the company; he must act according to the laws and regulations of the company. They have made no provision for the insurance of hot ashes, he is compelled to refuse to write a policy. I then plead with him, saying, "Do you see this burning ember?" While there is a spark yet on it, surely it is not too late to take out a policy?" The insurance agent refuses to comply with my request and you will all say that he was just and right. Now apply that to religion. A man hears the gospel. God's representative minister pleads with him to obey. He refuses, lives a life of wickedness and sin, and finally lands upon the gallows. In the face of the Bible doctrine taught from Genesis to Revelation, and very plainly expressed in Galatians 6:7: "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," how can we as ministers of Christ contrary to all the law, promise that man salvation? Or, in other words, write him a policy on the burning building? I leave these thoughts with you.

Did Jesus Baptize with Water or the Holy Ghost?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 20th chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, part of the 21st verse, where you will read these words: "As My Father sent Me even so send I you." These were words Jesus Christ addressed to His disciples.

The subject under consideration to-night is "Did Jesus baptize with water or the Holy Ghost." In this subject as in many others we differ widely from our friends of other denominations. The general idea regarding this question may be stated as follows, that Christ did not baptize with water but with the Holy Ghost, because the Holy Ghost baptism is essential to salvation, and that water baptism is a non-essential. Now we take a position that is diametrically opposed to that, in part at least, namely that Jesus Christ did baptize with water and that He did not baptize with the Holy Ghost, the abiding Comforter, while upon the earth. There can be no greater difference between two persons, between two churches, or between right and wrong, truth and error, light and darkness, than between these two propositions. One is dimetrically opposed to the other. Both of them cannot be right. Either your speaker is absolutely wrong upon this question, or the popular churchianity of the day is in error. Who is to decide? If the Bible is to be the light to our feet and guide to our pathway it will be able to put us right on this matter, and if the Bible does not settle this matter then it is an absolutely unfathomable mystery. The allegation that Christ did not baptize with water because water baptism is a non-essential is contrary to your Bible on that question, from the fact that the Bible clearly shows that water baptism is part of the new birth, which is essential to salvation.

A Good Witness.

Jesus Christ is my first witness upon this matter, and the record of His words is found in John 3:3 to 7, "You must be born again!" The question comes back, "How can a man be born when he is old?" And the answer is given by Jesus Christ, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man is born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Here water baptism is co-equal with Spirit baptism, which is called the new birth, declared by Christ to be essential to salvation. I am not going to discuss the essentiality of baptism to-night but rather "Did Jesus baptize with water or with the Holy Ghost," and if you reject the witness God sent, namely, Jesus Christ, on this question, then I would not give much for your standing with God, for God sent Christ as a witness Isaiah 55, 4, and if Jesus Christ, is a false witness then down goes Christianity.

Was It Water Baptism?

Now to the question, "Did Jesus Christ baptize with water?" on examining my text: firstly, "As my Father sent me, so send I you." Now, to make the subject as brief as possible this hot sultry night, let us just

examine the scriptures as to how Christ sent the apostles, for if we can learn that, then we may know how God sent Christ, for He distinctly says in my text, "As my Father sent me even so send I you." Now how did He send His disciples? The 28th of Matthew contains what is called the great commission given by Christ to His apostles, "Go you therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." In the 16th chapter of Mark we read part of that same commission, as follows, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here is the great commission to the disciples to go and preach the gospel: those that would believe it and repent of their sins were to be baptized. Here you discover the apostles were sent to baptize, and "as My Father sent Me, even so send I you." It seems to me if that were all there was on this question in this regard it would prove that Christ was sent to baptize.

In reading the record we learn that Jesus was baptized Himself, thus endorsing baptism, by example. We read in Luke 7:30, where He is preaching baptism, declaring it to be essential, in that He says. "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." In Acts 18, 24 to 25, we are told the baptism of John was "the way of the Lord." We discover Jesus submits to being baptized in order to fulfil all righteousness, Matthew 3, 13 to 17. He is preaching baptism as being essential to salvation, and sends His disciples forth to baptize, and the disciples taught it as being essential. In Acts 2, 38, which reads as follows, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

Preached and Practised Baptism.

Now, having shown to you, first, that He was baptized, second, that He taught baptism as essential to salvation, third, that He sent His disciples to baptize, I think it would clearly prove it was essential, and He certainly would not teach a thing that He would not practise, or that He would not do Himself. So that you have pretty strong evidence that Christ was sent to baptize.

Let me give you something stronger than that. John 3, 22, "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized." Now if language is a science to convey ideas there never was a more clear, concise, emphatic statement made to prove any fact, than that, which is here stated, namely that Jesus did baptize. Yet we have men going around with the Bible under their arm, professing great reverence for it and belief in it, singing, "Precious Bible, book divine, precious treasure, thou art mine." Yet when it comes in conflict with their creeds and their preconceived ideas they throw it aside as they would a last year's almanac. Thus we see that they think more of their churchianity and creeds than they do of the plain words found in the Bible on this question, as on many other questions.

"Oh," says one, "It only says in one place that Christ baptized." Well, what of it? Suppose that is true, how often must one speak the truth before it becomes true? That is only a little superficial quibble. We submit the 26th verse of the same chapter, which reads, "And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." Who was it to whom John bore witness? Read the 1st chapter of John and 29th verse, "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and said, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." There is the one to whom he bore witness; the one to whom he

bore witness was the one who was baptizing people; the one who was baptizing was the one who was the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Who was that? That was Jesus.

I now submit for your consideration John 4, 1 to 2, I want you to read this carefully, for here is something where they claim to have support that He did not baptize. Please keep in memory the fact that I have proven to you from the scriptures: first, that God sent Christ to baptize; second, that Christ sent the apostles to baptize; third, that both Christ and the apostles taught that water baptism was essential to salvation; and fourth, I have read to you two positive statements which show he did baptize. Now, let us read the scripture referred to John 4, 1, 2: "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples)."

A Seeming Contradiction.

In the above scripture the following fact is made apparent, that the Lord knew the Pharisees had heard something. What was it they heard? Answer, that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John. The King James translation of the Bible puts the next verse in brackets and makes it to read as follows: "Though Jesus Himself baptised not, but His disciples." This, you will discover, is placed in brackets kindly given by someone as explanatory, but you will notice that this explanation does not explain but is a positive flat contradiction of the three emphatic statements hitherto made, which declare in unequivocal language that Jesus Christ baptize. If you had four or five witnesses that made strong perfect unequivocal statements to a certain matter, and you had parenthesis put in by some amanuensis to explain what was meant that contradicted all the other witnesses, would you accept the explanation to the rejection of the witnesses? You would not. Therefore, be consistent now. You will notice these words are in brackets, that ("Jesus Himself baptised not, but His disciples.") Now, the best translation I ever read of this verse reads like this, "Though Jesus Himself baptised not so many as His disciples." That is the inspired translation by Joseph Smith. Now we have evidence before us. What does it mean? We have four positive statements that Jesus Christ did baptize. We have one of them stating that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John; but another one says he baptised not so many as His disciples; that is to say, by taking John's baptisms and adding them up and putting the baptisms of Christ all in a line the baptisms of Christ were more numerous than the baptisms of John the Baptist.

Now, that is no wonder to me, for if John were baptizing and Christ were baptizing to-day in different parts of the Humber River and you were going to be baptized, which of those two would you desire to baptize you? Why, you would go twice the distance to be baptized by Christ Himself; so that is possible, and it is reasonable to suppose that with Christ baptizing at the same time as John, as the record clearly shows both were baptizing in the River Jordan, Christ's baptisms counted up to more than John's baptisms. But, on the other hand, we have the disciples, that is to say, we have the twelve apostles, and perhaps others who have been called to minister in the priesthood and who were authorized to baptize. Now, by taking all their baptisms together, they outnumbered those performed by Christ, just as His outnumbered those performed by John.

What Authorities Say.

This statement is in perfect agreement with the whole record, that is Jesus Himself baptised not so many as His disciples. To me that is a plain

62 DID JESUS BAPTIZE WITH WATER OR THE HOLY GHOST?

historical statement. Now, you have all these plain statements, saying He did baptize, contradicted by this explanatory. Believing that unprejudiced logical minds will accept the preponderance of evidence in place of this contradictory explanatory. I will conclude this part of the discourse by showing that I am not alone in the contention that Christ did baptize, by presenting the following: "Whether our Lord even baptised has been doubted. We necessarily infer from John 4:1-2, that as soon as our Lord began His ministry and gathered to Him a company of disciples, He, like John the Baptist, admitted into the company by the administration of baptism." (Dr. Wm. Smith, Bible dictionary, Article on Baptism, page 73.) "He baptized in Judea, while John was baptized at Enon." Wesley's notes on Matthew 3:12. Here we have Dr. Smith and John Wesley, who was the father of Methodism, declaring that Jesus Christ did baptize with water. When the representatives of churchanity have the indubitable evidence that Christ did baptize, as presented in the foregoing, they quibble around it by saying, "We know He did baptize, not with water, but with the Holy Ghost."

Another Comforter Sent.

Now, let us examine this position. John 14:16, says, "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever." Here Jesus is promising to send them another Comforter. What is that? The 26th verse gives a plain explanation. It reads as follows: "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name," will send, not hath sent three and a half years ago, but "will send in My name to bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." In the 15th chapter and 26th verse we read, "But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me." The 16th chapter is so full of it that I hardly know how to give you the complete sense of it if I abbreviate. I will endeavor to produce the most salient points on the question referred to in this chapter.

Jesus Christ had been talking to His disciples about going from them and their hearts are sad because of His going from them, and He tries to cheer them up and He says that "because I have told these things unto you sorrow hath filled your heart. Nevertheless I will tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send Him unto you." He is going to pray the Father and the Father will send them the Holy Ghost. To say the least, this is funny language if they had already received the Holy Ghost three and a half years before this time. In Luke 24:49, Christ there says, "And behold I send the promise of My Father upon you: but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Acts 1:4-5, the crucifixion and resurrection have come to pass, they are assembled together in Jerusalem, Christ is with them, and the last words uttered by Jesus Christ upon earth prior to His ascension are now spoken.

When Was It Sent?

It is in regard to the very matter under consideration, namely when they were to receive the Holy Ghost, He says, "But wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith He, ye have heard of Me. For, John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." And He tells them in the three verses following that when the Holy Ghost is come upon them they shall receive power.

An Explicit Statement.

I draw your attention to, perhaps, the most complete incontrovertible statement in the Bible on this matter. John 7:37-39, which reads as follows: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, if any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the scriptures hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive: For the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Here is a plain positive statement that the Holy Ghost was not yet come, distinctly proving two things; first, that He did not baptize with the Holy Ghost while here; second, that He baptized with water.

You discover that the reason assigned why the Holy Ghost was not yet given is that Jesus Christ was not yet glorified. What does this mean? Let Jesus tell us. John 17:5, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own Self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." The truth of it is Christ had promised on several occasions that when He went away to His Father He would ask the Father to send the Holy Ghost as an abiding Comforter. He did go to the Father—He was then glorified—He made the request of the Father; it was answered; the promise was fulfilled and the Holy Ghost came upon them, as recorded in Acts 2nd chapter, where you may read an account of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples and the people that were in the house with them. Peter speaking of that memorable event many years afterwards, when defending himself regarding the baptism of Cornelius and his household, said: "The Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning," showing that the beginning was when the Holy Ghost came and not three years before the beginning began.

Disciples' Early Hopes.

I will now try to convince you that I am right in my contention regarding this proposition before us from another standpoint of reasoning. Last Sunday evening I endeavored to submit to you the history of the conditions that existed anterior and during the time of Christ's mission upon the earth, in that the Jewish people were crushed and broken in spirit as they bore the tyrannical yoke of Roman oppression—the only comfort that they had was in reading the sacred scriptures, which contained promises that the Prince of the House of David would yet be raised up to re-establish the kingdom of David and Solomon with greater splendor and more brilliant magnificance than in the days of either David or Solomon.

This hope was expressed in the lullabies of their cradle songs, in the sermons of their priests, and of course, found lodgment in the hearts of the people who composed the following of both John and Jesus. It was this hope that actuated the apostles to leave their fishing nets and follow the Nazarene. They thought they could see in the dim distant future where they would be enabled to exchange the fisherman's rough garment for the royal ermine of state. They pictured themselves in the magnificent kingdom with Jesus as king and they as the favorite ministers, wielding a power more potential in its character than all the other kings in the empires of the past. This spectacular view was not the result of the promptings of the Holy Ghost, for, as we have shown, the Holy Ghost was not yet given. They discussed this matter among themselves; it seemed to be the uppermost thought in their minds, and, as I showed you last Sunday night, the great question that throbbed in their hearts was voiced in the sentiments so frequently expressed in the scriptures, "Who's going to be the greatest?"

Had Not the Holy Ghost Then.

This human, natural and unholy ambition proved the downfall of Judas Iscariot, nearly destroyed Peter, and proves conclusively that they were still carnally minded, and were viewing things from a human rather than a spiritual standpoint, for we are told in 1st Corinthians 2:9-14, that no one knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God, for the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned.

Permit me to show you that the most potential feature in the gospel economy is the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. Around the resurrection of our Lord revolves all our hopes and joys, but let us see if these apostles were so carnally minded that they knew absolutely nothing about the resurrection of Jesus Christ after He was crucified. One of them having betrayed Him, and another denying Him three times with cursings and oaths, and the rest forsaking Him either through fear or cowardice, till it is written, "They all forsook Him and fled." They moaned out. "We trusted that it had been He which would have redeemed Israel." Luke 24:21.

Two women went down to complete the embalming of the body, for it is said by some that the borrowed tomb was not to be the last resting place of Jesus. On approaching they found the stone rolled away, the body gone, and knowing nothing of the resurrection they supposed the body had already been removed, and meeting a stranger in the dim twilight, whom they supposed to be the gardener, they said, "Tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away." John 20:15. Whereupon Jesus spake her name. Mary, and she became the first witness to bear testimony of the resurrection.

They rushed away to tell the apostles that Christ was risen, but listen, "And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not." Luke 24:11.

After several of the apostles had been convinced by seeing Him alive they bore testimony to Thomas who declared he would not believe it unless he could put his hand in His side, and his fingers in the prints of the nails. All this evidence and a hundred other testimonies might be cited in support of my position that these apostles were carnally minded and were ignorant of the real mission of Jesus Christ upon earth.

Hence, we see the reason why Jesus, speaking to these apostles, said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matthew 18:3. This shows their need of conversion, and that conversion came when they received the Holy Ghost, which produced a change in mind and faith, as also in their hopes and expectations.

Holy Ghost Changed Them.

Oh what a depth of meaning do we perceive in these words, "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses of Me to the uttermost parts of the earth." Acts 1:8. What changes was wrought in these very men when they were born again! Surely the Holy Ghost, according to the promise, did bring to their remembrance that which He had said to them opening their understanding, inspiring their minds, indicting their words. Indeed they were born again from an old existence into a new life.

While it is true they were uneducated, illiterate men, yet under the new birth they became the wonders of the world, they became the most magnificent and potential defenders of the gospel of Jesus Christ known to the world.

Education Not Everything.

In closing let me say that while I do not wish to decry or belittle a collegiate course, a university education, yet I have been at times sorry to hear the claim put forth that no one can preach the gospel successfully, and properly represent Christ without he holds a diploma from such institutions. What the church needs most, what she is suffering from is the lack of inspired men, endowed by the gift and power of the Holy Ghost. I trust the church will see to it that we make this distinctive plea, as stated in the law, when speaking of the priesthood, "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron." Hebrews 5:4. When the ministry is thus called and divinely commissioned being filled with the Holy Ghost then will the church rise and shine and the glory of God shall be upon it to the salvation of the people.

The Blood of Christ

THE subject under consideration, to-night is the Blood of Christ. Permit me to draw your attention to the first chapter of the Gospel as recorded by St. John, the 29th verse, where you will read these words: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."

Now, I desire that you notice this text particularly. It does not say that the Lamb of God is going to take away the sins of the world, but the sin of the world. Jesus Christ made an atonement for sin; that is to say, God's law was broken by man. In consequence the Almighty was insulted, and there must be a sacrifice provided by way of an atonement. If you notice the word atonement and spell it out you can read at-one-ment. That is to say, since by one man sin entered into the world, by one man that sin was to be atoned for, not that because Jesus died upon the cross that the blood spilled on Calvary will wash away your individual sins; that is not the thought suggested here, Christ's blood could not wash away your individual sins committed by you within the last twenty years, because it is impossible to wash out the stain before the stain is made. You might just as well talk about cutting down a tree before the acorn fell into the ground from which springs the mighty oak. The acorn had to be planted and the tree grow before the woodman can cut it down. I illustrate this thought for they say that illustration is better than argument. Suppose a man came to your house to-morrow morning and he said that he had a new kind of soap. You have heard of castile soap and you have heard of Pear's, but this soap he is offering for sale is better than either of those soaps, and he goes to work to tell you of the wonderful properties of this soap and before he finished he says this soap will wash out a stain in the coat years before the lamb was born on whose back grew the wool from which the coat was made. Now, what would you think of that agent? You would form one of two conclusions, either that he was insane, or that he thought you were, and so I take the position that Christ's blood on Calvary shed 1800 years ago and more, could not wash out the sin that you committed to-day, and that is not the sin referred to in my text.

Original Sin.

The sin referred to in my text is what is called commonly original sin, or more properly speaking the Adamic transgression. He was to pay that debt because the whole human world combined could not pay it. He alone could make that atonement, and so we as a people believing that Christ made that atonement do not believe that the guilt of the original sin attaches to a baby. While the children may suffer some of the consequences of the Adamic transgression to a degree, yet I emphatically deny that the baby must suffer the guilt. I stand guilty before God for the sins I have committed and I have not to answer to God for the sins committed even by my own natural father, much less my great grandfathers and mothers, running back to Adam. That is taxation without representation, and you know that the British Empire lost one of her most brilliant children along that lines.

Now, when the record says that John made use of the words, "Behold

the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," he meant this, here is the accepted and anointed of God, that He is to pay the debt of the Adamatic transgression, and so Jesus speaking of His crucifixion and atonement said: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me," John 12th and 32nd. That is to say, by reason of the original sin, or the Adamic transgression, men were separated from God, so by the atonement of Christ, that original debt being paid, men would then answer to God only for their own sins.

Christ's Atonement.

This is made very clear in the first chapter of Corinthians, 15: 22 and 41st verses, where you read something like this, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," that is to say, Jesus Christ through this atonement, paying the debt of original sin, makes it possible that every son and daughter of Adam's posterity will be granted a resurrection from the dead, whether they are saint or sinner, good or bad. All are to be resurrected, but that opens a wide field to us here, and I cannot examine all its corners in this discourse, but briefly let me say, notwithstanding all shall be resurrected by reason of the death and atonement and resurrection of Jesus Christ, yet all will not come forth in the first resurrection. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." On such the second death shall have no power. They shall be priests of God and Christ and shall reign with Him 1000 years upon the earth, but the rest of the dead that is wicked dead shall not live again till the 1,000 years are finished. Rev. 20:4-6. Then, by reason of the atonement, even the wicked dead shall come forth with their resurrected bodies.

This is clearly announced in this same 15th chapter immediately following the text just stated, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," but every man in his own order Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming, and then it goes on to show the differentiated conditions of those that shall be resurrected, one glory of the sun, another of the moon, another of the stars, and as one star differs from another star in glory, so shall the resurrection of the dead be.

I. John 2nd chapter, 1st and 2nd verses touch this thought and is worthy of your consideration: "My little children these things write I unto you that you sin not, and if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous, and He is the Probation for our sins and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." I want you to notice this carefully. We must not apply all scripture to all people. Many of the promises and privileges and blessings extended in the scripture only reach God's covenant children and frequently in reading the Bible and preaching from it, the promises made to God's own children are applied to the world, and that is a mistake.

Christ's Blood Essential.

Now, you will notice here that this language is addressed to "My little children." You will notice the word "we" and the words "our sins." We have an advocate" and then it says "not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world." Now, evidently, that is a mis-translation, and those of you who care to look it up will notice that the words "the sins" are in italic letters, indicating that these words were not in the original at all, but they have been supplied by the translators, and if you will read the Emphatic Diaglott, containing the original Greek text, the words "our sins" are not there at all. In support of this position, I draw your attention back to your own Bible, that gives this text as being in agreement with the text that I have selected upon which to base the foundation of

this discourse. In my text, the word "sin" is in the singular; in this text it is in the plural, and is not in the original. While I wish to make this point clear, I have already stated that the great object of Christ's atonement was to pay the debt of the Adamic transgression, but that was not the only object. There was another in view and that was to seal by His blood the wonderful testament or new covenant made between God and the people found in what we call the gospel of Jesus Christ which is the power of God unto salvation, as stated in Romans, 1st chapter, 16th and 17th verses.

Several of you people have brought me a peculiar looking paper within the last year, which cost you about \$2, and which gave me the right to perform a ceremony that under the law of God and man makes two to be one. You will notice on that paper, called a marriage license, that there is a large red seal attached to it. That is the seal of the governor of the Province of Ontario, and if that red seal was not attached, the words on that paper would have no efficacy and your marriage would be illegal, and so the ordinances of the gospel of Jesus Christ, such as baptism, confirmation, and the sacrament would all lose their essentiality if Christ had not sealed this gospel economy, this wonderful covenant, this great testament, this certificate, with His blood. That which has been sealed by His blood is essential to our salvation, and the man that tries to make any of the ordinances of the church of Christ or the gospel of God to be non-essential, is throwing a shadow over the atonement made on Golgatha's brow, and is guilty of underestimating the blood of Christ. That is way we are told in Hebrews 9th chapter, 22nd verse: "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission."

The Passover.

Now, every denomination must agree with me that the types and shadows of the Mosaic law found their fulfillment in Christ, and so I draw your attention to the great Passover revealed in the 12th chapter of Exodus: "Israel was then in bondage to the Egyptians. They had been their slaves for 400 years. The time of their deliverance had arrived and God gave this commandment to them through the Prophet Moses. They were to take a male lamb, without blemish, they were to slay the lamb, roast it, and eat it, but the blood of the lamb was to be used as follows. They were to take a bunch of hyssop and dip it into the blood and strike the lintel and the two side posts of their homes. God said I will send my angel, and when he sees the blood he will pass over, but upon that house where there is no blood, the first-born must die to-night, and so it came to pass. They killed the lamb. They struck the lintel and the door posts with the blood thereof and the angel passed over every house that had blood on it, but in every house of the Egyptian, the first-born died that night, even every first-born of the cattle died that night. Here was a type of the great atonement, a lamb. This lamb was to be without blemish, so Christ was to be immaculately pure; not a bone of this lamb was to be broken. The New Testament says not a bone of Christ was broken in the agonies of the crucifixion. They were to eat unleavened bread in this ceremony.

Now, what does all this mean? It is a type of Christ. No stranger could eat of that lamb. If there was an alien or a foreigner come into the Israelite's home he had to comply with the conditions prescribed in the law before he could take part in the passover. Here is close communion. Here, by the very unbroken bones, indicating unity. The lamb was to be a symbol of unity, the unity of the family, the unity of nations, the unity of God with His people whom He has taken into covenant with Himself. The unleavened bread, it seems reasonable to accept Paul's letter to the Corinthians, 1st chapter 5th, 6th and 8th verses as furnishing the true meaning of this symbol: "Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a

little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened, for even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

As the blood of the Lamb did not reach these outside of the covenant, so in the gospel covenant. The blood of the Lamb of God will not reach you unless you are born again. Jesus says: "I pray not for the world? But for them which Thou has given Me, for they are Thine." John 17:9.

You will discover this blood was only applied to the house of Israel, or those out of Israel who became Israelites through obedience to the law. Thus, the blood was only a sanctified power to Israel. Paul writing along this line in the 1st Corinthians, 5 and 7, said: "For even Christ our pass-over is sacrificed for us."

Hebrews 9:28, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Notice now, not to bear the sins of every, but to bear the sins of MANY. Jesus Christ speaking in Matthew 26:27-28: "This is My blood of the New Testament which is shed for many," (not for all. "For many for the remission of sins. Romans 5th chapter, 15th and 19th verses: "By one man sin entered into the world, but I abbreviate here, but have given you the sense of the text faithfully. Christ abounded in his sacrament for many." Isaiah 53:11, speaking of Jesus Christ and His atonement, says: "Christ:" "By My righteousness shall justify many." The word Christ is not mentioned there, but my righteousness, my righteous servant, by His atonement shall justify many, is the thought.

There is a text found here that is very much misrepresented: "The blood of Jesus Christ, His son, cleanseth from all sin." I make this statement fearlessly, knowing that hundreds of clergymen will read what I have to say, while I have read those words on clerical cards, while I have seen them written on the walls of the churches, while I have witnessed them flying on the banners of certain religious processions, yet I want to say to those who hear me to-night and to the thousands who will read this sermon that that text is not in the Bible. Notwithstanding they give you chapter and verse for it, it is not there. Now, I know how easy it is for a man to misspeak himself in a hurried speech, and he might do it and be thoroughly honest, but when a man goes to the Bible and professes to copy word for word and then leaves out words in the text that will change the entire meaning of the text, and then starts an argument upon the misquoted passage, it requires more charity than I possess to make me believe that that man is thoroughly honest. I think he is more anxious to establish his creed, which is in conflict with the Bible, than to present to you unadulterated Christianity.

Now, the way they have it printed, the way they quote it is: "The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth from all sin." Do you see the difference? Let me read it to you just as we find it on the cards, banners and church walls. Now, I want to emphasize this, for I want you to see the difference: "The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth from all sin." And then upon that, they put up an argument something like this: Oh, water baptism is not essential; we are saved by the blood; get behind the blood my brother; the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin. It don't say that or hint at it at all. First epistle of St. John 1 ch. 7th, 8th and 9th verses: "But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin." Vastly different. They leave out the word "us," which makes it apply only to the church, and not the world. If we walk in the

light as He is in the light, then the conditions change entirely. That is to say, if we obey the gospel as He taught it, then we are walking in the light. We have fellowship one with another. We are one family.

Now, those who are not in Christ, that is out side of the family of God, outside of the Church of Christ, are said to be "strangers and foreigners, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise having no hope and without God in the world." Eph. 2:8-12. Now, the question comes with full force. How does the blood of Christ reach us? How can we get into Christ's body? His church? Let the word of God give the answer. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek. There is neither bond nor free. There is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:27-29. The Lord here clearly shows that the promises were made to those in Christ. Those who had obeyed the gospel. The apostles were writing to the saints, writing to those who obeyed the gospel, this promise was for them, not the world. As the lamb, the passover, the blood, only was for the true Iraelite in the old covenant, so the blood of Christ only reaches those that are in His body, the church, under the new covenant. Your blood only courses through your own physical body. It does not course through anybody else's, and you use this metaphor and apply the physical representation to the spiritual body and the church is called the body of Christ. Let me prove this before going further. "Now, ye are the body of Christ," 12th chapter 1st Corinthians. Again, "Christ is head of the body, which is the church." Colossians, 1st chapter, 18th to 24th vers. Christ's blood only flows through His own body; physically that is all it did; spiritually that is all it does. Christ's blood does not touch those outside of His body, the church, so that all this talk about the non-essentiality of gospel ordinances, that you need not be baptized for the remission of your sins, nor anything of that kind, because you are saved by the blood, is just so much nonsense. The blood does not reach you until you are baptized into the body of Christ. Before that, you are an alien, a foreigner and stranger from the communion of Israel, and you are like those described in the 12th of Exodus, that, "No stranger, nor foreigner shall eat of the lamb, and the blood shall only be applied to the lintel and the door post of the Israelite homes."

The Witnesses.

I draw your attention to 1st John, 5th chapter, where we read something about these ordinances that I want you to really understand, "Who is he that overcometh the world? but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God. This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and blood." As I have said to you, the ordinance of baptism would have no efficacy had Christ not shed His blood no more than your marriage certificate would be legal without the red seal. And it is the spirit that beareth witness, because the spirit is truth. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." You know Christ frequently in the New Testament is called the Word, so that these three are going to bear record in Heaven, but that is not all. "And there are three that bear witness in earth; the spirit; and the water and the blood, and these three agree in one."

If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater, for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of His Son." Now how do we have these witnesses. We hear the gospel that declares that Jesus

is the Christ, and we have faith in that declaration, faith in God, the Father, Son and Spirit that is to bear record in Heaven. Upon this faith we repent of our sins and are baptized, for the remission of sins, and then we may receive the Holy Spirit. Acts 2:38. The blood has already been shed to make that gospel efficacious: "this is the New Testament in my blood shed for the remission of sin." Matt. 26,28. That is to say, He died to seal the new covenant under which the human family were to obtain the remission of sins.

I want to show this point as clearly as I can, the first three bear witness in heaven, one God-head, one in testimony; the second three witnesses testify on earth, one baptism. If we have the united witness on earth, Spirit, water, blood; to witness that our sins are remitted and that we are born again—been made a partaker of the covenant—sealed by Christ's blood—born of water and the spirit, the same facts will also be witnessed by the three in Heaven. If we do not walk in the light, we will not be born of water and the spirit, and the blood of Christ will not join with the water and the spirit in testimony that we are the children of God. Gen. 2, 24: "They twain shall be one flesh." Mat. 19, 6: "What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." What? Can two persons of opposite sex be one? Yes. For God will join them together that they may consummate His purpose. So God has united the two elements—water and spirit, that they might be instrumental in bringing about the new birth. Since those who are concerned in the natural birth are, by God, called "one flesh," we deem it proper that the factors obtained by Him to bring about the new birth, should be called the one baptism. Eph. 4, 5. God ordained the law that governs the first and second birth.

The Water, Blood and Spirit.

I trust that I have made plain the two important points of this sermon, first that Christ was the Lamb of God fore-ordained to shed His blood to pay the debt of the Adamic transgression, or in the language of my text, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world"; and second, that He shed His blood to establish the new covenant, the gospel, that through obedience thereunto, we might obtain a remission of our own sins, and be born from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of Christ. In closing, permit me to point out to you once more that the new birth without which we cannot enter into the kingdom of God, Christ teaches, is by water and spirit, not water only, as some teach. Not spirit only as some others teach, but here His own words, "Except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John, 3, 3-5. This birth brings us into His body, and there the blood reaches us, and becomes a witness with the other two, as stated, Paul in Rom., sixth chapter, refers to the doctrine that makes one free from sin, and if you will read carefully you will see that the ordinance of water baptism was that doctrine.

This is not only supported by the rest of the Bible, but by leading church historians. He says: "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here is death to the world and sin, and after burial, a new birth, hence, immersion representing a burial, emersion representing a birth. Your attention is now called to Acts 2, 38, where, under the Holy Spirit, the people were told to repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.

Paul, when asking the important question as to how he would be saved,

was told "Go into the city and it shall be told thee there what thou must do," Acts 9:6. Here is an imperative command, what thou must do. And when he comes to tell us what it was, it is recorded in Acts 22-16, where the command is given, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins."

Conclusion.

By way of summary let me say, the blood of the lamb in the Old Testament, the old covenant times, applied to Israel only, so the blood of the great lamb applied to Israel only, his blood coursing through his own body, which is the church, that blood joining with the water by which we have our sins remitted under the promise of God, and the spirit which sanctifies us, giving us the seal of our adoption, and we are born again from the old existence into the new life, transplanted from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Hence, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us, the church from all sin. May we see the gospel, the essentiality of its every ordinance, and walk in the light that the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, may cleanse us from all sin, is my prayer. I thank you.

The Prodigal Son

THE subject under consideration to-night is "The Prodigal Son." The story of the prodigal son is found in the 15th chapter of the Gospel as recorded by St. Luke, from the 11th to the 32nd verses, inclusive.

The story runs about like this: There was a man who had two sons. The younger son requested that the father give him the portion that belonged to him and this was done. He left home, went into a far country, wasted his substance with riotous living and became stranded. He hired himself to one of the settlers there who sent him into the field to feed swine. He was so hungry that he was sorely tempted to partake of the husks that the swine did eat, and no man gave unto him. He came to himself, looking back into the dear, dead past, memory's hand presented to his view, the old life at home with father and the family. He made a contrast between his present condition and his former condition and concluded to go home, make confession and serve his father.

Traveling backward in all the poverty-stricken conditions, while he was yet a great way off, his father met him and ran and kissed him. There was a great jubilee, the fatted calf was killed, the festive hall was decorated, and music was ringing through the halls. They had found the lost chord by his joining in the splendid family harmony, but the elder brother, who had approached, heard this music and the good time, and he began to sulk and pout. He became envious, he remonstrated. The servant told him what was the occasion for the pleasure, and the glee, and the gladness, and the good time, and the party but he would have none of it. Finally, the father came out and pleaded with him and he and the father had quite a time, but the father justifying his position went on to show the elder brother that he had nothing to lose because of his faithfulness. He would be amply and fully rewarded, but that it was the father's good pleasure to take back to his loving arms the wandering boy.

Interpretation.

Now this story has a pleasant and a happy side to it, and it has a sad one, and to this story am I committed to-night, and I want to say—shall I say as usual—that I look even upon this narrative from a far different standpoint to the general preacher. I do not like to differ with my fellow men, but I must if I consider them wrong. Now the general interpretation of this prodigal son story may be given like this. You go to a revival meeting. Fire and brimstone, hell and all that, is just being given out in music and in song and story until you are just about frightened to death to go out, and somebody under the scare comes up "looking for Jesus" to a penitent form or something of that kind and immediately he makes an effort to find Christ. The cry goes up, "Another prodigal has returned." Why, that man is not a prodigal! That man is going to a place he had never been before, and does not fit this story in any particular. While they make it appear that the prodigal son is represented by the man that is just converted to-night, the story shows clearly that this boy is only going back from whence he had strayed. It is not a new-found place, but he is returning home. He had been there before. Now let us go into this carefully to-night and see whether I am right about it.

A certain man had two sons. Who is this man referred to? God, our Father which art in heaven. Now, God is not the father of us all. That may seem strange to you, but I trust you have come here to learn and not only to be amused. When Jesus taught his own disciples to pray he said to them. "When you pray, say, Our Father, which art in heaven." You will read that in Matthew 6, 9. But there was another individual in existence that was the father of some folks. He is introduced to us in John 8, 44. Jesus is the one that presents his case there. Talking to the wicked world who had not yet made their peace with God, He said, "Ye are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father ye will do." Now, I am not going to go around looking up your past history and progenitors and all that. I am not going to make any special references and individualize you to-night. I just leave it with you. There is a certain class that has the right to call God their Father for certain reasons that may be ascertained to-night. There is another class who are the children of the devil, and he is their father. Now that is the Bible doctrine from Genesis to Revelation. How can we tell who is our father? Jesus tells us. "He that is of God doeth the works of God." Again, "Ye are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father ye will do." Now you know who your papa is by the life you are living. There is no getting away from it. If you are ashamed of your father to-night just take your medicine or leave it. That is all there is to that. Does not the Bible clearly teach that in our natural condition as sinners we are aliens, foreigners, strangers from the commonwealth, without hope and without God in the world. That is taught by Paul in the second chapter of his letter to the Ephesians. Then we discover that the unconverted individual, the sinner, the man that is not born again is in the kingdom of this world. They are aliens, foreigners, strangers from the commonwealth of Israel and without hope and without God.

Power to Become Sons.

Now, how do we become sons of God. How? The record tells us clearly and so I betake myself to the task of presenting to you the view as to how we become sons of God for I am going to show that this prodigal was a son of God as he is introduced to us in this parable. We are told in the first chapter of the gospel as recorded by John, 12th verse, "But as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God." By the words "received him" I take it to mean, As many as have accepted Christ as their Redeemer, accepted the gospel as the power by which God has translated them from the kingdom of darkness, the kingdom of Satan, into the kingdom of His dear Son. Paul tells us in the third epistle to the Galatians, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, and become Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Here then we discover that in order to be a son of God we must be born again, born from the old existence, the kingdom of Satan, into the new world, the kingdom of Christ; from the family of Satan into the family of God because we are told that the whole family of God is eventually to be gathered to Him, God being the father of the family and we who are born again His sons and daughters, while those who are not born again are foreigners and aliens and strangers from the commonwealth of Israel and without hope and without God in the world.

Now, how are we to be born again? I have remarked "by receiving Christ, by receiving His word." Well, what does that mean? Why, by receiving the evidence by which we learn the pure word of God and the power of it under which we may be born again. Now you will remember in the third chapter of the gospel as recorded by John, Jesus introduced the doctrine of the new birth. He said that we could not be saved by our

own righteousness. While we may be rewarded for every kind word spoken and every kind deed performed, yet by our own righteousness we could not become the heir to the kingdom of God, but in order to enter into the kingdom of God we must be born again. And when He taught this doctrine to Nicodemus the great ruler, He answered, perhaps, the most important question that was ever propounded by the lips of man even to God. This was the question: "How can a man be born when he is old?" It is equivalent to saying, how can a man become a son of God? How can he be born a son of God and a joint heir with Jesus Christ? Now that is a question that we all should study and it is important that we get the correct answer. There are a thousand answers given to it to-day; nine hundred and ninety-nine of them are wrong. There is only one answer.

Well, how are we going to judge which is the right answer, the one that is in complete accord with the Bible, with the words as they fell from the blistered lips of the Son of Mary. I care not how honest, how sincere you may be. If your reply to that question is in opposition and in disagreement with that spoken of by the Jesus Himself you are wrong.

Baptism.

I go to one large Christian denomination in this city and say: "How can a man be born again?" and the reply comes, "Oh, you must be born of water. That is, you must be baptized by immersion, for the remission of your sins or you cannot be saved." And I say to him, "Well, my friend, you say I must be born of water. Why do you exclude the birth of the Spirit?" and he will answer "Oh, brother, the birth of the Spirit! Why, those people that talk about spiritual manifestations are under some hallucination, it is all a delusion and a snare. There is no such thing as spiritual baptism now. There never was but a couple of cases of that in all the world. We do not have that now."

I go to another very large, respectable wealthy numerous denomination and I say to them. "How can a man be born again?" "Ah, dear brother," the reply comes, "there is only one answer to that, you must be born of the Spirit or you cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Yes, but why do you omit the words of Jesus, "Except a man be born of water." "Oh, brother, oh, brother, you must have water on the brain. Water! What has water got to do with it. You are trying to make out that baptism is for the remission of sins. Why, there're millions gone to heaven without a drop of water."

Now what are you going to do about that? One accepts the water baptism as the birth of the water but discards Spirit baptism, the other brings Spirit baptism into prominence and relegates to the dark ages the doctrine of water baptism as being a part of the new birth. If water baptism is not just as much as Spirit baptism in this text there is not a man in the world can prove it by the Bible. There is no man living who has the right to draw the line of demarcation saying water baptism is essential to salvation but Spirit baptism is not, or vice versa, that Spirit baptism is essential to salvation but that water baptism is not.

Paul, speaking of this great baptism by which we became sons of God, says, in the sixth of Romans, "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. There is the doctrine of the new birth. In a ward, it is called the new birth or born again or regenerated. Christ acknowledges it and we all should that anybody who has come into this world was born into this world. That is how we came. We became the natural sons and daughters

of men by natural birth. But that does not bring us into the kingdom of God as sinners. Jesus teaches that we must be born again. A word to the wise is sufficient, and I do not need to talk too plain about this. But you follow the first birth and compare it with the second birth and you will discover how we became sons of our parents in this world and how we became sons of God in the kingdom of God under the second birth. We conceive the good seed the word of God, for the Bible declares that the word of God is the good seed. After this conception we receive evidence of life because it moves us to repentance. Upon that faith and repentance or the conception of the good seed and repentance we are then buried with Christ in baptism, dead and buried, dead to the world of sin. Here we receive pardon of sin. Now we are dead and buried. Then we emerge from the womb of water into the world anew, born of water.

God as the Father.

Now I will leave that part with you, after showing that that is how we became sons of God, and these two men referred to in this story were sons.

I want you here to see the strongest evidence of God's love for the boy that has gone astray. There are people in the church who, as soon as a young man or a young girl or a member of the church does something wrong, think they ought to get the officers at him and cut him off from the church. "Let us excommunicate him. He is a disgrace to our society." Nonsense. He has a wrong idea that the church is just the place for the good people. The church is the place to bring the bad people and by precept and example throw about them the wonderful influence of goodness till it becomes contagious and they grow good and strong. That is the business of the church. God had not forgotten the boy though the boy had tried to forget his father. He had tried to forget home, he had tried to shut his eyes to the past, but there was a golden nugget within, the nugget of divinity was still there, for once a son always a son. We are told sometimes that when the son does wrong God is practically waiting to hurl him into the fires of a never-ending hell, to say to him "Damn you, take it, you deserve it," and some of them say he was made on purpose for the fire. By all the fatherhood of God I denounce the doctrine of eternal pain, perpetual hate and literal fire. It has no place in that Bible. Only has it birth in the frenzied brains born behind the iron bars of priestcraft, superstition and idolatry.

The Welcome Home.

While he was a great way off his father saw him. Yes, father is always waiting to bid welcome home to the boy that in the storm of human experience has grown seasick. He is ready to throw out the lifeline to help and to save and all the children in the house should be just like that. Well, we follow the story. What does the boy do when the father embraces him affectionately? Does he try to justify himself and say to him, "I am just as good as Tom is." No, he says, "Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before thee and am no more worthy to be called thy son." Did the father go into a kind of theological discussion with him and talk to him about there being one particular kind of sin he could do that his father would never let him up for. No, he did not. That was left for church committees to answer; that was left for theologians to talk. What did the father say? "Bring forth the best robe and put it on him." The best robe. The best robe. Why, he had not deserved it. "He is my boy, he is born again from the old existence into the new life and while he fell under the temptation that led him from home I love him still. Nothing shabby or second-class in my family. Bring forth the best robe and put it on him."

But the boy interjects, "Oh, father, I have sinned and am no more worthy to be called thy son." Did the father on second thoughts say something about "Well, I guess you do deserve to be damned and I guess I will give it to you good and plenty because you knew better and you would not take my advice. Serves you right, I guess I had better damn you straight. I know you are my son, but I had better throw you out." Did he say that? What was the second reply that he made to his son's plea? "Bring forth the ring and put it on his finger and shoes on his feet." To the servants, he said, "Bring forth the fatted calf, let there be music and dancing, my son has come home." Oh, that sounds good, that sounds lovely.

God is Love.

Now back to the thought. When John the Revelator had thought about all that the old testament writers had written about God, and had tried to bring home to his mind, before the vision of his understanding all that Jesus had said about the love of God, when he tried to think of all he had heard and seen and looked for and he took his own pen in his hand and wrote the great last message as we have it in the Bible, he just ran up against the stupendous character of God Almighty, and there dropped from his brain into his pen those wondrous words as he tried to describe God as he saw Him. "God is love," not hate, not spite. Some have tried to make me believe the one in the church who wanders away gets the worst of it and not so much love, grace and pity is shown him as one that never belonged to the family. Stop and think. Would you show more pity, grace and tenderness to one not of your own family, than you would to your own child. That is not true at all, not true at all. Now what was done. The father blessing the boy with the best robe and the ring and the shoes and placing neath him the arms of parental affection, brought him home. Home! Yes, back from whence he had strayed, not to some new place just converted, but brought him back home; the boy that had left the church has now returned to it. That is what I believe the thief on the cross did.

His Loving Power.

Brethren, the love of God is your greatest asset and through it will the prophetic declaration be fulfilled. "Every tongue shall confess both in Heaven, earth and under the earth that Jesus is Christ to the glory of the father."

Let me show you in conclusion the ultimate of God's loving power as it is revealed in the sacred record called His own law. "And every creature which is in Heaven and on the earth and under the earth and such as are in the sea and all that in them heard I saying, 'Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the lamb for ever and ever.'"

Ah, my dear brother this is the New Year night. I ask you to remember when you left the country home, when you walked down the grassy sidewalk and closed the old garden gate, when mother placed her good-bye kiss upon your brow and placed God's book in your hand and bade you be good. You have broken many of those resolutions in the great city and whirl of a metropolitan life. To-night make those new resolutions. Go home again back to the prayer, back to the preacher. back to the religion, back to the Sunday school, back to the circle of home and church.

The prodigal may come. God bids you come. The church bids you come. The Spirit and the Bride say, come. Let not my people forbid their coming. I thank you.

Charity

Being a brief exposition of the 13th Chapter of St. Paul's
First Letter to the Corinthians

IF you will turn to the 22nd chapter of the gospel according to St. Matthew, verses 37 to 39, you will read these words: "Jesus said unto him, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

I have been requested to give you a talk upon the 13th chapter of Paul's first letter to the church at Corinth. I shall during the discourse read the entire chapter, and make such comment upon it as we proceed as I may have time and the ability to do. The text that I have selected seems to be the basis for all true religion. It is said that God is a jealous God. He has the right to be jealous, in the sense that He has done everything for us: "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." Every breath we breathe is the result of His potentiality, of His love, and of His wisdom. It has been truly said that "every good and perfect gift cometh down from the Father of lights." (James 1, 17). And so we are pensioners upon His bounty, the creatures of His care, and the monuments of His mercy. This being true, He has the right to our first, best and truest love; and hence, "Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Out of the first will inevitably spring the latter. Jesus adds farther, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Eloquence Without Love is Vain.

Upon this great and wonderful principle of love, God acts; and by precept and example He has taught us to act upon it, too. And in this chapter that I shall read for you is exemplified and emphasized this great truth: That without this undivided love all other things will not secure to us salvation in the presence of God. So the Apostle Paul in the first verse of this 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians, says: "Though I speak with tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal." Here is impressed upon us the thought that it matters not how eloquent one may be. Though a man were the greatest orator of all time—a Demosthenes or a Bryan; yea, though one were endowed with the eloquence of an angel, and had not that first underlying principle of charity, he would be as sounding brass. Our language would be but a noise like the tinkling of a cymbal. If our words are but spoken from the lips, however eloquently they may be, they but go to the ear; they do not impress men with that lasting influence that serves to the building of character; and, however eloquent the oration may be it is soon forgotten. And if mother asks you the text of the

sermon, you have a hard time to remember it. You can say, "Oh, it was grand!" and that is about all you know of it. But words spoken from the heart, the product of love, go to the heart. However feeble, however ungrammatical, however stammering the tongue of a true witness may be, if fired by love, it finds a lodgement in the hearts of men, and serves to make them better in this life, and consequently, better fitted for the next.

"And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." I do not believe that Paul wished to convey the idea that a man might have these wonderful gifts from God without he loved God in the first place. Not that, I think; but he is seeking to show you that this underlying principle of love is paramount; that it excels, it supersedes, it outshines even the man who could explain to you the deep mysteries, and tell you all about the hoofs and horns of the prophecies of the Bible; and though his knowledge would seem to be vast, and his faith wonderful, yet it all depends in the final analysis upon that wondrous force underlying all these beautiful gifts. All else without it would be as nothing.

Philanthropy a Method of Advertising.

"And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." Now, there are a great many people who think the word "charity" means philanthropy—to be generous to the poor. You help the needy with your money, you spend your dollars to alleviate the suffering of the world—that, to some people is the meaning of the word "charity." Now, charity means that, but it means vastly more than that. There is many a man that gives lavishly to the poor, but who has no love for God burning in his breast at all—he who uses the means at hand to advertise his business, perhaps. We have men in the world who never give a dollar unless their names are heralded in the columns of the press. Mr. So and So gave such an amount to such an institution. And very frequently those men after making a large donation, come into their factories next morning with a face on them as long as the moral law, and begin to preach sermons about competition, hard times, etc., and the result is there is a ten per cent. reduction made in their employes' wages. Steel goes up, on the one hand, oil is raised a cent a gallon on the other hand. And with the hundreds of thousands of gallons of oil consumed daily, how long would it take Rockefeller to make up for the gift of a thousand or two here and there? A change of a cent or two on a rail; how long would it take Carnegie to build a paltry library? The man who could laugh at the agonizing groans of little children as they tugged at their mothers' skirts for bread when the soldiers shot them down, regarding them as a mob, which meant hundreds of thousands of dollars to him. And he could easily afford to get his name up by buying an organ, or building a library, or donating money for the building of a swimming pool or something of that character. I have known men to have their names appear in Christian papers, and within a week drop the wages of the bread-earners in their factories, until in the law courts of Canada the lawyer went fighting for some of those who were deprived of their just earnings, and pointing to the philanthropist said, "There stands a man without a soul!" So that we sometimes need to go behind the gift

bestowed to the motive that prompts the giving. Sometimes it is a cheap way of advertising oneself to give away alms.

Perseverance Sometimes Makes Martyrs.

And so it is written that we may dispose of our goods to feed the poor, and yet not do it because of the love we have for the recipients, or because of the love we have for God. But, says one, don't you think a man would be in earnest if he gave his body to be burned? Yes, he would be in earnest all right, but it is not an infallible sign that he is in love with God or his fellowmen. Frequently he is in love with himself, and rather than give in he would die. There is many a stubborn man who would rather be burned at the stake than acknowledge his error. Men have through stubbornness not only died at the stake when they were in the wrong, but have blighted their own lives, and broken hearts, and distressed families rather than give in. This sin of stubbornness has destroyed many happy homes, has blighted the prospects of many lives. The martyrs who died at the stake were not all good men, when we measure them by the Gospel standing. Some of them were willing to burn their fellows, and did do it; but when the stronger power came and they had to submit, they just occupied the place where they had put others.

Living Martyrs vs. Dead Ones.

There are two kinds of martyrs in this world, and I think that the living martyr very frequently suffers more than the martyr who suddenly, though, perhaps, ignominiously, meets a horrid death. For instance, take the martyrs for their country, whether the cause be just or unjust, they are fired with a patriotic zeal and enthusiasm that inspires them to kill until they themselves are killed in turn. But it seems to me that it does not require a great amount of love for God, or even humanity, for a man, amid the beating of the drum and the bellowing of the brass instruments, to go up with thousands of others and be shot down in a moment, and perhaps die without a minute's pain. These have not been the greatest martyrs even among our wars. I give you a picture from life's other side. I have presented to you the man lying in his own blood, his agony is over; it came without a minute's warning. But look at the mother at home; think of her as she goes down the little garden walk, strewn with flowers that his hand helped to plant. She looks out far into the distance; the postman comes, but no letter from the son whom she loved. By and by the news comes—he has given his life for his country. He is the martyr before the world, but what of that mother who lives a long life with only the memories of prattling tongue, which was like a divine melody in her ears, and of nestling hands in her white bosom? Or, of that wife who pressed the farewell kiss upon the manly brow of the one who swore to love and protect her. She hears the news of carnage and of how her husband has been killed in the battle; and through a long life with her children around her, she brings them up to manhood and womanhood, perhaps in poverty, by her own struggles, through a life of loneliness. There is the real martyr! And, I believe, my brethren and my sisters, that the man who is in love with God, who is in love with Christ, who is in love with the Gospel, who has to take up his cross and deny himself daily, and endure the contradictions of sinners, facing the enemy and feeling their fiery darts in his breast, bearing all the taunts of envy, malice and jealousy that are frequently heaped upon the true servant of God—

that man is a living martyr, and suffers a thousand times more than the man who walks at the beating of the drum to meet his death suddenly. The one man may die without giving any great exhibition of love for God and for his fellowmen; the other man is a standing certificate that the gospel is "The power of God unto salvation." He, as Paul says, dies daily, and is existing as a living martyr because he loves God and his brethren as himself. And in this sense he blesses not the evil propensities of his nature, but is crucifying them daily, hourly, momentarily; and thus demonstrating that he is in love with God.

The Test of Genuine Love.

And now, here are some signs of fruitage that grows on the tree of charity. You may examine yourself and see whether you have this fruitage. "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up."

Have you these, shall I say, Divine fruits, growing in the garden of your life? Kindness is stored away in the heart like rose leaves in a drawer; it scents all around it. It is like little drops of water that fall upon the meadows making them verdant and beautiful. Kindness brightens life, gladdens the disconsolate, cheers the sorrowing, and is a perpetual benediction. There is something connected with it by which those who give it to others the more lavishly, become the more endowed with it themselves. Here is a clear case where giving does not impoverish, where withholding will not enrich. Brotherly kindness is said to be one of the Christian graces. It costs very little to be kind, and yet it is invaluable to the recipient, a leverage by which you may ameliorate the condition of those who perhaps are far beneath you.

The Inevitable Remorse of Unkindness.

Ah! How often people neglect to brighten the life of those around them by words and deeds of kindness. How often are they not only thoughtless but even cruel to those around them, till death calls the neglected one away; then they would give all they possess to recall the past, but it is too late. Ah! what a hell such must suffer. Just think, the pangs of an accusing conscience probing you through the sad and lonely years; tried at the tribunal of your own conscience and found guilty.

There is many a wife to-night that would almost drop dead with surprise if the husband should bring her home a bouquet of flowers. You never gave her one since the day of your marriage, and you will not place another in her hand till it is cold in death. My friends, just make that little change and see the difference it will make. Kindness is a flower that will fill your home with the aroma of happiness. I was called to preach a funeral sermon over a poor woman a few years ago. I entered the chamber of death and there sobbing near her bier was the husband. Every few minutes he would sob, "Oh, Mary, come back to me." He fairly covered her coffin with broken wheels and gates ajar; but it was too late. He had helped to hurry her to her lonely place in the silent city.

This sad scene reminds me of a little poem that was found under the pillow of a woman after they had taken her body to another room. She had written the words amid her agony and sobs. They read as follows:

Love me now, while I am living; do not wait till I am gone.
 And then chisel it in marble; warm love-words on ice-cold stone.
 If you wait 'till I am sleeping, ne'er to waken here again
 There'll be walls of earth between us and I could not here you then.
 I won't need your kind caresses when the grass grows o'er my face.
 I won't crave your love and kisses in my last low resting place.

Envy Defined.

Charity envyeth not." What is envy? Envy began with Satan in Heaven. Nothing pleased him there. He found fault with everything around, and by and by was cast out of Heaven. And then he was envious of the innocence and of the purity and of the goodness of Adam and Eve; and hence he sought to work their destruction. So it is said, "Envy has made devils out of angels." How careful we ought to be to avoid that awful curse which follows in the wake of the envious. Envy is produced by the excellency of another. Envy is the expression of inferiority, the avowal of deficiency, the homage paid to excellency. Envy is fixed on merit; and like a sore eye is offended with anything that is bright, so envy is offended with anything that is good. Any man who develops character makes enemies; any man who stands for the right, and is successful, makes enemies. Someone has said, "A radiant genius calls forth a storm of peevish, biting, stinging insects, just as the sunshine awakens the world of flies." If you see a man or woman in any branch of life who has good prospects of becoming a success, his fellows, who will not make the necessary sacrifice to acquire and develop the same standing, at once become envious. Now, it is scarcely ever that the blacksmith envies the king, but you will find the poor blacksmith envying the good blacksmith. There are those who, if they hear somebody speak well of a man who has developed character, and made his mark in the world, cannot stand it; and these are bound to say something nasty, something vile about that man, to spit out venom, to give out insinuations that are calculated to destroy confidence and to murder faith, and thus bring about suspicion and ruin. My friends, that has been the case over and over again since Cain murdered Abel. Envy is one of the great sources of evil; it is the twin brother of slander; the result is always disastrous when a man becomes envious. Why, I have seen it go so far that a man envious of another has said, seeing that other man's picture hanging on the wall, "Your god is coming, get down and worship." And then would come the slander.

The poet has spoken of slander in the following terms: "Slander, whose edge is sharper than the sword; whose tongue outvenoms all the worms of Nile; whose breath rides on the posting winds of death, belies all corners of the world. Kings, queens and states, maids and matrons, in the secrets of the grave this viper slander enters." It has destroyed homes; it has ruined neighborhoods; it has blasted congregations; it has depleted the ministry of its spirituality and has produced more sorrow, misery, agony, and bloodshed than the triune enemy, war, pestilence and famine.

The Humility of Love.

"Charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up." The man who is working because he loves God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself—he is not a "vain babblers"; he will not be "puffed up" at the recep-

tion of flattery; he will not be jealous and envious because someone else is accomplishing something; he will not puff himself up to be greater than his neighbor. But he will be unassuming, he will be modest, he will be retiring, he will be like the primrose flower. You know the difference between the primrose and some other roses. Some roses blossom and bloom in the sunlight; the primrose blooms at night, when it cannot be seen. So there are men and women who do not puff themselves up and appear big and strut around when the audience is there; but when there are floors to clean and chimneys to polish, seats to dust, the sick to visit, the poor to be cared for; when the night of adversity sheds its gloom upon such as are unfortunate, there you will see these angels of mercy, these ministers of Christ. Even in their penury they will go with their loaf of bread; purchase a few choice tomatoes, half a dozen oranges; or, it may be, but a bouquet of flowers plucked by the wayside, to the home of the sick and the impoverished. Or you will see them in the church quietly working away, without an eye to gaze upon them—only the eye that never sleeps. There is the man that is the personification of charity, which is the pure love of God.

Wreckage Caused by Bad Temper.

“Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil.” How many of us are sunshine Christians when everybody is patting us on the back! We have got religion when everything comes our way; we have got a smile on our faces then as long as the moral law. But the very moment that something comes up that we have not probed to its depths, that we have not measured, that we do not understand, then we fly off into a temper. We are not going to give in; we are going to run this institution. How much of this spirit is seen in the world, until homes are wrecked, branches of the church are distracted, communities are set into commotion, bringing about tattle, scandal, slander, evil talking; until the whole church, or community, or family is injured.

Unity Wins the Victory.

Did it ever occur to you how you could get even with a mean man? You cannot do so unless you get to be as mean as he is. That is how horses get even with each other. Speaking of malice, I might suggest a nice little story I heard a little time ago, and it goes right to the heart of this matter. It is said that in a certain country there are a great many wolves. Sometimes these wolves would get so hungry that they would actually attack the mules that were grazing in a field hard-by. And the mules seemingly reasoned the thing out among themselves, and they got all their heads together. The result was that when the wolves made an attack they were kicked to death. But suppose, now, that these mules had just put their feet together and started to kick each other, and bray at the wolves, putting their heads toward the danger. They would have been destroyed.

There is a lesson here that will only cost you just what the collection amounts to to-night. Learn it right now. When you put your feet together as a congregation, whether it be a church congregation or a lodge congregation or any other assembly, and you start to kick each other, the foe will win out against you. If you put your heads together where you can feel the warm beating of love and sympathy and confidence and trust,

the powers of hell cannot shake this bond of unity. Let us learn this lesson.

Sympathize With the Fallen.

“Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.” How often, how often, we are opposite to this, even in church work. When someone makes a mistake, when someone in the cold, dark night, in the fierce storm of human struggle with sin, slips and falls, and some dear old gossip rises to say, “I always thought that of her; I knew it was coming; what did I tell you? It served her right; her mother wasn’t any better; what could you expect? I always thought there was something behind that creature; I never did think that she should associate with us folk.” “Rejoiceth not in iniquity.” I will tell you that the man or woman who always thinks bad about people, is living in the dirt, or they would not think the worst evil about one who makes a mistake. It will be the bad persons in the audience who denounce the fallen ones, and the good people will begin to pity them, to sympathize with them, to search out some method by which they can help them. Oh, this world is dying for a drink of the milk of human kindness, of fellowship, of love, of tenderness. We are too cold with each other; we are too unrelenting to those who have made mistakes. Someone has said, “Speak gently to the erring, you may not know the power with which the dark temptation came, in that unguarded hour. You may not know how bravely she struggled, or how well, until the hour of weakness came, and sadly there she fell.” “Let him that is without sin cast the first stone,” was the answer of the Christ to those who knew no pity for one whom, presumably, they themselves had helped to wreck. Christ wrote the woman’s sin in the sands; he chisel it on marble—imperishable—marble—till she and her posterity is hurt by the blows we deal.

Misplaced Blame.

Alas! too often a man’s mistakes are written in the sand, and we excuse him by saying such as, “Young blood,” “wild oats, and we hush it up. The robber is excused, but the one who is robbed of all that makes life worth living is ostracized. Mark you, I do not wish to gild the crime or excuse it, but I am here to say that the virgin whose honor is despoiled, the honor that makes her dear, suffers enough without you adding to her sorrows. Indeed, I just paint this picture because Christ painted it—not to excuse sin. While you hate the sin, love the sinner—that is Christ’s way. With all your knowledge and faith and ability, unless you are endowed with that wonderful love that will represent Christ in you the hope of glory, you will fail. Having known no mercy, mercy will not claim you under her protecting wing when you at last stand to be judged.

Love’s Triumphant Note.

“Charity beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.” That shows us that if we have the love of God, which begets within us an undying faith, that all things will work together for good. If we are in love with God we can then endure and bear all things; and the hope that shines within us will illumine the pathway notwithstanding our enemies’ taunts.

“Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. This does not mean that the gift of tongues, which is one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, shall be no longer needed in

the church during our development in this mundane sphere. It does not mean that prophecies will be taken out of the church. It clearly shows that in this life they will continue, but there is a time coming when there will be no prophecy, because time will give place to eternity. You will not have to foretell future events—there will be no future; we shall be dwelling in an ever-living present. Then we shall have no need of the gift of tongues, which, as Paul teaches elsewhere, is a sign to the world and a great blessing to the church. Jesus came to give the world one pure language, so that we shall not have any further need for the gift of tongues the great future. And Paul clearly announces this in the next verse: "For we know in part, and we prophecy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then (and mark you, not till then) that which is in part shall be done away." What is meant by "that which is perfect?" When Christ comes, when the new heaven and the new earth are before us, when death and sin have vanished, when the gospel has done its work, when all is perfect. Then we shall not have these things that are given to us in this life to produce perfection.

Limitations of the Finite.

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things." Showing that in this life God gives us that which is adapted to the spiritual development of man; but when we reach the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ conditions will change. And so the apostle continues, saying, "For now (that is, in this life) we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." My friends, I cannot pass this by without just making this observation: If we would only remember at all times that in this life the best of us are shortsighted; we know in part; we are here on the shore. Some of us dabble in the waters, and pick up a bright stone here and there; but we forget that the fathomless ocean is spread out before us, into which we cannot delve. We know a few things, but, oh, how limited our knowledge really is. None of us ought to be puffed up; none of us ought to speak "ex cathedra." Let us, rather, with tenderness and humility and loving kindness act well our parts in the drama of humanity, recognizing that at best we are but circumscribed in regard to what we know. Let us also remember that if that love of God permeates our souls, then by and by when the mists have rolled away we shall see Him face to face; we shall know as we are known. There are so many things we thought we knew, but time has proved that we did not. And still we must travel the thorn-clad path of investigation, learning if we would develop. Moreover, there are things that we hold to to-day that we must abandon if we would progress, for we see but through a glass darkly.

And the closing phrase has it, "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." Paul does not minimize the beauty and the strength of Faith and Hope, but there shines undimmed through all eternity the golden link that binds earth to heaven, that binds humanity and divinity—that white-robed angel of Charity.

Charity and Love—Interchangeable Terms.

What is charity? Charity is the pure, unadulterated love of God. Tyndall's Bible translates the word 'charity' to mean love, and your revised version of 1881, wherever the word 'charity' is found in King James'

translation, translates it 'love.' And so, my brethren, let love be your watchword. When the Apostle John was old, with his years full of experience, he was looking over the history of the past, to try to find something fully to describe God, the Divine Architect of the universe, the Source of all good, he was just astonished when the words of inspiration came giving him this description: "God is love." May we all fall in love with each other—that pure, unadulterated love that will make us one. This is the one way by which we can show that our mission to the world and the great missionary church is not a failure; in that Jesus said, "By this sign shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one toward another."

The Laying On Of Hands

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 13th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and the 41st verse where you will read these words: "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe though a man declare it unto you."

With this prophecy and warning before us it behooves us to be careful to examine that which is presented for our consideration, along religious lines especially, in order that we might find out that which God has put his signet of approval upon and be able to reject that which is man-made in its character. We are warned by the Master of man Himself, and by those inspired by the Almighty, that men in the latter days will turn away the people's ears from the truth and turn them unto fables, and that the time will come that they will not endure sound doctrine. 2 Tim., 4; 3-4.

The doctrine of the laying on of hands is perhaps as limitedly understood as any doctrine presented in the Bible. Many churches discard it entirely; some acknowledge it in part but deny the power that it commands and so they are more inconsistent than those who have discarded it entirely. The second class comes under the statement as given in the Bible wherein it is said: "Having a form of godliness but deny the power." We are told that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, or in other words the great plan inaugurated by the Almighty so that by obedience to it the human family might be saved and Paul tells us our gospel came not in word only but in power and with the Holy Ghost and much assurance; and a gospel without the power, a gospel that does not bring the same assurance that God promised to grant to those who would obey his gospel, is a spurious gospel and should be abandoned. If ever there was a time in the history of this world when God should set His signet of approval upon His own work, it is now. In the mass of confusion the conglomerated state of modern churchianity to-day is the laughing stock of infidels from the rivers to the ends of the earth. If you had a coat with as many colors to-day as you have churches that conflict with each other, Forepaugh would have it as his chief attraction for the summer of 1911. We have one set of people in the Dominion telling you that this city is going to be awakened as it never was before under some new scheme of revivalism and at the same time darkly hinting that the ones we have had before were not in it. That is what I have been telling you for seven years and you are beginning to say amen to it now. Oh, my work has not been in vain. We have one of the greatest Methodist preachers in America, as reported last week in Toronto papers, giving the cold shoulder to the very thing that others are telling you is the last and best thought of God Almighty.

Signet of God's Approval.

Now, in this conglomerated state of confusion we ought to have

something authoritative, something with the signet of God's approval upon it, and in this doctrine or through this doctrine of the laying on of hands comes the signet of God's approval, and through this ordinance comes the authority of God to man. Now let me say something very plain to you. I have been reading the Bible for a number of years and I cannot in the face of my responsibility to God and to you, refrain from telling you that I have no evidence that any man ever was divinely commissioned to preach the gospel unless he was ordained by the laying on of hands, and that God nowhere has promised to give us the Abiding Comforter, the gift and of power, of the Holy Ghost by which we may know the things of God only as it is given through the laying on of hands. Under this ordinance God has ordained that the Holy Ghost is to be given by which we may know that Jesus is the Christ. Through this ordinance the spiritual gifts, such as tongues, prophesy, the healing of the sick and the wonderful potentialities of divinity, were displayed in the Early Day Saint Church and should be established and recognized in the Latter Day Saint Church. And by these terms Early Day Saint Church and Latter Day Saint Church I mean the true Church of Christ in former and in latter times. Paul tells us in the second chapter of First Corinthians that the natural man cannot understand the things of God, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned and to the carnal mind the things of God appear foolish. Therefore we cannot comprehend God by a university education. Now mark me well. I do not wish to speak a disparaging word against education, but as Josh Billings once said, "Book larnin' ain't education." We have men that are crammed with book education that are helpless parasites on ma and pa or somebody else as long as they live, and to demonstrate that Scholastic education cannot settle this religious question I have only to make this statement to convince you all. Some of the best educated men we have in the world are Roman Catholic priests. Some of the best educated men we have in the world are Episcopalian clergymen; some of the best educated men in the world are Methodist preachers, are Presbyterian preachers, are Baptist preachers. And let me tell you that their education has taught them to differ as widely upon the ordinances of the Church of Christ and the doctrine of Jesus, as the poles, so that education does not settle this question.

Doctrine of Jesus Christ.

"The natural man cannot understand the things of God, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." So God has devised a plan by which His Holy Spirit shall be given that will guide men into truth and reveal to them the things of God, and that plan is found to be a perfect obedience to a perfect law that emanated from the perfect God, which is called the gospel of Jesus Christ or the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Now one of the fundamental principles of the doctrine of Jesus Christ is the laying on of hands. You will read that in Hebrews 6:1-3. I remember a number of years ago when the now famous General Booth came to London, Ontario—I was but a boy, but I had my say you know even then—and when I had had my say, he said: "Oh, God, save us from doctrine, we do not want any doctrine, we want to keep behind the blood." Yet the Bible says, "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God." This is found in the Second Epistle of John, 9-10 v. Again, "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine and by so doing thou shalt save thyself and them that hear

thee," was Paul's instruction as found in 1st Timothy, 4, 13-16. So the preachers that don't want any doctrine don't want God, don't want Christ, don't want the Holy Ghost.

Blessing of Little Children.

Now I am going to discuss the doctrine of the laying on of hands from four different points. First, the laying on of hands for the blessing of little children. If you go away back to Genesis the first book of the Bible, 48th chapter, 8-20 you find where God inspired His Servants to lay hands upon the children and bless them and in prophecy futurity was opened to them away down through the mists of unborn time. Coming down to the New Testament we find Jesus endorsing this in the 10th chapter of Mark and in the 19th of Matthew, where He took the children, laid His hands upon them and blest them, and you remember Jesus said: "The works that I do, shall you do." "Well," says one, "We don't bless babies by the laying on of hands, we baptize them." "Yes, why do you do that?" In doing this you fulfill the prophetic declaration of the Son of Mary Himself when He said: "By the tradition of your elders you make the commandments of God of none effect." Mark 7th 3-13. Who authorized either the Catholic or the Presbyterian churches to do away with the laying on of hands for blessing children, and instituted in its place infant baptism? I again remark THERE IS NOT A MAN LIVING CAN PRODUCE A SINGLE SCRIPTURE THAT WILL SHOW WHERE GOD EVER BAPTIZED A BABY, WHERE CHRIST EVER BAPTIZED A BABY, WHERE THE APOSTLES EVER BAPTIZED A BABY OR WHERE THEY AUTHORIZED ANYBODY ELSE TO BAPTIZE A BABY. Why is it that this statement can go out to hundreds and thousands of people through the publication of my sermon in The Sunday World, and not a single preacher fling back into my face a single passage of scripture to prove I am wrong in this regard? That should be an eye-opener.

Infant Baptism.

Now right here let me digress for a moment from the subject. Last Sunday night I made a statement here that I had the evidence from the books and sermons of leading men such as John Wesley of the Methodist Church, John Calvin, and the Church of England prayer book. The sermons of Wesley were all given chapter and verse wherein they show that babies were born in sin, that the wrath of God is upon them and that they will be damned unless baptized. The reporter got me almost perfectly but in some way I think a sheet slipped away from the compositor and a lot of the evidence was not given in my sermon published to-day. If I don't get too long winded to-night that part may be inserted just about here in this sermon, and if I do get too lengthy in this discourse I shall promise you at no distant period to deliver a lecture on infant baptism when all these quotations will be fully set out before you. I regret they were not in last Sunday's sermon, but I cannot help it. So I pass that by now, I want to just support my contention that infant baptism is the work of man and has no right to take the place of the laying on of hands for the blessing of children, by one historic statement which I read for your consideration. Curcelleus in his Religious Institute says, "Baptism of infants in the first two centuries after Christ was altogether unknown, but in the third and fourth centuries it was allowed by some few. In the fifth and following centuries it was generally received. In

the former age no trace of it appears AND IT WAS INTRODUCED WITHOUT THE COMMANDMENT OF CHRIST." Now, all I wish to say on this question is that I have shown you both from the Old and the New Testament the direct practice of Jesus Christ in two cases where children were blest with the laying on of hands and hurl a defy for any face of human clay to give us a single Bible statement that proves infant baptism. It is a relic of the dark ages, and is a standing reflection upon the atonement of Jesus Christ, for from His blistered lips fell the words, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven and their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." I leave that part of it with you.

Ordination.

I now introduce to you the scriptures in favor of the laying on of hands for the ordination of the ministry. The Bible certainly teaches it. Numbers 27: 18, 23, Moses ordained Joshua by the laying on of hands. Numbers 8: 10 and 11 show that the Levitical priests were ordained by the laying on of hands. In John 15 and 16 Jesus there states: "Ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you and ordained you," speaking to the twelve apostles. In Acts 6, 1-6. Seven deacons—some call them bishops—were ordained by the laying on of hands. Paul in 1st Timothy, 2-7, says he was ordained a preacher and an apostle and I will close this part of the discourse by quoting 1st Corinthians, 7-17 where Paul tells us "that as God has called ministers so he ordained them in all the churches."

Now I draw your attention to the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and you read something like this: That Phillip went down there and preached the gospel and a number of people believed it, repented of their sins and were baptized. There was a gifted gentleman came that way by the name of Simon and he asked for baptism and it was granted. After baptism, Peter and John, two of the apostles, came down from Jerusalem, laid their hands upon the people that had been baptized and they received the Holy Ghost, and now let me correct a common error. People say that Simon when he saw the wonderful power, offered the apostles money, thinking he could purchase therewith the Holy Ghost. But that is a miserable mistake; he never offered to pay one nickel for the Holy Ghost. Simon was just in the same predicament as I have read of other men in the nineteenth century. He was trying to buy what is called a living, he was trying to buy a position in the ministry. Listen to him, "And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given he offered them money saying, give me also this power that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost." Peter fastened his eyes upon him and said, "Repent, for thou art still in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity. Thou has thought that the gift of God could be purchased with money." There are thousands in that boat to-day. They think that they can purchase the gift of God with money. Simon wanted to buy the authority of priesthood, the right to lay his hands upon the people that they might receive the Holy Spirit as he had seen the apostles do it. Now in this quotation there are two points proven, I think, quite clearly. First, that in the days of the apostles the Holy Ghost was given by the laying on of hands. Second, that that man tried to buy the priesthood, the right, the authority that would entitle him to the privilege of laying on hands as he saw the apostles do it. I draw your attention to just one other quotation found in the 19th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles,

wherein he says something like this: Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus and finding certain disciples there he said unto them, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" and they said, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Paul said unto them, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" And they said: "Unto John's baptism." Then said Paul: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." The truth is they had not been baptized by proper authority. They had been baptized presumably by somebody professing to represent God and they concluded about all there was to it was going down into the water and coming out of it. But they had not divine authority. The Holy Ghost did not sanction their work, did not put the seal of God's approval upon their work, and when Paul had so argued with them they were converted to the Christ's gospel of former day saintism. And then Paul baptized them and laid his hands upon them and the record says they received the Holy Ghost. This is the Bible doctrine. Let me ask of you, brother mine, you have believed, you repented and tried to turn over a new leaf, you have been up to the penitent form once or twice and got warmed over. You have helped to contribute now and then to an extra \$35,000 to make a spread in revivalism. You have been baptized some of you by professed ministers of Christ. Now let me ask you the question Paul propounded to those men. Have you received the Holy Ghost as they received it? Do your parsons say to you as Paul said, "Now concerning spiritual gifts brethren I would not have you ignorant." No, they wish to keep you ignorant by telling you they are no longer needed. You have got the Holy Ghost they say, but it don't act like it used to act. They tell you that when the Holy Ghost came eighteen hundred years ago one spoke with tongues under its power, another prophesied under its power, another laid hands upon the sick and they were restored, another was wrapped in visions till the things of futurity were opened to their gaze under its power. Oh, yes, the preachers says, that is what used to be, but it is all done away with. "What? You have the Holy Ghost but it don't act like it used to!" The Holy Ghost is one of the Godhead and never changes, is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

An Illustration.

Suppose that I was to tell you that I have some first class anthracite coal and you buy a ton and put it in the furnace and it won't burn. It doesn't produce a flame, it won't give forth heat. You can't even get it to smoke and finally you come down to me and you say, "Say, what is the matter with that coal I bought of you?" "Oh, it is the finest anthracite coal," I answer. "Well, I can't get it to burn." "Oh, it won't burn, oh no, that old idea of coal burning is done away with. It used to produce heat, but it doesn't any more. Oh that is the old-fashioned way, but we don't need that any more."

It strikes me you won't buy another ton from me. You would conclude if you did not need the heat I did not need the \$7 per ton. Now, brethren, it is the sign of priestcraft, superstition and idolatry and the most damnable deception ever palmed off upon the credulity of the people to tell you with one breath that God is the same and His promises never fail, that the Holy Ghost is the same to-day as ever and that you may receive it if you will only repent, and then with the next word when you

go to read the wonderful promises contained in that Bible that to one is given by the spirit wisdom supernatural, to another supernatural knowledge, to another the gift of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues, to another power to work miracles, to another the power to have the very heavens opened to him, for when the Holy Ghost is given he shall take the things of the Father and reveal them unto you. And they will tell you that all those golden, glittering promises have lost their lustre, that the promises of God are no longer yea and amen, that we do not need these things now. Brethren, let me speak to you in all earnestness. If ever there was a time in the history of this world when we needed the gospel of Jesus Christ as He preached it in Judea and as the apostles preached it till they sealed their testimony with their blood, it is now. Now, when infidelity is growing in every city when the respectable, higher critic is the worst kind of an infidel, the most injurious kind of an infidel, when you are told that three parts of the Bible are not true, when you have a church on every corner contradicting the church on the opposite corner, when you have a thousand and thirteen different denominations all in conflict with each other, I remark if ever there was a time in the history of the world that we needed the gospel just as Jesus preached it, that we needed the power to demonstrate that the gospel is no cunningly devised fable but that it is the power of God unto salvation, it is now. If it be a fact that the Holy Ghost does not produce those miraculous spiritual manifestations that are described in the Bible, if these things are done away, then the God of your Bible is a myth. The promises He made are false and the facts are there never was a God that made them if they are not still true, but the world has been badly fooled by the cunning craftiness of the priest. Let me give you one of the chief authorities of America on this question. I am quoting from Cardinal Gibbons. In his work called the "Faith of Our Fathers," page 322, when speaking of the miraculous gifts of the gospel that made the church the wonder of the world eighteen hundred years ago, the poor fellow, the representative of an apostate church, that is without the spirit and therefore, as James the apostle said "dead," for "the body without the spirit is dead." Cardinal Gibbons makes this statement: "It may be asked why don't these gifts accompany now the imposition of hands. I answer because they are no longer needed." That is absolutely false in all its parts. If ever the world needed the distinctive features and wonderful blessings that were conferred upon the apostolic church that made it different from every denomination in that age of the world, we need it now. We once heard of a conversation carried on by Robert G. Ingersoll, the noted agnostic, and a parson. He took up the Bible in conversation with the parson and they got talking about the 16th chapter of the Gospel of St. Mark, where it says these signs shall follow them that believe. "In my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them. They shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." Ingersoll said: "That is a wonderful promise, but I don't believe Jesus ever made it." The parson is horrified, "Oh, yes, the blessed Lord had made it." Ingersoll says: "Well, it is up to you, if Jesus made that promise does your church teach that now. Does your church enjoy those blessings now?" "Oh, no!" he said, "they were only for the dark ages, we do not need them now." Ingersoll says: "That won't do; you aren't a true believer, or else these signs would follow you if Jesus made that promise." And there is the test. I would occupy that position to-day. The

Latter Day Saints make the claim that the priesthood has been restored, that this gospel came not in the word only but in power with much assurance, the gifts of the Holy Ghost accompanying this wondrous gospel message. I am a living monument of God's mercy, the creature of His care and I testify to you in all the words of soberness to-night, that I believe that the man or woman who will obey from the heart the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is taught in the New Testament, will be made the recipient of the gifts and blessings that God has promised. I believe that with all my heart, and if I did not I would never preach another sermon in my life. Now that is why some folk do not like me, because I am old-fashioned, I want the Bible gospel. In other words, I am preaching nothing but what I can prove by the book. The Pope is no authority to me, the archbishops are no authority to me, the Council of Trent does not go with me. I go to the book of God and I expect God will be true to His promises and that is my testimony to you to-night, that if you will render a perfect obedience to the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God, the same results will follow as did the obedient of eighteen hundred years ago, and the man that says these things are done away proves two things by such statement: that he has never received the gift and power of the Holy Ghost as an abiding comforter, and second that he has never been divinely commissioned to represent Jesus Christ, but that he is a man-made preacher called and sustained by the church and not by the Almighty. The last promise that Jesus made the church was: "You shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come." And oh that men and women would be persuaded to fling away the tinsel show, the froth and foam, the excitement and the glitter, and receive with meekness the engrafted word by which they may be born again from an old existence into a new life and receive all that divine grace that comes from God.

Healing the Sick.

One thought more, the laying on of hands for the healing of the sick. I want to be careful here for I am not related to Mrs. Eddy. I have no kinship with Dr. Dowie. I don't believe in what is commonly called faith healing. I never preach come and have a treatment for so much. I don't believe that I have any power to heal the sick of my own self, nor do I believe any other man has, but I believe the scriptures and take them for just what they are worth. I have already quoted to you the 16th chapter of Mark, where the promise is made by Jesus Christ, "they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." I want also to draw your attention to the 5th chapter of James and the 6th chapter of Mark, where you will find that Christ on one occasion sent the apostles to anoint the sick with oil and the apostle James promised on another occasion, saying: "Is any sick among you. Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." The Latter Day Saints take olive oil consecrated by prayer, anoint the head of the sick, lay their hands upon them, and in hundreds of cases in this city and throughout the world are living witnesses ready to testify that they have been healed of almost every malady known to this part of the world. By the power of God almost every disease has been rebuked in my own experience.

Now, I cannot preach faith cure to get you to join the church,

for if it required a miracle to get you in, it would require a miracle to keep you there. I want to preach to you the gospel. "If you love me you will keep my commandments," said Jesus, and I want people first to believe in God and the Holy Spirit and then to repent of their sins and then be baptized by immersion for the remission of their sins and then be confirmed by the laying on of hands for the reception of the Holy Spirit. That brings them to the new birth, makes them children of God and entitles them to the promise of God, and as their bishop to-night I say to them, the promises of God are as invulnerable as the God that made them. I do not know that it is necessary for me to continue this discourse further.

I want to say as Latter Day Saints we believe in every principle of the gospel taught in the New Testament and one of the doctrines of Christ is that of the laying on of hands for the blessing of children, for the ordination of the ministry, for the confirmation into the church that they might receive the Holy Ghost and for the healing of the sick. It is the great ordinance of God by which His power has been displayed. In the language of my text, I beg you do not fulfil the prophecy. "Behold, ye despisers and wonder and perish for I (God) work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe though a man declare it unto you."

Signs of Christ's Coming

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 14th chapter of the Prophecy Zechariah and the last clause of the 7th verse, where you will read these words: "But it shall come to pass at evening time it shall be light." From a careful reading of the Divine record before us, we conclude that the world is divided into three periods, known in Scripture as the morning, noon and night. In verification of this assertion we desire to draw your attention to the parable of the Lord Jesus, as recorded in the 20th chapter of Matthew, where he says that the kingdom of heaven is like unto an individual that had a vineyard. He declares that early in the morning he went out to hire laborers to work in the vineyard, and he agreed with them for a penny a day. It is stated that he went out again the third hour and found others and hired them; he went in the sixth and ninth hours and finally his last visit to the market place to hire laborers to work in the vineyard was made in the eleventh hour.

Now, I am conscious that this parable has been misrepresented. While the facts seem to show that Jesus is dealing with the different dispensation of the gospel to the sons of men, the world has interpreted this to mean the different periods in a man's lifetime in which he may be converted to Christianity. They tell us that very early in the morning means when a child is brought to God, in the days of his youth; that the third hour means when a person is converted in early manhood; the sixth hour means when a person is converted about the middle age of life; that the ninth hour represents a man being converted in his old age, and the eleventh hour means when a dying man finds the Lord Jesus.

Reward for Good Works.

Now, I cannot make this interpretation agree with the rest of the word of God because you discover that they all got a penny for having worked in the vineyard. All who have labored in this vineyard received every one a penny, the story goes. Now, that would seem unfair from the fact that the whole Scripture teaches that we are all to be rewarded according to our works, that as a man's deeds are in this life, so his reward will be in the life beyond. The character that he forms here, the work that he performs in this life will meet with a just recompense of reward in the life to come. This idea that a man can serve Satan all the day long until the moment when he stands upon the gallows or lies upon his death-bed, and when he feels that the icy hand of death is laid upon him, then turn and say, "Lord have mercy upon me," and the Lord is going to take him home to heaven and say, "Come, enter into the joy of thy Lord; thou hast been faithful over a few things committed to thy trust, I will make thee ruler over many." It seems to me that God would not be telling the truth to receive the man right from the criminal dock and take him right home to heaven. It seems to me that this individual, if he is rewarded according to his works shall be, whether they be good or bad, as the Scriptures say, that his reward cannot be the re-

ward of eternal life for having kept the word of God. If God rewards a man with eternal life for a single moment's service on a death-bed, and that reward is equally as great as a man's who has served Him all the day long, it seems to me the Bible is not true when it says that a man must give an account for every idle word. It seems to me that this theory would contradict the Bible, which so plainly teaches that we are to be rewarded according to our works.

Premium on Crime.

I cannot accept this theory. I do not say that God will absolutely disregard the penitent cry upon the death-bed, but I do say that a man who has served the devil all his life until the last moment and then cries for help should not receive the reward that is laid up for those who have kept the word of God. This idea of offering to the man upon the gallows eternal life for a look, is hurting the morals of our country and it is offering a premium on crime; convert me to the idea that I can serve the devil all my life, that all I must look out for is to have the chance to die with my reasoning faculties unimpaired, so that I can through my senses cry out, "God, have mercy on me"; teach me that that is all I have to do and you teach me that the gospel is not the power of God unto salvation. This man who cries upon the gallows never obeyed the gospel of the Son of God, he never has complied with the conditions prescribed in the law and therefore cannot rest under the power and sanctifying influence of that law. "Well," says one, "I see plainly that that parable does not mean what the people have said it meant." What does it mean? In my opinion it means just this: God, when He placed Adam in the Garden of Eden in the early morning of this world's history, gave him a law. He broke that law and was at once clothed upon with that dread leprosy of sin. Immediately that he had fallen, he required a Redeemer, not before; it is only they that are sick that need a physician. Adam had no need of a Saviour until he had need of Salvation; so it is said that God presented the gospel law to him very early in the morning of the world's history. In process of time the sons of men wandered from God, forsook the gentle leadings of their first love and dwindled into unbelief; but God came down again to the prophet Abraham and plead with the sons of men to hear and obey the truth, the same truth, the same gospel that was taught by Adam. Abraham's mission was in the third hour of the world's history and the man who would obey the gospel in that age of the world, would receive just as much as the man who obeyed it in the days of Adam, namely, a penny a day, according to this parable, which, being interpreted, means celestial glory.

Raised Up Moses.

The world went far from God again and in the sixth hour of the world's history, God raised up Moses to whom He again committed the gospel law; Moses plead with the people to keep God's gospel, but they would not. In process of time they wandered from God, far from the law, and finally God added the Mosaic economy, the Mosaic law with its types and shadows; an expensive law, a law of carnal commandments; He established a kindergarten school—if you will allow me the expression—by these types and shadows prefiguring the great Christ and the atonement and the law of adoption into the kingdom. Who can look at the pascal lamb, at the blood on the doorposts, at the scapegoat, at the serpent in the wilderness and all the ordinances under the Mosaic econ-

omy, and not see Christ upon the cross? not see baptism? not see the laying on of hands? Not point forward with the finger of hope to the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment? But friends, in process of time this law was added, not for their salvation, for the Bible is very explicit upon this when it says, "The law was added." What to? To the gospel. Why? Because of transgression, until the promised seed should come, which was Jesus Christ.

The people, it is said, could not be made perfect by this law for it was the law of sin and death, it was a law of bondage. This was the sixth hour of this parable, but in God's own time He sent Jesus, John the Baptist and the twelve apostles, and again the great truths of the Gospel as taught in the days of Adam, in the days of Abraham and Moses, were preached to the sons of men in the ninth hour. Many obeyed it then, but in process of time there came a falling away. Jesus recognized this when He said in the eleventh chapter of Matthew, that the kingdom of heaven would suffer violence, and the violent would take it by force. Paul saw the dark hand of apostacy in his time and could say: "The mystery of iniquity doth already begin to work and men of their own selves will arise and preach perverse things and many will follow their pernicious ways." The apostacy of the church as established by Jesus is so plainly outlined in the New Testament that it needs no further comment at this time from me, suffice it to say the whole reformation as started and carried on by a Wickliffe and a Luther, a Ridley and Latimer, a Knox, a Calvin and an Alexander Campbell and all those reformers point to this one grand truth, that Rome, the mother church, apostacized from the grand truths disseminated by the stainless Christ in the ninth hour of the world's history.

Gospel to Be Restored.

In the eleventh hour, just before the end, in the hour of God's judgment, in the harvest time, in the evening time of the world's history, at the closing of the day, the gospel was again to be restored for the last time by the hand of an angel. We have tried to show you that that angel has come with the same everlasting gospel, called in the record the everlasting gospel. That it has been restored. That we are living in the eleventh hour, in the hour of God's judgment, in the evening-time of the world's history. This is a fact acknowledged by almost every religious denomination which take the Bible as a standard of its faith. There are many signs by which we may know that we are living in the evening-time of the great day of probation here. Jesus declares that it is our privilege to discern the signs of the times. He tells us that when we see the fig tree put forth her leaves, we see that summer is nigh; so He says, when you see these things come to pass, know ye that time is nigh, even at the very door. What things?

War and Pestilence.

A few of them are: Nations shall rise against nation, kingdom against kingdom, there shall be war and pestilence and famines and earthquakes and the sea waves shall roar and heave themselves beyond their bounds; men's hearts shall fail them for fear looking forward to the terrible things that are coming upon the earth. Are we living in these days? Are these signs before us? Within the memory of men living under the sound of my voice to-night has not the war fiend gone abroad spreading his broad wings over the entire civilized earth, even since you have

been born? Almost every nation under heaven, chief among them, England, the United States, France, Germany, Italy and Egypt have during the last fifty years been engaged in bloody conflict upon the field of battle and to-night there is not a nation under the broad canopy of heaven that is not either preparing for war or in actual war.

Pestilence and famine are abroad in the land. In this great age of rapid transit thousands and hundreds of thousands have perished from starvation in the last fifty years. Pestilence has gone out over the land until there is not an oak in the forest, not a blossom in the floral garden, not a vegetable in the field that has not its standing enemy in the shape of bugs and worms of a thousand different species.

Evening of World's History.

Now we are living in that generation, and the generation is nearing its close, or in other words, it is the evening-time of the world's history. Now, another sign He gives us, that "knowledge shall be increased," "many shall run to and fro in the day of His preparation." How will they do it? Well He tells us that they will do it because knowledge shall be increased; He tells us the effect produced by this knowledge, for instance, that we shall have railroads in this generation. "Oh," says one, "bless my heart, I never read that in the Bible." Well, it is here, and you will certainly not blame me for inserting it, for there are many people in the audience who read this Bible before I was born, He tells us over here in the second chapter of Nahum, in the plainest language possible, that we will have railroads, and mark the thought, they are to come in the generation when He will prepare the people for His second advent. Now let me read it to you: "The chariots shall be with flaming torches in the day of His preparation, and the fir trees shall be terribly shaken. The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broadways, they shall seem like torches, they shall run like the lightnings. He shall recount his worthies, they shall stumble in their walk, they shall make haste to the wall thereof and the defense shall be prepared. The gates of the river shall be opened, and the palaces shall be dissolved."

Modern Railroad Train.

If this is not a complete photograph of the railroad, I don't know what it is. The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the Broadway. Don't the railroad trains rage in the streets and put forth their steam as though some ponderous animal in his rage was coming down the street and they jostle one against another in the Broadway. He continues, "They shall seem like torches." Go out to-night and watch the evening express as it thunders through the land and you see the headlight—it seems like a torch. "They shall run like lightning." Do they run like lightning? We now have them going sixty to eighty miles an hour, and frequently we hear people saying: "Here comes the lightning express, the cannon ball," etc. "He shall recount His worthies." Who? The conductor. "Tickets, please." "Why, I showed you my ticket away down there sixty miles below." "Don't matter, I want to recount and see who is worthy to ride."

The Second Coming.

The Lord has delayed His coming, as Paul stated, but notwithstanding all this, friends, the fact of the truth of the second coming of Christ remains the same, and as the wolf came, even so the Saviour will come

in the hour that they look not for Him. He has given us the signs of His coming, and they are well nigh fulfilled. We say, "O my, but the Jews were a blind set, that they could not understand the mission of Christ in His first advent," but I fear, my friends, that we are as blind, that is as a nation, we are as blind to-day with reference to the prophecies concerning His second advent as the Jews were concerning the prophecies touching His first advent. He tells us that before He comes the Jews will find favor in the eyes of the nations. It has been fulfilled. The nations signed a treaty in 1856 removing the disability from the Jews and they are now preparing to return to their promised land. He tells us in the prophecies of His second coming that the former and latter rains shall be restored again to Palestine and it shall be again a fruitful field. For hundreds of years it laid a barren waste, but in 1853, the spring and fall rains were restored to the land and it has become a fruitful field.

The Second Coming.

Now, considering this and then recognizing that they are fast finding favor, we have no hesitancy in saying that in a short time the Jew will be the richest of the world, and what does the history show? A careful reading of the 12th, 13th and 14th chapters of Zachariah shows that after all these nations shall be at war and the treasuries shall be depleted, they will then make a covenant to go and rob the holy people, there shall be a great struggle which shall be the closing scene of this world. You know when Jesus came before the world was about to be crushed by the Roman power. History, it is said, repeats itself, and when the Jew is about to be crushed again, you may look for the coming of Christ, and the nations are fast preparing for that great event.

Now, this is how Jesus is coming. Says one, "There is just one thought that troubles me about that. One time it says that He shall suddenly appear at His temple. Who shall be able to abide the day of His coming when he appeareth?" "He shall purify the sons of Levi." Another says, "When He comes He is to come to Jerusalem and when He comes every eye shall see Him." Another says, "When He comes He is coming as a lion of the tribe of Judah to take vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel," and said one, "These conflict and I cannot understand them." When He comes He is going to fight that battle and win for Israel her rights and redeem her, and while this is true, it is equally true when He comes He will come to Zion and suddenly appear at His temple. It is equally true that when He comes He is coming as a lion of the tribe of Judah to take vengeance upon those that know not God and obey not the gospel.

Who Shall Abide.

The closing thought is, who shall be able to stand? Who shall be able to abide the day of His coming? Let us to-night ask ourselves the question individually, are we prepared to meet our God? Are we ready should the summons come to-night? If the cry were to come at midnight, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet Him." Oh, what an awful question. How many are prepared to answer in this audience, "Are you prepared?" "Have you oil in your vessels?" "Are your lamps trimmed and burning?" if not, think of your condition. "O," says one, "I know I ought to obey the Gospel." "I know I ought to be prepared to meet God. I see that we are living in a momentous age of the world's history. I recognize that the signs bespeak His near approach; that the

omens of the day tell us in words louder than thunder that He is liable to come at most any time, but O, the sacrifice that I must make in obeying the Gospel. Look at the sacrifice—friends, relatives, associates, school-mates, all will forsake me. I will be despised, down-trodden, forsaken.” This may be true, but while it may be the case, there is another thought that should engage our attention, it is this: Were the Saviour to come to-night, your school-mates, your friends, your associates could not help you. You must meet either the smiles of Christ, because of your love and obedience, or His frowns and judgment because of your disobedience; you must go through that ordeal alone; you must stand alone at the tribunal bar and meet the scrutinizing gaze of the Stainless One who to-night perchance you are ashamed of before your friends.

I ask you to-night, friends, as you discover that the coming of Christ is near at hand, do not let the hours glide unimproved away, but seek to making your calling and election sure; seek to prepare yourself by perfect obedience to a perfect law that emanated from a perfect God to meet that perfect Christ as He comes to number up His jewels. “At evening time it shall be light,” and amid the darkness and gloom and amid the conglomerated mass of religious confusion the light has come; the day star has risen; the sun of God’s true gospel beams again; rest under its effulgent glow and bask ’neath its radiant light, and prepare yourselves for His coming is my prayer, in Jesus’ name. Amen.

The Day of the Lord

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 24th chapter of the Gospel as recorded by St. Matthew and the 36th verse where you will read these words: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven but my Father only." An old English version makes that same verse read as follows: "But that day and hour no man maketh known, neither the angels who are in heaven, neither the son, but the Father." This is the correct reading according to several of the ablest critics of the age.

An Unfulfilled Prophecy.

This text of scripture has been frequently used to show that no one ever would know even approximately the time when Jesus would return to earth. In the early part of the nineteenth century a man having heard some of our elders preach on this question—the second coming of Christ—became quite interested in the subject. He did not obey the gospel but made this subject a hobby. He was surrounded by many people and finally they went from one extreme to the other until they eventually set the day and some historians tell us that they even set the hour. We have read how that many of them were dressed in white robes and declared that on a certain day at a certain hour in the year 1843, Christ was coming, and how they went out on the hillcrest to watch for His appearing. That they were honest and sincere people we have absolutely no doubt. Many of them sold all that they had, distributed it to the poor and needy and when the day arrived they were left without a dollar; their faith in the promise was destroyed and many of them went into infidelity. Many rallied again and the day was set for 1844, and several other dates were set and some of them now claim that Christ will come in 1914.

Now, to offset this, the sectarian world went from that extreme to the other and they marshalled this text that I have selected as their strongest weapon in support of their theory that no one was able to tell anything about the time of the coming of Christ. They began to spiritualize every prophecy relative to the coming of Christ and therefrom sprang the idea that the coming of Christ was not literal, but it was a spiritual coming; that is to say, every time a Christian died Jesus came and took him home to heaven. They discouraged the idea of the literal reign of Christ upon the earth and declared that upon death the good man went immediately to heaven and that the bad man went immediately to hell upon his death—one got bliss for ever and the other blister for ever—and that is the popular doctrine to-day. But that extreme is as far from the truth as the other extreme is.

Now, it may surprise you when I direct your attention to an examination of this text that you will not find in any part of it that it says that no one will ever know the day nor hour of the coming of Christ. It does not even hint at such a thing. You have to torture the text to make it say that at all. Let us read it: Christ is talking about the signs that would precede his coming, and He says, "But of that day and hour

knoweth no man." Please look at the word, "knoweth," and you will see that it is used in its present tense, that is to say that at the time Christ spoke no man then knew the day nor the hour of His coming. He never said anything about they never would know. The text has to be tortured to make it mean that. Let me illustrate. Supposing upon that occasion He had said, "No man knoweth anything about a railroad, nor a steamboat, nor an envelope, nor a postage stamp, nor electric light, nor the telegraph, nor the telephone," and a hundred of the other inventions with which we are familiar to-day. Would He not have been telling the truth? Yes.

But that wouldn't prove that because they didn't know anything concerning these things then that they never would know anything about them. It is an axiomatic truth that that which proves too much proves nothing at all and therefore the argument that would prove from that word "knoweth" that they never would know proves more than any denomination, any logician, any scholar would agree to.

Therefore, it can only mean that at that time God had not revealed to any man the hour and day of Christ's second coming. But it does not stop with that but goes further. Let us read: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels." That is to say even the angels did not know the time appointed by the Father. "Oh," says one, "I do not think anybody knew." Not so fast. The text says there was one individual knew—"My Father only." God knew it then, but He did not tell it to an angel. He did not reveal it to a single human being. But that does not prove that He never would reveal it to any man and that Jesus Christ Himself would not know. That would never do. That would prove too much, and therefore all the argument upon that text to the effect that it proves that no man ever will know the hour, is untrue, and if it did show that you would be compelled to admit that Christ and the angels would never know anything of the time of His coming so that Christ, humanity and the angelic throng would be ignorant of it till the very moment of its occurrence, and that won't do.

How Long is "An Hour?"

I don't believe that the hour there referred to means sixty minutes. I have shown you in two former lectures how that "very early in the morning" meant the first dispensation of gospel work, from Adam to Noah, I have shown you that the third hour meant the Abrahamic dispensation of gospel work; that the sixth hour meant the Mosaic dispensation of gospel work; the ninth hour had reference to the Christian dispensation and the eleventh hour—referred to in the 20th of Matthew—refers to the dispensation of the fullness of time when the gospel of the kingdom shall again be preached as a witness and then shall the end come. These words fell from the lips of the Man of Sorrow Himself and you may read them in the 24th chapter of the gospel as recorded by Matthew, clearly indicating that in the hour of God's judgment—in the eleventh hour—the gospel of the kingdom (that is the same gospel preached by Adam himself and by Christ and the apostles) would be preached again when God would restore the true church. So that hour does not mean sixty minutes of time as we understand it, but a dispensation.

Signs of His Coming.

Now, we may know by the signs of the times when we arrive at that hour or dispensation and I will prove that from this very chapter in

which I took my text, where Christ supports me in this allegation. He says in the 32nd verse, "Now learn a parable of the fig tree. When its branches are yet tender and putteth forth leaves ye know that summer is nigh, so likewise ye when ye shall see all these things"—that is the things I am going to refer to to-night, know (not 'guess') "that the hour of My coming is near, even at the door." Now, if language is a science to convey an idea here Christ is on record as telling you that just so surely as you see the fig tree put forth her leaves, ye know that summer is approaching so surely you shall see certain things come to pass and may know that they are being enacted to prepare the people for His coming, which will then be near at hand, even at the door.

The Biter Bit.

To the Latter Day Saints especially I submit the doctrine and covenants, section 45, par. 5, where, speaking upon this very question, it says, "Then shall they know the hour is night," and from the same work, section 68, par 1. "Unto you it shall be given to know the signs of My coming." Now, I admit the general world will not be able to read these signs. When they say "peace and safety" sudden destruction shall come upon them, but nowhere is it hinted that the child of God may not know. You know that we are told except a man is born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God, but the child of God, the one that is born again, he can see the Kingdom of God, (John 3 and 5.) Again we are told in 1st Corinthians, 2; 9-16, "The things of God knoweth no man save he hath the spirit of God," and it goes on to say that the natural man cannot understand the things of God, that they are foolishness to the carnal mind. So that while we may marshal a number of texts to show the world will not know the near approach of His coming, yet it does not indicate that those born again may not know. My effort to-night will be to show you that they will know.

First Thessalonias, 5, 1 and 6, is considered a strong text in favor of the theory that we may not know, but I am going to show you that it is a wonderful text in favor of that we may know. "But of the times and seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you for ye yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night for when they shall say 'Peace and safety,' then suddenly destruction cometh upon them as travail upon a woman with child and they shall not escape." "Why, brother Evans," says one, "you ought never to have read that. It shows clearly that they shall not know when He is coming upon them. He is coming as a thief in the night." As a thief in the night? Yes. Upon the child of God? Never. It is coming upon them—who is "them?" It says, "suddenly destruction cometh upon them." Is sudden destruction going to come upon the children of God? If so, what benefit is it to be a child of God if sudden destruction will come upon one? It taxes all my charity when I hear an argument like that made by someone with a Bible in his hand and I think if he was only honest enough to read the very next verse it would upset all his theory. Let us read it.

"But ye brethren, (that is the children of God); are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief." Now your big text only proves this: The wicked world shall not know when this day shall dawn, it shall come upon them as a thief in the night and they shall suddenly be destroyed, but the brethren, (the children of God), shall know and it shall not overtake them as a thief. You will discover that I have selected the two strongest texts that our opponents use to

prove our position to be a fallacy and both these texts show clearly that the child of God may know while the wicked may not know.

I wish now to draw your attention to Revelations, 14th chapter, 6th and 7th verses. It reads as follows: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, "Fear God and give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgment is come." At the opening then of that eleventh hour—the hours of God's judgment—the first sign like the putting forth of the fig leaf, is that an angel shall come from heaven with the authority to confer the right of priesthood on man to represent God, that he might administer in the ordinances of the gospel, to organize the true church as it was organized in the days of Christ and then "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then the end shall come." It seems to me that if God Almighty was to sit up nights he couldn't make it any plainer than it is in these two texts. Jesus, in the 24th Matthew and again to John in the 14th of Revelations, revealing that an angel was to come, bringing back the gospel with authority to properly administer it; the beginning of the last hour and at the end of that hour that Christ should come. That is the first sign—the opening of the eleventh hour.

A Sign is Given.

What does Jesus say about this? In this very chapter He says, "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." What was the most important feature that transpired in the days of Noe? "Why," says one, "God raised up a prophet through whom He preached the gospel to the people. The great majority rejected it but a few that heard it believed, repented and were baptized and entered the ark which was a type of the church, the bride, the lamb's wife. Well, then, in the generation that opens up the eleventh hour the first move on the part of God was to send an angel to raise up a prophet to reintroduce the everlasting gospel. Well, says one, it does look like that, but that word generation there is very misleading. It says, "This generation shall not pass." What generation shall not pass away till all these things are fulfilled? Oh, says the infidel, the generation in which Christ spoke. Oh, no; the generation in which these things began to blossom and bloom shall not pass away till they see the fruitage in the coming of the King. That is to say from the time the angel would appear to re-introduce and re-establish by human instrumentality the kingdom of God, that generation should not pass away till the fulfillment of the prophecies that would culminate in the coming of the King. That is what it means.

I draw your attention to Amos 3rd chapter and 7th verse, where you read: "Surely the Lord God will do nothing but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." Can you think of a more important epoch than the dispensation when Christ will come? Can you think of anything more important than the setting up of the kingdom or the church of Christ to prepare the people for the last day? No; then above all things you have a right to expect that God will again call a prophet, who will be divinely commissioned to re-organize the church set up the kingdom and preach the gospel as it was taught in the days of Christ and the apostles and thus prepare the people for the coming of the King and he says that is the very thing he will do. "Surely the Lord God will do noth-

ing but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." He must have a prophet or else he could not reveal it.

A Text Misunderstood.

I am going to read how and when he is going to send this prophet, Malachi, 3rd chapter, first few verses, "Behold I will send my messenger." God is going to send a messenger; he would not be a messenger unless God sent him with a message. "And he shall prepare the way before me and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in. Behold he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts. Who may abide the day of his coming and who shall stand when he appeareth? For he is like a refiners' fire and like fullers soap and he shall set as a refiner and purifier of silver and he shall purify the sons of Levi and purge them as gold and silver that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Juda and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord as in former years." "Oh," says one, "that refers to Christ's first coming and to John the Baptist as he preached on the mossy banks of the River Jordan." Now, there is a little truth, but the majority of it is false. While I admit that it may have reference to John the Baptist, yet I deny that it has reference to John's mission prior to the first coming of Jesus Christ. And now to prove it: "Behold I will send my messenger." Now, that is a prophet, that is admitted, "and the Lord whom you seek shall suddenly come to his temple." Now, dear friends, go back with me to the coming of Jesus Christ nineteen hundred years ago. Did He suddenly come to His temple. Every Sunday school child knows that He came to a barn in Bethlehem, with a manger for a cradle. He came as the baby of Bethlehem, so it does not refer to His first coming.

"And who may abide the day of his coming." Why who would not abide the day of his first coming? Who was afraid of the baby in the manger at Bethlehem? "Who shall stand when he appeareth?" Why He couldn't stand Himself when He first appeared as a little baby in the Hebrew girl-mother's arms. That is how He came the first time. "For He shall set as a refiner and purifier of silver and shall purify the sons of Levi." Did He do that the first time? Read the 23rd chapter of Matthew and see what He said of the sons of Levi. Eighteen times in that one chapter He says, "You are liars, hypocrites, a generation of vipers, outwardly you appear like whitened sepulchres, but inwardly ye are ravening wolves. How can ye escape the damnation of hell." Not much purification went on there, I think.

"Then shall the offering of Juda and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord;" as in the days of old and as in former times. Was that fulfilled then? Oh, no, my friends, they murdered Jesus Christ on Golgotha, the sons of Levi assassinated the apostles and saints. They did not offer an offering in righteousness before God. Well then it does not refer to John the Baptist's first coming nor to Christ's first advent, but it does refer to this: That in the latter days in the hour of God's judgment—in the eleventh hour—when the angel will restore the authority of priesthood that John the Baptist will be that angel.

"But who may abide the day of his coming and who shall stand when he appeareth?" Why does it say that? Because when He comes again He will not be in the garb of the Lamb of God, but as the lion of the tribe of Juda, coming in flaming fire. That is why the question is propounded, "Who shall abide the day of his coming?" All the evidence points con-

clusively that it does not have reference to the first advent, but the second advent when God will raise up this messenger who will prepare the way for His second advent as he raised up a messenger to prepare the way for the first advent.

John the Baptist's Second Coming.

"Well, Brother Evans," says one, "you will have a big time proving to us that John the Baptist will come again in the latter days." Oh, no, I won't have a big time if you believe the Bible. I draw your attention to the words of the Master Himself, 17th Matthew, 10, 11 and 12th verses: "And his disciples asked him saying, 'Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come?' Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Elias truly shall first come.' (Note the word 'shall' in future tense) and restore all things" (that is someone will come in the spirit of Elias that will restore all things necessary to produce the Kingdom of God upon the earth in which the salvation of man is deposited. "But I say unto you that Elias is come already and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of Man suffer of them." Now, notice: "Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist." Those verses are tantamount to saying that John came in the spirit of Elias and that he shall come again in the spirit of Elias and restore the priesthood. You may learn more fully of this restoration in the 3rd and 4th chapters of Malachi. To whom did this angel appear? Those of you who will read the history of the reorganized church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, vol. 1, page 34, will read a story something like this: While Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery were praying on the 15th of May, 1829, an angel came down from Heaven and ordained them and declared that his name was John the Baptist. He had come in the spirit of Elias and hence the priesthood was restored to earth. "Well," says one, "that's peculiar." Yes; but it's true. Suppose you refer to your baptism to-night and I ask, "Who baptized you?" and you say, "Rev. Mr. So and So." Where did he get his authority to baptize you?" He was ordained by so and so, and so he goes all the way back in the Baptist church till he gets to Roger Williams if it is the American Baptist, or to John Smith in the English Baptist, and then jumps back into the Church of England and all the way back to the 15th century to the time of the reformation, and then back into Popery, and yet every reformer will tell you that popery is referred to in the Bible as the mother of harlots and the abomination of the earth.

Doesn't Matter Which.

Jesus said a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit nor a bitter fountain bring forth sweet water. Now then if Rome was right, the reformers had no right to leave her. If Rome held the true priesthood and was the church of Christ, then the reformers were heretics as Rome logically concludes, but on the other hand, if Rome was wrong and had no true priesthood, then the Protestant church is without priesthood authority, whether Rome be right or Rome be wrong. If she is right, the Protestant church has not got it because all she gave to those who became the reformers she took away from them. If she had power to confer she also had power to take away, for the same Christ that said, "Whatsoever ye bind on earth" also said, "Whatsoever ye lose on earth." If the Roman church had the priesthood to give to a man, she had the power to take it from those that left and denounced her, and all history shows that Rome denounced and excommunicated the reformers. You will readily see that

from either side of the question the Protestant church has no priesthood authority, (and but few of them claim to have any, and worse and more of it, some of them claim that they do not require any), and so you will discover that no matter how honest and sincere the man may be who baptized you, it is not a question of his being a good man, it is a question of divine authority, being conferred upon a good man. If that authority was not conferred, the fact that he was a good man does not give him the right to baptize you.

Authorized to Baptize.

You may ask, "By what authority do you baptize?" I will gladly answer that Joseph Smith was ordained by an angel. He blessed His son, and he was ordained to be his father's successor in the prophet office, and I was ordained by him. In a word, my authority runs throughout the two Joseph Smiths and from them to the angel whom God sent according to the scriptures, and the man who baptized you, has to run back through the reformation to popery, and then is compelled to admit that Rome was in apostasy and had no authority to import.

Now, I have in past lectures quoted the best of the reformers, as looking forward to the time when God would restore the everlasting gospel and set up his kingdom, with apostles and prophets and the gifts and blessings as also the ordinances, so that the church with the true priesthood and pure gospel would come to bless humanity and prepare them for the second coming of Christ, and their prayers have been answered in that the priesthood is restored and the church is organized, and let me say that is one of the most prominent signs in proof of the fact that we are nearing the time referred to as the coming of Christ.

Other Signs are Present.

"Now to one or two other signs that mark the near approach of the Master. The Lord speaking through Daniel the prophet, referring to the time of the end, says, "Knowledge shall be increased," Daniel 12:4. Has knowledge increased? Let the great men of the earth answer.

"The great facts of the 19th century stand out conspicuously above the achievements of any preceding century. Go back only a little more than half a century and the world stood about where it did in the days of the Patriarchs. Suddenly, the waters of that long stream over whose surface scarcely a ripple of improvement had passed for more than three thousand years, broke into the white foam of violent agitation. The world awoke from the slumber and darkness of ages the Divine finger lifted the seal from the prophetic books, and brought that predicted period, when men should run to and fro and knowledge should be increased. Men bound the elements to their chariots and reaching up laid hold upon the very lightning and made it their message bearer around the world."—Bible Readings, pages 224-5.

"Within the last fifty years photography, the electric light, the spectroscope, revealing the nature of distant worlds, the telephone, carrying from a distance the actual tones of a friend's voice to our ears, the phonograph, recording sounds, have all been invented within living memory. Researches into ancient history and the deciphering of Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions have thrown light on the past. While the discoveries of biology and geology have opened new paths of thought, and free libraries which were first opened in 1850 enabling all men in large cities and towns to read without expense."—Buckley and Robertson's High School History of England, pages 319-320.

The above will be sufficient to prove that since the angel came to Joseph Smith and the eleventh hour gospel dispensation was opened the world has made more strides in the increase of knowledge than for thousands of years combined.

Another sign of the last days is that the nations of the earth will engage in great wars, Mat. 24, 6-7. Let my hearers just think back a little and you will remember that the nations have been at war and that to-night every nation under Heaven is armed to the teeth and in proof that the nations are groaning under the heavy curse, I submit the statement.

Lloyd George on War.

Chancellor Lloyd George, at a lord mayor's dinner recently made the following statement on the subject of war among nations:

"The increase in expenditure, not only in England, but in every land under the sun, is due to what Lord Charles Beresford, in the house of commons the other day called, 'The insane competition in armaments.' between the various countries of the world. They are now spending annually four hundred and fifty million pounds upon this machinery of destruction. All nations seem to be infected with an epidemic of prodigality in this respect, which seems to be sweeping over the world and sweeping to destruction. England takes the lead in that expenditure," Toronto Mail, July 18, 1910.

In a previous lecture I gave you a list of the earthquakes and many other signs that prove we are nearing the end, and were it not for the intense heat I would continue this lecture, but the warm night compells me to forebear.

Suffice it for me to say, the signs of the times prove to thousands that we are living in the latter days. In the harvest time, in the hour of God's judgment and that soon the King will come in his glory, may God help us all to obey the gospel and develop a character that will entitle us to dwell with him in glory when he comes. I thank you.

Priesthood

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 11th chapter of the gospel as recorded by St. Mark, 27th and 28th verses, where you will read these words: "The chief priests and scribes said unto him, by what authority doest thou these things and who gave thee this authority?"

I am requested to speak to you to-night on the subject of priesthood. Priesthood, as I understand it, means the right, the authority, the divine commission to represent God and administer in the ordinances of the gospel. I believe there is no subject of deeper importance than that which divides priesthood from priestcraft; than that which draws the line of demarcation between hireling ministry who preach for money, divined for hire and make merchandise of the people, and the true servant of God called by revelation, authorized by Jesus Christ to represent Him in this age of the world. The time has come when this question of authority must be discussed. Men claim the right to speak in the name of Jesus Christ, and they are differing as widely as the poles in their presentation of Jesus Christ, and what He said, and what He did. If ever there was a time in the history of the world when man should be divinely commissioned it is now in this great age of priestcraft, superstition, idolatry and religious confusion. Jesus, speaking on this question Himself, said, John 3:27: "Man can receive nothing except it be given him from Heaven." The Bible shows us clearly that Jesus Christ Himself, though the Son of God, did not attempt to act in the priestly office until He was commissioned by His Father, according to the scriptures. And we read Hebrews 5:5-10: "Christ was called of God an high priest." Again, we are told, "He suffered not Himself to be made a priest until he was called by God, a Melchisideck priest." And so it was written called of God an high priest after the order of Melechisideck.

In speaking of this call He declared, John 5:41-3, "I receive not honor from men. If another shall come in his own name him ye will receive." And so we have it to-day—churches built up and called after man, and their names chiselled in conspicuous places upon the several edifices. But a man coming to-day, as in the past, claiming to act by direct revelation of God, is regarded with pity, and in some places with contempt.

John 5, 26:7, we are told, "God gave Christ authority to execute judgment," and in Acts 10:42, we are told that Christ commanded them to preach that He was ordained of God to do the work that He was performing. Now, it is quite evident from the scriptures already cited and others that might be adduced that Jesus Christ was called by direct revelation from God to the order of priesthood known in the Bible as the Melchisideck priesthood. For there are two priesthoods referred to—the high priest, called the Melchisideck priest, and the lower priest, called the Aaronic priest, the order of Aaron. When Christ was here He declared, "I will build my church, and as the Father gave me commandment, so I speak."

Choosing the Apostles.

My second thought is that as God called Jesus and authorized Him to act in the priesthood, so God inspired Jesus to select His ministers to

act in the several departments of the priesthood. There is a great difference between a man's selecting the position of a minister and God selecting him, as may be made apparent to-night. Jesus, speaking to the Apostles, John, 15-16, said: "Ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you and ordained you." You will remember that after Christ had spent all night on the mountain top in prayer He came down from the mountain and by the force and power of God that was conferred upon Him. He selected the twelve apostles, (Matthew 10:1-3). He conferred upon them by ordination the same priesthood that He held Himself. Hear Him, John 17:18-22, "As my Father has sent me, even so I send you." Again, "The glory thou hast given me have I given them." First Timothy 1:12, Paul informs Timothy that Christ put him in the ministry. In Mark 16:15-16, is found the great commission. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Matthew 28:19, has it in a little different wording, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

It is a great pity that men to-day, in the absence of revelation from God, will steal the commission of dead men that have been dead eighteen hundred years and claim that as their authority to preach and administer in the ordinances of the church. What would you think of a man to-day if he stole the commission that had been given to some judge or sheriff—the judge or sheriff having died—and without any authority conferred upon him whatever under the statutes of the government he was to tell you that he had a feeling in his heart that he was to be the judge now, or he had a peculiar feeling that he was to be the sheriff, and under that commission he would declare that he was commissioned according to the government statutes of the British Empire to represent King George V. Remember, when a man says, "I arrest you in the name of the King," it means, "By authority vested in me under the laws of that king," and when a man says that he baptizes you in the name of Jesus Christ, if Jesus Christ has not commissioned him under the statutes of the kingdom of Heaven, that man is an impostor. Surely we have a right to respect the King of Heaven and the laws He has given for the government of that kingdom as much as we have the right to respect King George and the statutory enactments of Great Britain. We cannot accept or take upon ourselves the position under some peculiar feeling we may have because it is a soft snap under the government of Great Britain, and methinks Jesus has made it plain that we cannot assume to occupy a position in the priesthood just because we have a feeling.

"A man can receive nothing save it be given him from Heaven," and if God has not spoken as the churches claim for eighteen hundred years, and the last revelation that He gave is found in the Bible they say: if that is true, then will any priest of Romanism or parson of the Protestant world tell us how they learned that they individually are commissioned to act in the name of Jesus Christ? And like little children, nine out of ten of them will refer you to the commission that was given to twelve other men, as though that gave them any authority. Why don't they go and build an ark? God told Noah to build one. They have just as much right to build an ark under the commission God gave Noah as to baptize under the commission that God gave Peter.

Called by Direct Revelation.

Now, my friends, I want to make this plain to you to-night, that the distinctive creed of the former day Saint church and the Latter Day Saint church is that God doeth the work and that no man taketh this

honor of the priesthood upon him save he be called of God by direct revelation; and when the former day Saint lost the Holy Spirit and God refused to speak to them because of their sins, they then began as the Bible said, "To heap to themselves teachers having itching ears who preached for money, divined for hire and made merchandise of the people, and they shall turn their ears away from the truth and shall be turned unto fables." And if the Latter Day Saint Church ever loses that distinctive belief and begin to ordain men to the ministry because of some feeling that somebody has, then they will go down in my estimation just like the rest who are in apostacy. That is my position and has been since God revealed to me the truth.

Now, I have shown you that God commissioned and authorized Christ to act as a Melchisideck priest. I have shown you that God, by revelation through Jesus Christ, selected, called and ordained the apostles to act in that same ministry, and now I would show you that the apostles under the Holy Spirit of Revelation from Heaven ordained other men who had been called of God. First Corinthians 7:17, "As the Lord called, so I ordained in all the churches." But mark you, God first had to make the call. Titus 1:5. Paul wrote Timothy to ordain elders in every city, as I have appointed thee. That means, that as the Lord had called, so Paul had authorized Timothy to ordain these elders.

Acts 20:17-28, the elders are called of the Holy Ghost to be overseers in the church. Now I come to emphasize the distinctive plea of the Saints Church in former days and in latter days. Hebrews 5:1-4, "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained." Not was ordained, not used to be ordained, but mark the word, is ordained. "For man in things pertaining to God that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sin"—"and no man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." So also Christ, glorified not Himself to be made an high priest, but He that said unto Him, "Thou art My Son, to-day have I begotten thee," said also, in another place, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisideck"—"called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisideck," showing that the high priesthood was an order named in honor of this great man to whom we will refer later on.

Now, this statement is clear, concise, "That no man taketh this honor upon himself save he be called of God, as was Aaron." How was Aaron called? Go to Exodus 4:10-14. There God reveals to Moses that he should be a great minister; also gives him a revelation that his brother Aaron should be called to the priesthood; then God prepares Aaron by another revelation, and Aaron and Moses meet and they become two ministers to represent God. Now, I am told by some that the priesthood is done away; that there was no priesthood in the Christian church at all. Now, I want to say right here, somebody wrote me a letter this week. From its contents I concluded that they thought that because I was going to lecture on priesthood to-night, that I was going to place uncalled for reflection upon the Roman Catholic Church.

Agrees With R. C. Church.

Now, let me say, the Roman Catholic Church believes in priesthood, whether they have it or not. They are consistent, in this that they make the same claim as I do on that point, that a man to administer in the ordinances of the house of God and in the name of Jesus Christ must hold priesthood. I agree with Catholicism there, and I agree with one or two Protestant churches that claim that they have no right to officiate, only under priesthood, but the great question on which I will differ from Prot-

estantism that claims priesthood is that I challenge them to show that they got priesthood at all, and I will require of Catholicism to show where their priesthood came from. That may be discussed later on. I may just say in passing that they claim it came direct from Peter down through the Popes. They cannot prove that.

Rev. Father Tierney in the bishop's place, City of London, discussed that with me a good deal many years ago, and he said something that I think was really nice: "I will tell it to you, Mr. Evans," he said. "The religious world is like a great minstrel troupe with an end man at either end—the Roman Catholic Church the one end man, the Latter Day Saint Church the other end man. The Roman Catholic Church claims to have priesthood by succession from St. Peter down to the last Pope. The Latter Day Saint Church denies this doctrine of succession, and claims priesthood by the restoration under the hand of the ministering spirits sent from Heaven." Now, those are the two positions. "The middle man," said he, referring to Protestantism, "is simply not in it." I just throw that out to get you thinking which is right, Catholicism, with her claim of priesthood by succession, or Latter Day Saintism, with its claim for priesthood by restoration under the hand of an angel, for those men who claim to be acting without priesthood at all are, as the Rev. Father said, "simply not in it."

Now, to show the other side of the question, that there are to be no priests now, that is divinely commissioned to represent God as ministers, they quote the following: Hebrews 7:11-12: "The priesthood being changed, therefore there was a change in the law." But does it occur to you that the word "change" never meant abolished, destroyed or done away. Now, how was the change? Under the law the priests offered dead sacrifices. Hebrews 7:1-15. Offer the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a red heifer," and so on. Under the gospel a living sacrifice is offered by the priest, Romans 12:1, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice." Hebrews 8:3, "Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices." Not used to be ordained, but is ordained for that purpose. First Peter 2:5, speaks of there being in the Christian church "an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God." Now, what did the priests under the new covenant—the gospel covenant—offer sacrifice? It was not offering the blood of bulls and goats, etc.—dead sacrifices—but they preached the Gospel and under that preaching people were convicted of sin, and they came presenting themselves to the priests of the Christian church to offer them a living sacrifice for sin.

How was that priest authorized to offer them as a sacrifice for sin? Note this carefully. John 20:21-23, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." This was the authority given to the priests of the Christian church. Now, we are told by a certain class of people that that means that you have got to go into a little latticed business to the priest telling what you have done and what you think about doing, and that he will impose a penance by which you receive absolution. We do not believe that. Confess your sins to God, acknowledge that you are a sinner to the priest, but he need not know in what way you have sinned. The very moment that you divulge your weakness to a human being, whether you call him a Father of God or not, that very moment you place yourself in the power of that man and then God help you. But what did Jesus mean when he said that "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted?" Just this: When the penitent sinner comes to the priest of God confessing his faith before him,

acknowledging that he is a sinner needing salvation, the priest is divinely commissioned to take him as a living sacrifice and to offer him to God in the waters of baptism. For it is said, "Repent and be baptized, everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts 2:38. The priest is authorized to act in the name of Jesus Christ in the performance of the baptismal service by which you die to sin, are buried with Christ by baptism to death, and by which you are born of water and of the Spirit according to the statement of Jesus Christ in the 3rd John and by Paul in the 6th Romans.

This is where the priest takes you as a living sacrifice and offers wholly and acceptably to God according to God's own appointed way, being baptized for the remission of your sins. That is the only way the priest is authorized to act in the ordinance of the Gospel, which is for the remission of sins. "Under the law they had divers washings and carnal ordinances," Hebrews 9:10. Under the Gospel this was changed from divers washings to the one baptism, as referred to last Sunday night.

Two Orders of Priesthood.

Now, I have said that there were two orders of priesthood and that Christ was in the Melchisideck order of priesthood. I want to read just a verse or two concerning this Melchisideck priesthood. Hebrews 7, 1st verse, "For this Melchisideck, King of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all, first being by interpretation King of Righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is King of Peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." Joseph Smith in his translation of the Bible corrects this statement that Melchisideck had neither father nor mother, beginning of days, etc. The original of that verse reads thus: "For this Melchisideck was ordained a priest after the order of the Son of God, which order is without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, and all those who are ordained under this priesthood are made likened unto the Son of God, abiding a priest continually."

You see, it was the priesthood that was to be without end, not the man. Jewish tradition pronounces Melchisideck a survivor of the deluge, the patriarch Shem. (Smith's Bible Dict., page 398) "Melchisideck and Shem are supposed to be the same person." (Gardner's Christian Encyclopaedia, page 641.) Rabbi Jochanan-Ben-Nuri says, "The Holy One took Shem and separated him to be a priest to himself and called his name Melchisideck, a priest of the most high and King of Salem." This hypothesis satisfied Lyrd, Melancthon, Martin Luther and many others. Early days of Christianity, page 220. There are other authorities who differ from these, but certainly Melchisideck was a man, the Prince of Peace, the King of Salem (which was afterwards called Jerusalem), and he held the order of priesthood which was to abide forever.

Christ, you are told, was called to that Melchisideck order of priesthood. The apostles held the same order and many others. Now, I want to read to you a few historical statements relative to priesthood being in the Christian church. Turtillian says: "It was customary among heretics to confound the offices of the clergy and the laity altogether." In his book, De Baptismo, he says: "The right to baptize belongs to the chief priests. Saint Jerome says that both in the Old and New Testament the high priest was an order the priests another and the Levites another,"

page 49 and 50. "They (the early Christians) reckoned that to be no church which had no priests," page 49. Theodored said that Ignatius received the gift of the high priesthood from the hands of the great Peter. Bingham, the great historian, says: "The name of priesthood is sometimes given in common to the whole body of Christian people, 1st Peter, 2 and 9 and Revelations 2 and 6, but so it was to the Jewish people, Exodus 19:16, yet every one knows that the offices of priests and Levites among the Jews were very distinct from those of the common people, not by usurpation, but by God's appointment, and so it was among the Christians from the foundation of the church," page 40. The allegations are sufficient evidence as to the practice of the Christian church in the first three ages; that there was then an order of chief priests or bishops superior to the elders, settled and allowed in the Christian church.

Of the chief priests, he further says: "It was no human invention, but an original settlement of the apostles, which they made by Divine appointment," page 54. "If it be inquired how the bishops and elders took the title of priesthood the answer is plain and obvious: because every order had its share though in different degrees in the Christian priesthood. Bingham's Church Antiquity, vol. 1: "John that rested on the bosom of our Lord was a priest, and bore the sacerdotal plate." Origin went to Greece by way of Palestine, where he received the ordination of the priesthood at Cesarea from the bishop of that country. (Eusibiues Ecclesiastical History, pages 240-243. "The Christian priesthood is the substance and truth of which that of the Jews is but a shadow and a figure.", (Rev. E. Robinson, Bible Ency., page 759.)

Now, I want to call your attention to the several degrees or different offices in these two priesthoods named. High priest, Hebrews 5:1; bishops 1st Tim. 3:1-7; Evangelists, 2 Tim. 4:5; Apostles, Luke 6:13; seventies, Luke 10:1-17; Elders, Titus, 1:5; priests, Rev. 5:10; teachers, Ephesians 4:11; deacons, 1st Tim. 3:8.

Saul Not Authorized.

Now we read in the Scriptures that men were to assume the priestly rights and that they did at times assume them. First Samuel 3:9-14: "Saul acted as a priest and was rejected of God because he never was authorized to act." Second Chronicles 26:16-21: "Uzziah acted as a priest and the curse of God came upon him instantly." Acts 19:13-16: "The son of the priest here attempted to act and was severely punished." 2nd Tim. 4:2-4, contains a prophecy that reaches down to our time that in the latter days the people would not endure the sound doctrine as taught by Christ and the apostles. They would do away with this inspired ministry and heap to themselves teachers having itching ears. Isaiah, speaking of this kind of ministry, refers to them, Isaiah 56:10-12, as "greedy dogs, never having enough, each looking for his gain from this quarter." And when I read I stop to think of some men to-day claiming to represent Jesus Christ, the meek and lowly, one securing \$5000, another \$10,000 and more, besides a beautiful mansion to live in, all furnished, and now and again we still hear the lamentable cry, "We are not getting enough. Increase the salary." And yet Jesus said, John 10:11-13: "The hireling fleeth, he careth not for the sheep."

John Wesley in his notes on the New Testament, 1st Tim. 3:8, where Paul, writing to Timothy about preachers desiring filthy lucre, says: "With what disgust does he everywhere speak of this. All that is gained (above food and raiment) by ministering in holy things, is filthy gain indeed. Far more filthy than honestly gained by raking kennels or empty-

ing common sewers." What would Mr. Wesley do now with a Methodist conference? They say he is the father of Methodism. He declares that the man that takes more than for his mere food and clothing is just what the Bible declares, "a greedy dog, never having enough," and Wesley declared it is not honestly gained and that it would be more honest if he would earn it by emptying sewers. He would not be a good Methodist to-day, would he? Remember that the Methodist Church claims to endorse Wesley's notes. (See Discipline, page 1.)

You ask. Does not the Bible say, "Is not the laborer worthy of his hire?" "Yes." I freely admit that, but who hires him? If he is called of God, according to the Scriptures by direct revelation, then let him go according to the plans and specifications given, and not hire out for a certain salary to preach a certain thing. Do you know, my friends, that the ministry are just flesh and blood like anybody else, and when a class of men hires them they put the discipline in their hand; they put the rules of that church in their hand and it matters not what the preachers believes; he must preach according to that church or lose his salary, and as one great man said in Cincinnati a little while ago, "I get \$10,000 a year. If I preached better sermons reflecting my real views I would not get \$4,000." So you see that bread ordinance outweighs both inspiration and aspiration. My reply to that is I would sooner sell whiskey at five cents a glass over the bar than preach what I do not believe for a salary.

The Commission.

Now, with regard to the commission. I happen to be a direct relative to Rev. Ephraim Evans of the Methodist Church, one of the early pioneers of Methodism in Canada. I met him at the Grand Trunk Station in London a number of years ago, I but a young man lately ordained, he tottering on the brink of the grave, having preached for half a century. "Good morning, Richard." "Good morning," said I. "Where are you off to to-day?" "I am going to attend a conference in Bothwell." "Oh, what church is meeting there in conference?" "Why," I said, "the Latter Day Saint Church." "Richard," he says, "have you disgraced your name by becoming a Latter Day Saint?" "No, sir," I said, "I have done my level best to make it honorable." Well, to make the story short, he gave me a sound good talking to and I finally mustered up courage to say to him: "Where did you get your authority to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances of the church?" He said: "I preached the Gospel before you were born." He wasn't mad, it was only his indignation that was aroused, that was all. I said to him: "I did not ask how long you have preached, but where did you get your authority to preach?" He said: "My authority is in the Bible, sir." "Oh, indeed. I have read the Bible from Genesis to Revelations and I never saw the name of Evans in it." "Well," he said: "Richard, your ignorance is really deplorable." "Well," I said, "it may be there and I may have skipped over it, but I really confess to you I have never seen it." He said: "It is not there." "Oh, then I am not so bad after all, and how did you find out in the Bible that it meant you?" Then he turned to that commission. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel." "Oh," I said, "that commission was given to twelve men, their names are there. What right have you to act on the commission of dead men? If God's church is on the earth, if it is true, "I will build my church." If it is true that He will call his ministry, He can speak to-day as well as in the dear dead years of the silent past. Now, sir, if your name is not in the Bible, and it is true that God has not spoken for eighteen

hundred years and that He will never speak again, then He did not call you to the ministry, you only guess at it."

And that is my contention to-night, my friends. I believe that no minister has the right to say that he is authorized to act in the name of Jesus Christ just because he has a feeling. I will emphasize this by telling you a little experience and will then close. A farmer and his wife sat by the fireside one night discussing what they were to do with their three boys. Frank was a smart, brilliant fellow, and the father thought he had better make a lawyer out of him, and so the hard earnings saved up for years were liberally expended. Frank received an education and became a lawyer. James was one of the handy boys around that country. Whether it was a sick horse, a sick cow or a sick person, Jimmy was right on deck and seemed to have the happy knack of assisting, and so his father and mother thought he would make a good doctor. So again the money was handed out and Jimmy went to college, graduated and became a physician.

John did not care to work much on the farm. He was one of those quiet people, and mother said: "Pa, do you know, I think we ought to make a preacher out of John." Pa agreed, and so they sent John to college, and he learned to be a preacher. The old folks spent their money lavishly on him. When Frank came out he gave the old folks credit. "I am the product of their labor. They sent me to college and I am now a brilliant lawyer, thanks to the labors of my parents. The second son did likewise as he thought of his brilliant career as a physician, but John said, "the Lord called me."

God had no more to do in making John a preacher than he had in making Frank a lawyer, and you have not heard many people say God made the lawyer. Now, I do not know whether I could entertain you or not, but I could occupy hours here telling you of experiences that I have heard as to how men came to enter the ministry, but suffice it to say, brothers and sisters, this is a serious question.

We have a church at almost every corner contradicting the man who preaches in the church on the opposite corner, all claiming that God sent them. I want this thought to burn into their hearts; God never sent one man to contradict another man that he had sent, and it is because we have a man-made ministry that the world to-day is sick and discouraged and does not know which way to go, nor what to believe. This question of priesthood authority must come to the front and I hope and pray that you may seriously consider it, and find the truth and be sanctified under its power for God. I thank you.

What Is Man ?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 8th Psalm, 4th and 5th verses, where you will read these words: "What is man that Thou art mindful of him and the son of man that Thou visited him? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor."

I have been requested to take up the subject of man and his destiny, and I shall try to discuss that question from several standpoints, covering several evenings. To-night I shall try to present a few thoughts regarding the composition of man, physical and spiritual, the outward and inward man. I hope that you will follow me closely in this, for the reason that the position that I shall take is in direct opposition to that taken by the majority of professed Christians. There are two prominent positions taken in the world on this subject; one diametrically opposed to the other, with each side claiming Divine inspiration as the foundation of their faith, both differing as widely as the poles, and in my opinion, both of them unsupported by the Bible.

What Composed the Body.

The chemical composition of man, that is, the outward man, as I glean it from my reading, comprises thirteen elements; five gases and eight solids. A man of 174 pounds contains 97 pounds of oxygen, 15 pounds of hydrogen, four pounds of nitrogen, 26 ounces of chlorine three and a quarter ounces of fluorine, 48 pounds of carbon, 26 ounces of phosphorous, three and a quarter ounces of sulphur, three pounds of calcium, two and a half ounces of potassium, two and a quarter ounces of iron. A man has two hundred bones, besides sixteen teeth in each jaw, 475 muscles, and six salivary glands in the mouth. The intestines are thirty feet in length the liver weighs four pounds; the average number of hairs on the head is 120,000. There are four ingredients in a tear; namely, water, albuminous matter, chloride of sodium, and mineral salts. There are more than 800 distinct contrivances in the eye, which is held by seven bones. The respiratory glands of the body number 2,381,248, and the length of the glands is not less than two miles and a third.

Mortal Man.

Our mortal soulists tells us that that is all there is to man. In support of this contention I shall permit them to speak for themselves. I quote from Miles Grant in his work entitled "The Spirit in Man" pages 8 and 9: "Shall we dispute the record and say man was not formed of dust, but only the house in which he was to live? Why not believe the Lord? He says man was formed of the dust of the ground." When man is analysed he is found composed of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, sulphur, phosphorous, iron and lime. These are all earthly substances, and when He created man from these materials He made the most wonderful piece of mechanism of which we have any conception. The lungs with their millions of air-cells were prepared in connection with the air, to purify the blood that had passed through the system, and fit it for another revolution. The atmosphere or breath of life is a material substance

made to move the wonderful machinery of the being called man. I may give you some more on that point when we get to the question of what the spirit in man is.

Three Different Views on the Hereafter.

Our "mortal soulists" take the position—this is one of the most prominent position taken by them (there are, of course, diversities of opinions among themselves concerning this matter)—that man just made of dust goes back to mother earth; and that all mankind will be resurrected. They will have another chance for salvation and eternal life, and those who reject Christ in the Millennium will die, what is called the "second death"; that is, be annihilated, become extinct, be as though they never were, cease to exist.

An Everlasting Frizzle.

There is another position taken, perhaps by the majority of Christians, to the effect that there is an inward and an outward man; the outward man called the body, the inward man, called the spirit; that this spirit is intellectual, and that after death the spirit of the good man goes to Heaven. He gets a golden crown, and a golden harp, and sings hymns throughout eternity. But the bad man at death goes to a place called hell, there to roast, frizzle, fray and broil throughout the endless ages of eternity, and never ceases to endure excruciating, perpetual pain, anguish and unspeakable misery. Some of the leading preachers of the Protestant world say that it is so hot down there that if you were taken out of hell and put into a caldron of red-hot potash you would freeze to death instantly. Now, that is all I am going to say on that point to-night; I will reach it later on in the examination of this question.

Shove Him Through the Toll-Gate.

There is another phase of the Christian Church that denies that, and which says that at death man does not go to this awful burning, flaming hell, but goes to a kind of half-way house, where by a little assistance from the living relatives he may get out after having been purified, not only by the fire down there, but by the sacrifices they make up here. On account of this the fire does its work more quickly, they say, and he gets out and starts on the journey to eternal bliss.

Another Theory.

Now, the most humane of these awful theories is that there is no such place as this which I have described, called the burning flames of hell. Some of the most eloquent men that we have heard or read after have told us that if the great majority of the human family were to go there as the general church teaches, then the devil and the consequences of sin would overrule God Almighty Himself; and they put up another theory, that is less spiteful, less inhuman, less cruel, but, mark you, it serves the same place as the one they oppose: In the one case God is defeated, in that the devil gets the great majority and burns them forever and ever; in the other case God is equally defeated, in that by reason of sin you go back to mud—you become annihilated, you become extinct, you become as though you never were.

The Idea of Annihilation Absurd.

Now, if God created you for a wise purpose, and by reason of sin His purpose is thwarted, and you are annihilated, I ask you, has not the devil gained a march (even though he does not have the fun of burning you) if he reduces you to nothing? That is too silly to tell twice over, for

there is no power in earth, heaven or hell can reduce something into nothing; there is not a man breathing can demonstrate the doctrine of annihilation. Matter is eternal as God. There never was a time when the universe was filled with nothing, and God was nowhere and had no one to associate with. I care not though your Catholic catechism, your Church of England prayer books and Methodist sermons, and Presbyterian confessions of faith (as already quoted in a previous lecture) tell you that God made this world out of nothing; I again remark it is contrary to all common sense and reason and science. So that the doctrine of annihilation while it may be much more kindly in its character than the doctrine of perpetual torture, defeats God; therefore I do not believe it.

“A Little Lower Than the Angels.”

Another point in the text is worthy of consideration. It says, “For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.” The pronoun HIM, with its antecedent, MAN, evidently applies to the race. Even Jesus, the prominent pre-existent Spirit, took upon Himself a mortal body and was made subject to death. He, with other men, was made a “little lower than the angels.” Heb. 2:9. But He had to die, in order to fill His mission. Now the question, “Why was Christ and the human race” made a little lower than the angels? is settled by Christ. He said: “The children of this world marry and are given in marriage, but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more for they are equal unto the angels and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection,” Luke 20:34-36. This clearly shows that the leading difference between man and angels is that one has a mortal body, subject to death, while the other is immortal.

The Law of Adaptability.

The great law of adaptability proves that there is something in man which is immortal. If he is wholly of the earth, as our opponents claim, then the things of this earth only are adapted to his needs. He can have no desire because there is no capacity for God, Heaven or immortality. Perishable food would in that case satisfy his strongest desires and highest aspirations. His five senses may be gratified as follows: His sight may be gratified with the brilliancy and splendor his eyes may behold. The sweet aroma of fragrant flowers may gratify his sense of smell. Much in nature’s wonderful supplies may gratify his sense of feeling. The sense of hearing may be charmed with splendid music and song. The sense of taste supplied and satisfied with that which he may eat and drink.

Our Reach Beyond Our Grasp.

But does this satisfy man? All other animals are supplied and are satisfied but man must have his cold desires satisfied but climb as he will his highest aspirations cannot be reached though all the five senses of his body may be fully supplied. He is told to seek for immortality and eternal life, he is commanded to exercise faith in God, he is instructed to have faith and repent of his sins, but this he cannot do until he comes to a condition described as the new birth. Then by the Spirit revealing to his spirit the things of God, his soul reaches up to the Father of his spirit, whom we call God, for something more than earthly food. Hence we read, Matt. 4:4: “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” But we ask if man is wholly mortal and dies as the beast, why can he not live by bread alone, the very fact that

God has provided imperishable food for man proves that he is an immortal being, hence it is written, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak upon you they are Spirit and they are life." John 6:63. And again, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

Hopes Become Realized.

The lower animals, such as the silk worm, by force of instinct spins its cocoon and shuts itself up therein satisfying its instinct. The butterfly obeys a similar instinct. The blue wasp forms its cell of clay in which it deposits its eggs, then fills the cell with insects and seals it over that the young wasps may possess a supply of food, and thus the instincts of all creatures inferior to man receive the gratifying results of their highest impulse. In no case do we find the instincts of the lower orders of animated nature disappointed, and if God has designed to satisfy the instinct of his meanest creatures, shall He withhold from man made in His image, made only a little lower than the angels, made with a soul-inspiring desire for immortality and eternal life, is he alone to be disappointed in the grandest ambition and the most sacred desire of his soul; to rise to be like God, while the tadpole and the butterfly shall never be disappointed.

Man is Dual.

We take the position that man is dual; that is, composed of body and spirit, pre-existed with God; that it is the intellectual part of man; indeed that is the man that lives in this house of clay. That when that spirit leaves this house of clay and is consigned to the place appointed by the Almighty (which we may reach later on in this discussion) that that condition is called death; and that does not mean cessation of consciousness that death does not mean annihilation, that death does not transport us to perpetual flames; but that we shall be conscious between death and the resurrection.

To prove this allegation, I submit the following argument: In Romans 7:22, Paul, in speaking on the duality of man, says: "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." Here is a clear statement that there is an inward man. In Ephesians 3:16, he says: "Strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man." Job, speaking of this inward man, says, Job 32:8: "But there is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Here you discover the connecting link between God, who is a spirit, and the real man.

Through this inspiration God may converse with the spiritual man—may inspire that spirit; and so we have the testimony of men who have been in connection with divinity under spiritual influences, from whom they have learned the wonderful things of this life—both scientific and religious, and of the life to come.

Job, in speaking of this inward man, 4:19, calls the body a house of clay. Again, in the 10th chapter and 11th verse: "Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh, and hast fenced me with bones and sinews." The "me" here is the inner man, the spiritual man. Paul, in 2nd Corinthians 4:16, says: "Though our outward man (the body) perish, yet the inward man is renewed." He declares that when this outward man perishes and goes back to mother earth, that we have a heavenly tabernacle—a spiritual existence, notwithstanding the fact that the body goes to the grave.

The Soul Imperishable.

Christ, speaking on this important question of the relationship existing between the spirit and the body, shows very clearly that the spirit

may live though the body is dead. He says in Matthew 10:28: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Here is clear proof that Jesus has given evidence that the spirit (which is sometimes called the soul) is a wonderful thing, and may exist separate and distinct from, and independent of, the body. And it is strange that men who will laud and magnify Jesus Christ as the Son of God, as the Light Eternal, will just refuse to believe Him in a moment—however plain and emphatic He may speak upon a subject, if He chances to differ from their pet theories. That is what has made denominationalism; that is what has divided the church into a thousand or more rival creeds, because man, who professes to believe in Jesus Christ, does not believe Him.

A Little Wind.

Now, all these quotations prove that there is an inward and an outward man, the spirit and the body; that the spirit dwells in the body. But we are met on the threshold here, and we are told that man is wholly mortal; that the spirit referred to is wind, air, atmosphere. But I will let these mortal soulists speak for themselves. I quote their own language. Miles Grant, pages 2, 5, 6, 13 and 27, makes a statement like this: "The same word is used to denote the atmosphere we breathe, and is then properly denominated the 'breath of life' without which all living beings upon this planet would die." Again: "We all breathe from the same airy ocean and all die when there is not sufficient physical strength to breathe any longer." Again: "The lungs with their millions of air cells were prepared in connection with the air to purify the blood that has passed through the system and fit it for another revolution. The atmosphere or 'breath of life' is a material substance made to move the wonderful machinery of the being called 'man.'"

A Difference Between Spirit and Wind.

Now, here we are told that this spirit is wind, air, atmosphere. Let us examine that; suppose we insert the words air, atmosphere, wind where the spirit is. How will it read? If it is a fact that they are interchangeable let us try it out for a moment. "There is 'a' atmosphere in man and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth it understanding." Now you grammarians, how do you like that? There is 'a' atmosphere. If the words spirit and atmosphere are synonymous that is the way it would read. "There is 'a' air in man. There is a wind in man and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

Now, to Numbers 16:22, and we will substitute these words for the word spirit, and it reads: "The God of the air of all flesh;" "the God of wind of all flesh." Isn't it silly? Luke 23:46. Jesus is dying upon the cross and the Bible makes Him say, "Father into thy hand I commend my spirit." Would you have that translated thus: "Father, into thy hands I commend my wind, my air or atmosphere"? How wonderfully anxious He was over a little wind that He wanted to hand it over into the keeping of the Almighty. Acts 7:59—Stephen, the first Christian martyr is being stoned to death and with the death damps upon his brow he cries: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Do you believe he said or meant, "Lord Jesus, receive my wind, receive my atmosphere, receive my air?" Now, if you think that is silly, don't blame me for it. I am just giving you a photograph of the other fellow.

The Breath of Life.

Job 34:11-14 shows conclusively that the breath of life is one thing the air quite another thing. "He gathered unto himself his spirit and his

breath." Here are the two both mentioned in the same verse. According to the mortal soulists he ought to have said: "I will gather up my breath and my breath, I will gather up my wind, and my atmosphere and my air and my breath." They would have you to believe that the "breath of life" the air, the atmosphere and the wind are all one and the same. Go with me now to Genesis 2:7, and I want to be careful on this point because they build a good deal on that. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." This is the first time that the word 'breath of life' and 'soul' are found in the Bible. I have shown to you that the breath is one thing and the spirit is another. It says the 'breath of life' not life. He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; that is to say, life's breath. The body without life does not need breath, nor life without the body, but the combination of life and body does.

Spirit and Body Make the Soul.

I have shown to you that air is one of the component parts of the body. It requires air to help to make this body and air was part of the body before the breath of life reached it. Now, to speak to you in plain English, the body is not the soul; the spirit is not the soul, though it is used sometimes interchangeably but here is clear definition: the spirit and the body is the soul. For the sake of analogy we will say here is a pile of brick and yonder a pile of mortar, the pile of brick is not a brick house, nor is the pile of mortar, but when put together according to the plans and specifications of the architect we call it a brick house. Similarly spirit and body when placed together make a soul. Now, the soul that sinneth it shall die. I can only stop here to say that the word death means separation, which I shall prove in a future lecture. By reason of sin death ensued; that is the separation of these two great principles, spirit and body. Death means a dissolution, a separation. Never at any time is there a cessation of existence, never annihilation.

Spirit Not Shapeless and Vague—It Has a Form.

My next thought is to prove to you that this spirit has a form: Zechariah 12:1: "The Lord formeth the spirit of man within him." He did not form his breath within him. He did not form air within him. He did not form wind within him, but he formed the spirit within him. Job 4:15. Here Job seems to be considerably exercised. He seems to be frightened. What is the occasion for this fright? He says: "A spirit passed before me," and he goes on to refer to the form of the spirit, showing that spirit has form. He did not get frightened because he happened to breathe some atmosphere but he was frightened when the Spirit passed before him.

Daniel 3:25 gives a description of the three Hebrew children cast into the fiery furnace. When the king looked in he said that they cast but three men into the furnace but "I see four men walking and the fourth is liketh unto the form of the Son of God." Here is the pre-existent spiritual Christ before His incarnation in Bethlehem's barn. More of that anon. Matthew 14:26—Here the disciples are out upon the storm tossed sea. They see someone walking on the white crested foam. The record does not say they thought it was an atmosphere or a wind or an air. No; the record says that they thought it was a spirit. Now, who was it? It was Jesus Christ in the form of man. They recognized that spirit had form and they thought it was a spirit when it was Jesus the Immaculate Son of Mary.

God is a Spirit.

John 4:24, declares to us emphatically, "God is a Spirit." Would you tell me God was a wind, or God was an atmosphere, or God was an air? "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in truth." Does it claim that those who worship Him must do so in a cyclone or in a wind storm? I want to hit that so I can reach certain individuals in this audience that have been deceived on that question. There is only one step between the sublime and the ridiculous. I want to puncture an error that is rampant and save one who has gone astray. Angels have been known to walk and talk and eat and drink and come and go. In Hebrews 1:7-14 we are told: "He maketh his angels spirits, his ministers as a flame of fire." So Satan in the pre-existent spiritualistic world was an angel of light. Jesus declares that he abode not in the truth. John 8:44, and he saw him fall as lightning from heaven. Luke 10:18.

The Fall of the Angels.

Jude 6, and 2nd Peter, chapter 2 and 4th verse, give a description of this fall. It declares that the angels that kept not their first estate were cast down and reserved unto everlasting chains of darkness until the judgment of the great day; and on the side let me say if they were in everlasting darkness that should dispel the idea about the everlasting flames of hell. For if but a lucifer match was lit there could be no darkness there. There cannot be any literal fire where there is outer darkness. Jesus says they will be cast into the outer darkness. Jude 6, speaking on this thought, says: "The angels which kept for their first estate." "God reserved in chains, under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."

Rev. 12 tells us "There was war in Heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon and his angels. The dragon and his angels, which is the devil, were cast down." Peter and Jude say these spirits are "reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." We will reach that in later lectures as to when their change will come.

Don't Let Them Scare You.

Now, all this bespeaks intelligence and organization. Everything indicates that these spirits are intelligent beings of form. They sinned, they were punished. Disabuse yourselves of that extreme thought that spirit is wind or air and that after death there is no consciousness. You know we ought to avoid extremes. That is what has made denominationism. Some grand men have listened to the descriptions of inhuman tortures to be inflicted in the next world upon the conscious wicked, and they have become so horrified at these lying stories told from both Catholic and Protestant pulpits to frighten people into religion and their souls have been so wrought upon that to avoid that extreme they have rushed to the other and denied consciousness after death and one extreme is just as far from the word of God as the other.

The Bible on Pre-Existence.

I want to show now that the Spirit of Christ and our spirits pre-existed; that is they lived anterior to their entrance into this fleshy house of clay. John 1:1-14. I will read this direct from the Bible: "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God.

Fourteenth verse: "And the word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Here we are clearly told several things: First, that Jesus Christ was known as the Word; that He was in the be-

ginning with God; that He made all things and that without Him was nothing made, and by and by this pre-existent spirit was tabernacled in a house of flesh.

John 17:5, Jesus is speaking direct to His Heavenly Father: "And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine Own Self. With the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." If that it true, then Jesus Christ existed as a spiritual being ages before He was born in Bethlehem's barn in the flesh. 24th verse of the same chapter says: "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast give me, for thou lovest me before the foundation of the world." Here is pre-existence clearly stated. Colossians 1st, 15-17 speaking of Jesus Christ says: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature for by him were all things created that are in Heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him, and he is before all things and by Him all things consist, and He is the head of the body (the church). Who is the beginning the first born from the dead that in all things He might have pre-eminence."

Bible Very Explicit on This Subject.

Hebrews 1:1, 2 makes a clear and distinct statement as to the pre-existence of Jesus Christ.

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.

Here God is called a spirit and yet He is called a person. Christ in Corinthians is called a spirit. Second Cor. 3:17, and yet He is called : person. We are told here that He is in the express image of His Father's person, showing organization, entity, being. Now we have been told three times that Jesus Christ was with the Father in the beginning and that God made all things in this world by Christ.

Animals? No! After God's Own Image.

In Genesis 1:26 a conversation is taking place between two individuals, not two cyclones, not two windstorms, but two individuals. "And God said, let us make man in our image after our likeness and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowls of the air, over the cattle and over all the earth. So God created man in his own image. In the image of God created he him, male and female: created He them."

Now remember I have shown to you that God is a spirit, so God created man spiritually. Consequently he is referred to sometimes as the Father of Spirits. Heb. 12:9. Now I want you to notice this point very carefully for infidelity with its accustomed cheek and impudence rises to say: "I don't believe your Bible from the fact that the first chapter says that God made man and in the second chapter we are told that man was not made yet. A libel on the face of your Bible," they say. Now, the facts are the first chapter of Genesis is giving an account of the physical creation, and now to that chapter to verify that statement.

Spiritual Body First Created.

Second chapter, verses 4 and 5: "These are the generations of the Heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the Heavens. And every plant of the field

before it was in the earth and every herb of the field before it grew; for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground." It does not say there was not a man, but there was not a man to till the ground: there was not yet a man of flesh and blood and bones and muscle to handle a plow. He had created the spiritual man in His own image but He had not created the physical man yet to till the ground. Then what would God do? "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." Now there is the formation of the physical man. The physical man all through the Bible is called this house, this tabernacle, this tenement of clay.

We All Have Pre-Existence.

Now, I want you to note these things carefully and follow me closely. Not only did Christ pre-exist spiritually but the whole human family as well. Go with me to the 12th chapter of Hebrews, 9th verse. God is there called the "Father of Spirits." He through Jesus Christ had made the spirit of man liken unto himself, a spirit. In after time he made him a tabernacle, a house of clay in which to live. In Job 38:4, God is calling Job to task for his presumption in making certain statements that "soul sleepers" are very fond of quoting as their authority for their unconsciousness after death. God Himself comes right out and gives Job to understand that he was wrong, and Job acknowledges that he had spoken presumptuously. Job 42:1-6. The Lord in this dialogue says: "Tell me now—virtually saying, you think you know the whole thing and I am going to show you how little you do know—tell me now, where were you when I laid the foundation of this world, when the sons of God shouted for joy and when the stars of God sang together?"

Here you see that God is saying that anterior to the formation of this planet the sons of God spiritually existed and the stars of God sang together. It will not be necessary for me to take up your time to-night to prove to you from the Scriptures that the angels were frequently referred to as the stars of God. The pre-existent spirits were called stars very frequently. Rev. 8:1-12. Jesus Himself was called "the Bright and Morning Star." Rev. 22:16; and here we are told the stars of God sang together, proving pre-existence. Jeremiah 1:5 in the plainest language shows that God said to him: "I knew thee before thou wast born." In plainer language than that, He tells him of his existence before he was born into the world.

By Silence Christ Admits Pre-Existence.

Go with me to John 9:1, 2 and the disciples are there asking Christ a question which touches on this very question of pre-existence. A blind man was brought before Him, and they asked Jesus, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents that he was born blind?" Who did sin, this man or his parents that he was born blind? Why, is it possible that a man come into this world hedged about by conditions that were made anterior to his coming into this world? Why, didn't Jesus say, "Oh, brethren, you are mistaken. That man never pre-existed. That man did not exist before he came here. But He never corrected them, only to say this: "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents, but that the works of God should be made manifest in him, and the man was given sight.

He did not denounce the theory and say it was wrong, but by His silence on that point He silently admitted it was right.

A Case in Point.

Now, let me give you one clear case that men come into this world into conditions frequently decided by things that transpired in the pre-existent world. Our Presbyterian friends have taken this as a sure solid fact in favor of fore-ordination and predestination and unconditional election, but it does not mean that at all. It is in Roman's 9:13, and tells the story of two boys Jacob and Esau. Now, what does it say? "Jacob, have I loved; Esau have I hated" and it is distinctly said that this statement was made before they were born. We are told by our fatalists that God made up His mind to hate the one, it did not matter how good he had been and He made up His mind to love the other, it did not matter how bad he had been.

Fatalism Denies the Gospel Power.

Ladies and gentlemen, if that is God, what is the use of you trying to be good? If the whole thing was settled from the foundation of the world whether you would be damned or saved and your obedience or disaffection from the law would not make a particle of difference to your destiny, and that God either hated or loved you before you were born and consigned you to hell or Heaven as the case may be, then the gospel is not the power of God unto salvation, unto anybody.

Let us see if this text proves that. You will discover that it does not say, "Jacob will I love and Esau will I hate, but it is speaking in the past tense. God knew Jacob and Esau in the pre-existent world when there was war in Heaven and when Michael and his angels fought. Esau, doubtless fought on the side of the rebellious and Jacob doubtless fought on the side of the obedient, and God knew them in those days, and So He said: "Jacob have I loved; Esau have I hated." The tense is past and therefore He is speaking of past time.

Spirit Can Act Independently.

My object to-night has been to show you that the physical and spiritual man is an entity, not mind, atmosphere, air, but a living, moving, entity. Next Sunday night I am going to show that the spirit at times acts independent of the body, and I will show that after death that spirit is still conscious in the intermediate stage between death and the resurrection. "The body without the spirit is dead." James 2:26. Just at this point I will leave the subject to-night, perhaps at its most interesting period.

Where Are The Dead?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 15th chapter 1st Corinthians and the 26th verse where you will read these words: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Last Sunday evening I tried to show you that man was dual, composed of a physical organization, called the body or outward man, and the spiritual man called the inner man. I tried to show you that the spiritual man pre-existed and that at death that spirit would retain its consciousness in eternity. There are two popular theories with regard to the dead. One is that at death the Christian goes to a place called Heaven, there to dwell for ever and ever. Those who are not born again have no probation after death, but go to a place called hell, which they suppose to be one seething blaze of literal fire where the damned roast for ever.

Another theory is that at death they go to an intermediate place and that by the prayers of the living relatives their sufferings are alleviated, their stay in purgatory is shortened and then they go to glory. Still another theory is that death means extinction, annihilation, the end of existence, and that there is no such a thing as the conscious spirit after death, and as I showed you last Sunday night, they believe that spirit means atmosphere, air, wind.

Death Means a Separation.

To-night it shall be my effort to show you that death does not mean annihilation, the cessation of consciousness—extinction of being, but a separation of two existing principles, body and spirit, and that the spirit is conscious between death and the resurrection. While I pay my respects to the mortal soulists to-night I hope to reach the fire and brimstone people next Sunday night. I propose to let the mortal soulists speak for themselves on this question, and so I read: "That the extinction of their being will be the ultimate punishment of the wicked is evident from such plain assertions of the Scripture as that 'the wages of sin is death.'" Romans 6:23. This is taken from Jones in *Thanatopsis*; page 30 and 31. You will notice the Bible quotation does not read "the wages of sin is torture," but death. Mr. Jones here voices the sentiments of Miles Grant, Mr. Williams, Pastor Russell and a number of other brilliant men on the side of the mortal soulists.

In a discussion held a few years ago in London with Mr. Phillips, he affirmed that "the Bible teaches that the wicked, the depraved and the heathen have no immortal spirit and that they will be annihilated by death." I had four nights, I believe it was, with this gentleman in London, and the results were very gratifying. Webster defines death as follows: "Death: to part, to divide, to disunite." The great Hodge also agrees with Webster in this definition that death is a departure of two existing principles. "The suspension of personal union between the body and the soul, followed by the resolution of the body into its chemical elements and the introduction of the soul into that separate state of existence which may be assigned to it by its Creator and Judge." So speaks the great Hodge in his "Outlines of Theology," page 548. The poet has

said: "There is no death. What seems so is transition. This life of mortal breath is but a suburb of the life elysian, whose portals we call death."

The great Addison on this question of death said: "The soul secure in her existence smiles at the drawn dagger and defies its point. The stars shall fade, the sun himself grow dim with age, and nature sink in years, but thou shalt flourish in immortal youth, unhurt amidst the war of elements the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds."

The Spirit Shall RETURN to God.

After these statements from these great men, I now direct your attention to the Bible itself. Eccles. 12:7, speaking of the hour of death, says: "Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was and the spirit shall return unto God that gave it." You will notice the word return is here used. It shows the body goes back whence it came—to the dust, and the spirit goes back whence it came—to God, thus showing pre-existence of spirit and consciousness after death.

Speaking of this, Dr. Adam Clark, Com. volume 3, page 560, says: "At death putrefaction and solution take place and in process of time is reduced to dust from which it was originally made. While the spirit (Haruach) that spirit which God at first breathed into the nostrils of man, when he in consequence became a living soul, returns to God who gave it."

The Bible.

Now, I shall show you from the Scriptures that the word "death" really means a separation. Matthew 8:21-22, tells the story of a young man called to the ministry. He is about ready to leave home on his mission of mercy and love when his father dies. He approached Jesus and said: "First permit me to go and bury my father," and Jesus replied: "Let the dead bury the dead. Follow thou me." You would not have me believe that Jesus tried to teach that young man that it was the duty of some corpse in the grave yard to jump up, grasp this corpse in the house and carry it off for interment. No; not that. Cowper, in his hymn on the word of God, says: "God is his own interpreter and He will make it plain." So we will let the Bible define the term.

Ephesians 2:1-16, speaks of people who were "dead in trespasses and sin." They are still alive, remember, physically, but they were separated from God because they were sinners. In Romans 6:1-23, Paul is arguing out this question, and the whole chapter goes to show that death means separation. "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein." That is, we who have been converted, born again from the old existence into a new life, who have been separated from our sins, and therefore dead to sin, how can we live any longer therein? So you see when the father died the boy wanted to stay home for the funeral, but Jesus thought that there was something more important for him to do in going and ministering to the interests of the living, to break unto them the bread of life, rather than to stay home according to the custom of the country and weep so many hours, and cry so many days. You know in those days they used to have criers and when the father or mother, the husband or wife did not feel like crying over the dead body they hired somebody to cry for them. It was a system of hypocrisy, but even in this town certain people have to moan and cry for so long, according to their religious creed.

You see how silly a thing it is, but no more silly than your putting on deep mourning for so many days and then half mourning for so many more days, and by-and-by, before you have paid for the monument you have incurred the expense of a new wedding dress. There is as much hy-

pocrisy about the average funeral as there is about anything. People who have been waiting and wishing for some folks to die in order to be in the swim must feel terrible and they show it by sobs and sighs and scalding tears. Jesus really wanted to put an end to this kind of hypocrisy and So He said to the young man: "Let the dead" (those who are dead in trespass and sin, swallowed up in the frivolities and tinsel show the froth and foam of society) let them put on airs at the funeral, but you go about your more important business and preach the gospel. That is all there is to that.

In Romans 6:23, we read: "The wages of sin is death." This is where Mr. Russell grows eloquent. He repeats it over and over again in nearly every sermon. "The wages of sin is death," and yet he says "they want you to believe that when a man is dead he is more alive than when he was alive," and he makes a big argument of it and laughs at the people because they believe in the absurdity that an individual can be dead and alive at the same time. And he propounds this question over and over again. "How can a man be dead and alive at the same time?" Why, it is the easiest thing in the world. Let the Bible tell Mr. Russell how.

The wages of sin is death, not annihilation, not an extinction but a separation from God. That is the point. "The soul that sinneth it shall die;" that is it shall be separated from God. That very text proves that man can be dead and alive at the same time. When Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit and came under the curse: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." They died in that they were separated from God spiritually and within the thousand-year day they died, physically as well as spiritually but notwithstanding, they died, they were still alive physically. Spirit and body had not separated, howbeit, they had passed upon them the death of the spirit, separation from God. So you can be dead and alive at the same time, Pastor Russell to the contrary, notwithstanding.

For further proof of this, I draw your attention to 1st Timothy, 5th chapter, 6th verse: "But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." Mr. Russell I did not make that up. Here is somebody that is dead and alive at the same time, and when you are giving the laugh on everybody that believes that you can be both dead and alive at the same time, you are jeering at Paul. So, you see, you can be dead and alive at the same time. Luke 15:11-32, tells the pathetic story of the Prodigal Son. Briefly told, it is as follows: A man had two sons. The younger gathered together his living and departed from the old homestead and went into a far country, where he wasted his substance with riotous living. There came a famine in that land and he came to himself and in process of time returned home, and the father is relating the story to the elder brother. He says: "This, my son, was dead and is alive again. He was lost and is found." The whole story shows that the word death means separation. So that there is no laugh in it at all except that of the man who having put up a man of straw knocks it down and declares he has achieved a victory. It seems funny to me that men claiming to be the custodians of the Bible should be right up against the Bible on this question all the time.

Now, if death means extinction, annihilation, destruction, was Adam destroyed the day he ate of the forbidden fruit, in accordance with what God said: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Was he annihilated? Did he cease to exist? No; he lived for several hundred

years after that in the flesh and then his body returned to dust and his spirit returned to God that gave it. There was no annihilation.

Paul Calls Death "Departure."

Second Timothy 4:6: Paul is speaking about his approaching death, and he says: "I am now ready to be offered up and the time of my departure is at hand." Notice the word departure, in place of death, showing that death means to depart, to divide, to separate. In Phillipians 1:21-24 he argues: "To die is gain." Mortal soulists would say "To die is to be destroyed." I would like them to figure out how much gain there is in destruction. "To die is gain, having the desire to depart and be with Christ," showing that his death was a departure and that death would enable him to go where Jesus was; not to be annihilated, not to lose consciousness, not to cease to exist. Why, if I was to talk all night I couldn't make that any plainer.

Conscious After Death.

In 2nd Corinthians, 5, 6 and 8, Paul is reasoning about this consciousness between death and the resurrection: "While we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord," showing that while the spirit is here, living in this mortal coil, we are absent from the Lord; and when the spirit takes its departure from the body that has been sanctified by the law of the gospel, it goes to paradise, and in that higher sense we never die in the sense of being separated from God. And so he argues here that when he departs this life he will be with Christ.

To fortify that I quote the language of the Saviour, found in John 8:51: "If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death." This is really strengthened by a statement made by the Master in John 11:26: "Who-soever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." Now, what does He mean by this? He means that the true child of God, who has been baptized in Jesus Christ and put Him on, and become Abraham's seed and an heir according to the promise, that when he passes out of this body the spirit will go to paradise, to dwell in the presence of the redeemed. His spirit will not be separated from Christ. That separation shall not take place with the Christian; he shall be with Christ.

"Her Soul Departed."

First Kings 17:21: You read there the story of a child that died. The prophet prayed for the child, and administered to him; and it is said the soul of the child came into him again. Genesis 35:18: Speaking of the death of Rachael, says: "As her soul was in departing, for she died." Showing conclusively from all these texts of scripture that death does not mean extinction, destruction, annihilation, cessation of existence, or the end of consciousness, as stated by the mortal soulists, but it means a departure—a dividing—a separation; the separation of spirit and body.

Where Does the Spirit Go?.

My next point will be to show you that after death the spirit is conscious between death and the resurrection. I may say, by way of an introduction to this thought, that the righteous spirit goes to a place called Paradise, or "Abraham's bosom" or "under the alta."—three names describing one place—the abode of the righteous spirits between death and the resurrection. The spirits of the wicked at death go to a place known under three names: "Pit," "prison-house," "hell." Now turn your attention to Luke 23:39-46, and you will read there the narrative of the thief upon the cross. Some would have you believe that the thief never knew

Christ until the day he met Him upon the cross. That is an assertion made out of whole cloth without a single particle of proof in all history; for every reference to the thief shows clearly that he was a baptized believer. He knew more about Jesus Christ and the ultimate results of the gospel than the average preacher of the twentieth century. Enough of that just now; I will take that point up later.

“Be With Me in Paradise.”

You will remember that the thief said to Jesus: “Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom.” Jesus answered and said unto him: “To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Now, we all know his body went to the grave, and if the mortal soulists be correct, all that there was of him went to the grave. The grave is nowhere called paradise. What did Jesus mean by this word. Paradise: “Luke 16:24; Luke 23:43; 2nd Corinthians 12:4; refer to a place called paradise—Abraham’s bosom. “So the Jews, styled paradise the place where the souls of good men remained from death to the resurrection. When Abraham’s children meet in paradise they know each other. This is the seat of the happy spirits in their separated state between death and the resurrection” (John Wesley, Notes on New Testament). This shows clearly that there is a well defined place called paradise, the abode of righteous spirits between death and the resurrection. Luke 16:19-31, tells us the story about the rich man and Lazarus. It shows that at death the rich man went to a place called hell and Lazarus went to a place called Abraham’s bosom.

Notice several points here that we ought to dwell upon. First, they are both dead; second, their bodies are buried. The Bible takes time to show that the rich man was “dead and buried.” Now, after his burial Jesus makes him talk from hell. He tells his condition down there and shows that he remembers what occurred upon the earth and he pleads, saying, “Father Abraham, send Lazarus to my father’s house that he may warn my five brethren that they come not to this place of torment.” And Jesus said, “They have Moses and the prophets. If they would not hear them they would not hear or believe though one rose from the dead.”

Two Points Made.

Now, I do not care to go into this in too lengthy a manner to-night as it would occupy too much time, but it is quite evident that several points are reached here. Therefore, with Alfred Trench, Wordsworth and the best commentators we take the passage relative to the rich man and Lazarus as teaching at all events two things: First, that the soul of the man is conscious after death and secondly that according to its moral character it goes either into a place of happiness and repose or into one of disquiet and misery. These two thoughts lie not only upon the surface of the narrative but they also constitute its very life and essence. (Haley’s Discrepancies of the Bible, page 190-191).

Don’t forget, dear hearer, that Jesus is the author of this story. Here He shows clearly that there is a hell prepared for the departed spirits of the wicked and an intermediate place called Abraham’s bosom or paradise, prepared for the spirits of the righteous. If Jesus Christ told that story and it is not true then what will you do with Jesus Christ. It seems to me that every mortal soulist will have to give up his theory or give up his Christ on this question. It won’t do for you to say he means the Jew and the Gentile. You have to borrow that, to guess at it. You might just as well say it meant chalk and cheese. You are just guessing. It indicates clearly that at death there is a separation, and that between death and the resurrection there is a consciousness.

Rev. 6:9-11: "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain. They cried out: 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, doest Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth,'" and it goes on to say that white robes were given to them and they were told to rest until their brethren who would be slain would come there also, indicating that the spirit has form, as I showed last Sunday night, for they are wearing white robes. Here is consciousness clearly indicated between death and the resurrection.

Spirits Conversed After Death.

Matthew 17:1-9, gives us a very beautiful story about the transfiguration of Jesus Christ upon the mountain. Three brethren were up there with Him. Suddenly the Holy Spirit came down upon Him and His face shone like the lightning, and before them stood the spirit of Moses and Elias. These two spirits conversed with Jesus Christ. Remember, Moses had been dead fifteen hundred years. Yet his spirit is conscious between death and the resurrection. "God is not the God of the dead," Jesus said, "but the God of the living," and so He often is called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob and Moses, and the prophets.

Some would account for it by saying that Moses was raised from the dead. But that won't do, as it contradicts all the rest of the Bible. It may do for the man that hires a little hall and figures out a little scheme when no questions can be asked. But suppose you were to teach that that was the literal body of Moses and somebody was then to quote 1st Corinthians 15:20; Acts 26:23 and Revelation 1:5, all stating in the most emphatic terms that "Christ was the first to rise from the dead." Christ is the first fruits of them that slept, then that would knock your theory of the literal resurrection of the body of Moses too high for you to reach it again, so I leave that with you.

Remember, that I am giving you Bible in proof of the truth, that there is an intermediate state where the conscious spirit of man goes between death and the resurrection. Some may say I am proving the Roman doctrine of "Purgatory." Not so. The doctrine of purgatory is an unwarranted extreme, a prostitution of a great truth. God will do justice to the departed spirit without any money being paid over on the side. Purgatory is a trick to take advantage of broken hearts, sorrowing relatives and misguided religionists, and is somewhat on a par with the conduct of those who mournfully take charge of the remains of the loved one, and charge, charge, charge till the sun goes down. I cannot give you Bible for the last statement, but if the history of the courts is true, I am fully supported.

Kill the Body But Not the Soul.

Now, to show you that the spirit is one thing and the body another, and that one will live when the other is dead, I quote Jesus Christ as He speaks in Luke 12:4-5: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do, but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear, fear Him which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell." Here is something worthy of your consideration. If the soul only means the physical body, as I showed you was the belief of some last Sunday night, why could not enemies destroy it? If the soul dies with the body, why did Jesus say that when they kill the body, they could do no more. If conscious existence ceases at death, why fear God? What do you want to be afraid of if you are going back to mud to stay there if that is the end? Why should you be afraid of mud? I do not think there is any more to be afraid of in sand than black loam.

Now, what is it goes to hell after the body has been slain? You can see the line of demarcation is drawn between the body that returns to the dust and the spirit that on the one hand if it is righteous goes to Paradise or on the other hand if it is wicked goes to hell.

Where Do the Wicked Go?

Now, I am going to try and show you as hastily as possible the spirits in this pit, prison house or hell. I mean the wicked spirits. I have referred to a great many righteous, so now for a look at the wicked. Isaiah 24:22. The prisoners to be visited. Isaiah 42:6-7, declares clearly that Christ will bring the prisoners from the prison house. Isaiah 6:1, says: "Christ will proclaim liberty to the captives and open the prison to them that are bound." Isaiah 49:8-9: "Christ under a covenant will say to the prisoners, 'Go forth.'". Zachariah 9:11-12, declares that by the blood of the covenant the prisoners of hope shall come forth. Hebrews 10:29 shows clearly that Christ is the one that is to shed the blood that will seal that covenant. All these passages that I have referred to from the Old Testament are acknowledged by the translators and printers of the Bible (although the word Christ is not in them), to refer to Jesus Christ as you may see from the reading of the headings on every page.

Ezekiel 31:14-18 and 32:18-32, show that several nations have gone down to the pit. They have gone to hell, whole nations of them are there. We are told plainly that Pharaoh, who led on the Egyptians, is there; that he is in the nether parts of the earth, that is the lower parts of the earth. Our mortal soulists will try to make you believe that that is the grave, but ladies and gentlemen the grave is in the upper parts of the earth. I saw a lady buried the other day in just about four feet of earth. We are just on the crust, on the outside just dropped in, but this place called the prison house, the pit, or hell, is described in these chapters as being in the 'nether parts of the earth,' that is the lowest parts. So it does not refer to the grave at all.

They Will Be Visited After Death.

Now, it says that these are prisoners of hope, and declares that they will be comforted there. Now, on the one hand if they are unconscious and there was nothing left but wind, how could they be comforted? On the other hand, if hell was a lurid place of literal flames there would not be much comfort in that, but it does not say that they are unconscious. It shows clearly that they are conscious, just as it is clear that there is no literal fire, and while there they will be visited by Jesus Christ, and hence they are called the prisoners of hope that are to be visited after many days.

Now, how was that fulfilled. Psalm 68:17-20, says: "The Lord led captivity captive, and received gifts for men, yea, even for the rebellious that the Lord God might dwell among them." There you see there is probation after death made even for the rebellious. He receives gifts for the rebellious. Paul in Ephesians 4:8-10 says Christ fulfilled that prophecy "He that ascended is the same also that descended first into the lower parts of the earth (the nether parts of the earth as referred to in the former prophecies), and He led captivity captive and received gifts for men, showing the complete fulfillment of the other prophecy."

They Will Hear the Gospel There.

Now, how did He do that? 1st Peter 3:18-21, says: "Christ suffered, the just for the unjust, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit He went and preached to the spirits in prison (referred

to in all those chapters), who were disobedient in the old time of Noah, when a few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. (You folks that don't believe that baptism is a saving ordinance should cut that out of your Bible.) This suggests that after Christ's death in the body His spirit went to the prison and preached to those captive nations, reaching away back to the antediluvian world. The very next chapter says: "He preached to those spirits that they might live according to God in the spirit, but be judged according to men in the flesh." Here is consciousness between death and the resurrection. Here is probation after death. That is all I care to say about that.

Why Did Christ Descend to Hell?

Here is Christ descending into hell. Do not your own creeds teach "He descended into hell and the third day He rose again." What did He go there for? Would you have me believe that the Master of Men went to hell just to peek into the furnace to say: "Didn't I tell you what you would get. It serves you right." Do you think He went to hell to tantalize the damned? No; that was not His mission. The record says He went to preach to them, showing consciousness among those to whom He preached. For what purpose? "That they might live according to God in the spirit and be judged according to men in the flesh." Let me drop that now for I will reach it later on. Teeming millions of men never heard of Christ in this world, never saw a Bible or a Christian. They were born in ignorance and lived and died in ignorance. God has made of one blood all nations of men and has appointed the bounds of their habitation that they might feel after Him and find Him for He is not far off from every one of them. Now if God is no respecter of persons, and gives every one an equal chance, He must give those heathens who have not heard the gospel a chance after death to hear it, or if He didn't, He would be partial and unjust. Scorn this doctrine if you will, but it is the only way to interpret the justice of God, the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God.

Ignorance Has Not Power to Save.

Now, one man says: "The heathen will be saved because they are ignorant, they have not heard anything about God." If ignorance is an excuse then why bother to teach the gospel to us at all if we could be saved by our sheer ignorance of it. If the heathen can be saved without hearing the gospel, then it is no longer the power of God unto salvation. In that case, the gospel only jeopardizes your chance of heaven. If that doctrine be true, if we can be saved without it, then let us remove it and let us all be saved instead of bringing it here to damn us.

Did you ever read in the 16th chapter of Matthew where Jesus says: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" Against what? Against the wondrous truth that Jesus is the Christ, and in a coming lecture I will show you more clearly than I can to-night that Jesus descended into hell and preached the gospel there and rose a conqueror, but we pass that for the present. Revelations 1:18. It is a bright sunny morning. The waves are kissing the rock-bound shore of the Isle of Patmos and John, upon the barren rock with hands extended to God, is wrapped in visions. It is Sunday morning. A personage stands before him and says to him, I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. I hold the keys of death and hell. Who was that? Jesus Christ; He had risen triumphant over death, hell and the grave and He now holds the keys, the power the authority over hell. What will He do with them?

Jesus Came to Conquer Satan.

You have been taught to believe in the first place that hell is only the grave, and in the second place that it is the place where the damned are burned for ever and ever, but here Jesus is in control. You have been taught that God made an individual called the devil and has given him an everlasting situation as the prince of hell, king of the damned, but my Bible teaches me that Jesus Christ was manifest, that He might destroy the works of the devil. 1 John 3-8 Yes, my friends, Jesus will destroy the works of the devil, and He will destroy death, and the whole creation of God will rejoice in abundant life.

Let the record tell us what He will do. Rev. 20:12-13: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works."

Jesus Holds the Keys.

Does not that show consciousness? Does not that show judgment and reward? Does not that give you the idea that Jesus holds the keys of death and hell? He is going to bring them to His feet as the crowned victor of every battle: the hero of every struggle. Revelations 5:13 shows the completeness of this wonderful salvation purchased by Jesus Christ. It reads as follows: "And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth (that is heaven, earth and hell), and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb for ever." Here Jesus will fulfill the promise of my text. He will reign until the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. That is to say the wandering soul shall be found; there shall be no more death—that is no more separation between God and His creatures, between man and his Creator, but from one new moon to another shall all flesh come up upon the earth to worship the Lord.

Here Jesus is made the victor, and so I say: "Bloom on thou Lily of the Valley until Thy purity will be recognized by the inhabitants of heaven, earth and hell. Bloom on Thou Rose of Sharon until the aroma of Thy love, the perfume of Thy power shall be wafted on the zephyrs to the darkest corners of the universe. Shine on thou bright and morning Star until the world is illumined by the brightness of Thy glory.

That is my conception of Jesus Christ. He is not a "one-horse God" as stated by some. He is not king of a few only, nor will the work of salvation end in this probation. Now, we have proven, I think, that the soul sleeper is left-handed; we have proven that the mortal soulist is mistaken; we have proven consciousness between death and the resurrection, and next Sunday night I shall pay my respects to that department that believes that we are conscious after death, but that we will be tortured for ever and ever in literal fire.

Where Are The Heathen? Does Death End All?

THE subject I have chosen to-night is, "Where are the Heathen?" or, "Does Death End All?" Permit me to draw your attention to the 3rd chapter of the 1st Epistle general of St. John, 3rd chapter, verse 8, where you will read these words: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil." Associate with that another text found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter 2, verse 14: "That through death He (Christ) might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." These two texts I want you to couple with a verse in St. Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 15, verse 26, where we read: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Paul in writing to Timothy, 2nd chapter, 15th verse, says: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed; rightly divining the word."

Fallible Churches.

The great trouble with "Churchianity" is that, while they all have the Word of God as found in the Bible, yet they have formulated their own creeds, and in order to support those human creeds they have neglected to rightly divine the Word of God; and in many cases, both in pulpit utterances and in their printed works they misquote the sacred scriptures, they misapply them, they add to and take from, thus reflecting a different meaning from the plain statement as found in the record, and hence we have so many different churches each in direct opposition to the other.

Now, on this very question as to where are the dead—what becomes of the heathen—we have several different answers, while there ought to be one. There is only one true, correct answer. But the churches have formulated their own creeds, and each one has twisted and tortured the Bible and tried to prove that its creed is correct. Now, to illustrate this:

Contradictory Conceptions.

First, we have a large section of "Christianity" declaring there is no probation after death, that we must be born again in this life or be irretrievably damned, being consigned to a literal flame of fire and brimstone to roast for evermore. We have another section of the church that tells us that at death even the very best of men don't go direct to heaven, but, that they go to a place called purgatory, there to blister awhile, until, perhaps, their poor relatives have paid the last dollar for prayers and sacrifices, and, by and by they go out of that place called purgatory, finish the journey, landing in heaven. And let me say to you, even the popes and the archbishops are not fit for heaven at death; prayers have got to be offered up, sacrifices have got to be made, to get them out of this purgatory. If these holy men have got to stay down there for a long time and have some of their friends on earth pray and pay to get them out of their sufferings, what is the great majority going to do. How long are

they going to stay there? But we pass that over, as I have talked to you in a previous lecture on that subject.

Total Annihilation Theory.

Now, we have yet another class that repudiates the idea of consciousness between death and the resurrection, and who claims that man is wholly mortal; that death is the penalty for sin, and that unless we are converted and thus become children of God, that when we die we die like the beast. There is no more punishment, there is no hell, there is no hereafter; man being wholly mortal—nothing immortal about him—therefore, he goes back to the dust and there he remains. Now, that third class is a little divided in that some of them take the position that all are to be resurrected, and they are all going to have another opportunity in the millennium; but those who do not accept this second opportunity go back to the dust and there remain as though they had never been created.

They harp on the text found in the 6th chapter of Romans, "The wages of sin is death" and so they argue that death means annihilation, extinction of being, a ceasing to be. But to let them speak for themselves, I quote Mr. Jones, who has voiced the sentiment of their leaders when he says "That the extinction of their being will be the ultimate punishment of the wicked is evident from such plain assertions of scripture as that contained in the text above quoted, namely, 'The wages of sin is death.'" Romans 6:23. Notice it does not say the wages of sin is torture "Thanatopsis" (Page 29) Here you discover that humanity is wholly mortal, and unless converted in this life they will go down to the dust from whence they came. "The wages of sin is death." If you just think upon that word "wages" you would recognize that everybody does not get the same reward; that the very word "wages" shows that there will be a diversity in the rewarding of the good. Some are to be beaten with few stripes, some are to be beaten with many stripes; (Luke 12:47) their wages differ. But that class of the church that I have just mentioned can only say one thing—that death means total annihilation. Now, I have spent some time in a former lecture upon that point, but I want to draw your attention to some of what are considered by them their strong points in support of this unconsciousness after death, the extinction of being; and that man is wholly mortal. Mr. Williams, who circulated his book here sometime ago, is a gifted clergyman who was sent for to offset the efforts of Torrey and Alexander after their propaganda work in Massey Hall. He shows in his book every place in the Bible where the word immortality is found, and with your permission, I am going to examine every text that he cites. And I think I can show you from those very texts themselves that his contention is a fallacy.

Paul on Immortality.

Now, let us examine these texts. The word immortality is found five times in the Bible, and strange to say, Paul is the only writer who uses the word. I am going to turn to these and read them, so that you will not think I am making an argument that is false. In Romans 2:7 we read: "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." Now, we are told here that they are going to seek for honor, for glory, for immortality, eternal life. Now, we will try to find out what that means. Does it mean that there is absolutely no immortality only to the Christian after death? If that be true, then there is no honor this side of the first resurrection; there is no glory this side of the first resurrection; there is no life this side of the first resurrection. And it is an axiomatic truth that that which proves too

much does not prove anything. Now, it is a fact that the immortality of the body can only come through the resurrection but there is not a hint that the spirit of man is not immortal—not a hint of it. We pass on from that, however.

Death to Be Destroyed.

First Corinthians 15:53, we read: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." Anybody that will read that chapter cannot help but recognize that this has reference to the body only, because it goes on to show, speaking of the body: "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body. It is raised a spiritual body, and when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory."

Anybody in this world, unless he has a theological axe to grind, can see clearly that this has reference to the immortality of the body. You will notice in this text it says, "Death is swallowed up in victory." If you will notice in the four texts cited in the beginning of my discourse, we read that death was to be destroyed; but our "mortal soulists" just turn the thing upside down. While the Bible shows that death is to destroy—that is the difference. While in their position death destroys, the Bible position is that death has yet to be itself destroyed. In the one case the devil is made an eternal victor; in the other case Jesus Christ is to destroy the works of the devil. That is the difference, and, as you will see, one is diametrically opposed to the other. In a word, one is true, the other is wrong; one is correct, the other is false. In place of death going to be the destruction of all men, death itself is to be destroyed. Jesus will reign until He has put all enemies under his feet; and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. First Corinthians 15:26. When Mr. Williams was in Toronto I cited that very point and when he quoted the identical text, professing to give it direct from the Bible, he quoted it: "The last enemy shall be destroyed," omitting the word "death" altogether. In that way he attempted to show that Christ's enemies would eventually be destroyed, but did not want to say that "death" would be destroyed, for that would destroy his theory.

Pure in Heart Shall See God.

Second Timothy 1-10, we read, "Immortality is brought to light through the Gospel." That is to say, the hope of the first resurrection to an immortal body is brought to pass, or brought to light, through the Gospel; not that it never existed, but that we are to become acquainted with it, that is all. It always existed, but we only know it through the promises and preachings of God's word. That is clear, I think.

Again, 1st Timothy 1-17, has a statement that is worthy of your close consideration on this particular point. "Now, unto the King, eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God be honor and glory for ever and ever, amen." Now, again I say that that which proves too much does not prove anything. If the text here will prove that God only hath immortality, then what? God is the only wise—is everybody else a fool but the Almighty? Is it a fact that nobody knows anything but God? Again, God is here called the Invisible. Is it therefore a fact that no one has ever seen God; that no one ever will see God? Why, we read of Moses and seventy-three elders seeing God. Ex. 24:29. We read again of Moses talking to God face to face as a man speaketh to his friend. Ex. 33:11.

We read also that the pure in heart shall see God; Matt. 5:8. That the wicked shall not see Him, in that, since except a man is born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God. John 3:3. And until a man is purified and fitted to come into the presence of God, he will not see Him. In a word, He is only invisible to those who are in such a condition through sin that they cannot behold Him. But if there is any golden, glittering promise that will shine on undimmed, invulnerable as the God that made it, it is the promise that every blood-bought soul shall see God. So that He is not invisible in the sense that no one will ever see Him.

Is Man Immortal?

But the strongest text that they have is found in the 1st Epistle to Timothy, 6-16. (I want you to notice this carefully): "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." Thirty years before Paul wrote that statement, Jesus Christ was crucified and took His seat on the right hand of God in Heaven. I ask you, was Jesus mortal or immortal? Some thousands of years before that, Enoch was translated that he should not see death and went up in a whirlwind to Heaven. Gen. 5:24. Heb. 11:5. Was he mortal? Thirty years before that many of the saints arose and came out of their grave after the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Matt. 27:52-53. Were they mortal? And yet these people want to dwell on that term? "Who only hath immortal being; there is nobody immortal but God Himself. But Jesus certainly was immortal when He went to Heaven; Enoch certainly was immortal when he went to Heaven; Elijah certainly was immortal when he went to Heaven; for we read that flesh and blood cannot enter therein. Jesus tells us that Himself. Now, notice the explanation of the word, "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light." Luke tells us in his 20th chapter that the angels are immortal, so that the terms "Who only hath immortality," must be examined under the following statement: "Dwelling in the light." He hath it independent of all others; but life and immortality, as I have already read to you, is brought to light to us through the Gospel. God knew it before the Gospel was preached, but we did not. It has been revealed to us; that is the hope of the saint.

The Soul Sleeper's Favorite Text.

Now, I want to examine their strong point of unconsciousness and extinction after death. Ecclesiastes 3rd chapter, 18th and 21st verses. I will ask your indulgence while I read this, because I do not want to leave a word out bearing on the subject. "I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts, for that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

Every soul sleeper reminds us of that text every time he preaches that we are all just like the beasts that perish; no pre-eminence at all. If that is so, then did Christ die to save the beasts? Did He die to save the elephants and the frogs? If we have no pre-eminence, if there is no difference between us and the animals, then that must be so. Now, why not be honest and just read the next verse for it lets us out nicely: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth." Now, they deny that man is dual, spirit and body, and claim that we are all mortal, that all we do is

to go back to dust and stay in that condition. Speaking of the body, when a dog dies, if he has been in a kindly family of people, they bury him; if a man dies in a civilized community, they bury him—both dog and man go down to the dust; that is, both are put in the grave, no pre-eminence in that sense. But they either cannot see or will not see the very next verse is speaking about something beside the body; that is, “the spirit of man that goeth upward.” Or, as the same writer in another place, said: “Then shall dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.” Eccl. 12:7. You know, it is hard work for me to believe that a man will spend fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty years in preaching along that one line, looking at this text almost every time he preaches; and then try to make me believe that he has never noticed that next verse. It looks very much as though he had a little creed to support and where the Bible is in opposition to his creed he shuts his eyes to it and will not present it, because it downs his creed!

Body Mortal—Spirit Immortal.

Ecclesiastes 9:5 has another statement that they think is fine. Here it is: “For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything.” And again in the 10th verse: “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest.” Does that mean that the spirit will be unconscious between death and the resurrection? No! It seems to me that anybody with brains ought to know that has reference to this mortal body, that is to return to the dust. “There is no knowledge in the grave.” Nobody tries to preach that the body will know anything when it is dead and buried. Is it fair, think you, to make an argument that the spirit of man is unconscious between death and the resurrection, because it shows that when the body goes to the grave there is no knowledge, no wisdom there? But they keep harping on it, “The dead know not anything.” And when I hear them talking like that, I am pretty nearly converted to the belief that there is a whole lot of people living that don’t know anything! Further, let me say that if that proves unconsciousness between death and the resurrection, I am going to prove to you that this same people are unconscious before they die. Turn to 1st Timothy, 6th chapter, 4th verse. Paul in speaking of the wicked, says: “He is proud, knowing nothing.” Will you draw a line of demarcation between the dead that know not anything, and the wicked that know nothing? Which of them knows most?

Literalism and Figure.

Again, 2nd book of Samuel 15:11. Here you are told the story of Absalom and two hundred warriors that “they knew not anything.” Do you tell me that this is strictly literal, and ought to be interpreted that these men had no knowledge at all? Of course not. We go a little further. Through to Job 14:21. (This is a good one, they say!) Job here says: “His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not”; showing that when a man dies his sons will be honorable men in the world, but because the father is dead he won’t know anything about it. Well, if that proves unconsciousness of the spirit between death and the resurrection, let me tell you there are a good many of us unconscious before we go to the grave. Would you like to make an argument that I don’t know anything? I have a son who may have performed several acts this day or last week that I don’t know anything about. Do you tell me, therefore, I don’t know anything, because I don’t know every step my boy takes? You see, I don’t

have to go to the grave before I reach that stage. The thing proves too much, and therefore proves nothing.

I want to examine this clearly, for this is the last night I am going to be on this subject. Obadiah 16th verse (There is only one chapter to this book), we read: "The heathen shall drink continually, and they shall be as though they had not been." "There," they say: "that is total annihilation!" They shall be as they had not been. Yes, but if you literalize that, please don't forget the first part of the verse that says: "They shall drink continually." You see, they will continue to do something. The real interpretation of it is that they shall pass off from this earth, and if they have been wicked their acts or as St. Paul says, their works "shall be burned up." But it does not show unconsciousness between death and the resurrection at all—not a hint of it. Now, these are strange expressions, and we must take the text and the context in conjunction, or we do them violence.

Here is a statement by a very learned man upon this point. I quote from Mr. Haley's "Discrepancies of the Bible," page 209: "Those persons who undertake to build a doctrine upon the figures of poetry and Oriental idiom are expending their labors just as wisely as they would be in endeavoring to make a pyramid stand upon its apex. Their foundation is inadequate and their efforts nugatory. As to the Hebrew terms rendered in our version "consumed," "cut off," "die," "destroy," "devour," "perish," and the like, neither in the original terms nor in their English equivalents, nor in the connection in which they stand, is there inherent force or aught else which necessitates or even warrants the interpretation of them as implying annihilation, extinction or consciousness or cessation of existence." Now, I think I have said enough on that point to show you that their pet texts for unconsciousness after death, and man being wholly mortal, are absolutely unfounded in the Bible. Of course, you will not expect me to give all the evidences in favor of consciousness after death, to-night. I have presented them in a former lecture.

Are the Heathen Damned?

Now, to the question: "Where Are the Heathen," and what is their condition? One class of the church teaches that in this life only there is probation, that is to say, we are all born in sin, and unless we are born again in this life, hell—the material burning hell will be our everlasting doom; that death ends all; that there are only two conditions after death—heaven for the saved and redeemed, and a material burning hell for all the rest of mankind; that mankind can only be saved by hearing and believing the gospel in this life, and the heathen, not having heard the gospel in this life, are forever damned. Another class says, not burned, but annihilated.

Ignorance No Passport.

Another class declares such an arrangement would be unfair, to damn the poor heathen for not having faith in God, when they never heard of Him; for not obeying the gospel when they never heard it. They claim there would be no justice in such condemnation, and I agree with them thus far. But they seek to make it clear by saying God will save the heathen because he is ignorant. Now, this theory is somewhat better than the first, in that it is void of the cruelty reflected in the other, but it is not the true and proper position to occupy. We are told, "This is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent," John 17:3, and Paul informs us that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, Rom. 1:17. Take Christ as the true

witness and Paul as a proper representative, we learn that to be saved, one must know God, love Christ, and obey the gospel. Hence ignorance will not save the heathen. Just think a moment. If ignorance will save a person, then the gospel is not the power of God unto salvation, because we can be saved without it. But worse and more of it. The gospel, in place of being the power by which God has designed to save mankind, it will be the power by which the civilized world will be damned. If ignorance will save one, ignorance will save all and at that rate, it would be better that we were all heathen and all ignorant, then all would be saved.

The true position is that man is conscious between death and the resurrection, and that in the intermediate state the gospel will be preached to them, as the scriptures plainly state, man will enjoy probation after death, as clearly proved in my lecture of two weeks ago. See the following: Isaiah 24:22; Ezekiel 31:16-18; Ezekiel 32:17-32 1 Peter 3:18-25; 1 Peter 4:6.

Universal Opportunity.

If we will study the character of God we will see that He is "no respecter of persons," Acts 10:34. Paul tells us, "God has made of one blood all nation of men . . . and hath appointed the bonds of their habitation . . . that they might feel after Him and find Him," Acts 17:26-27. God is the Father of all the children of His creation, and the attributes ascribed to Him are power, justice, goodness, love. These attributes forbid us to surmise that He that is called Father more than two hundred times in the Bible, will be either unjust or cruel to any of His children. But all that is revealed of Him proves that the children that have not been permitted to hear the gospel in this life will have the privilege of hearing it and obeying it in the worlds that are without end. Our Father could not hold a man responsible without granting him an opportunity. Nor would He be just to reward him for knowing and obeying that which he did not know nor did not obey. Hence reason and justice, as well as the scriptures declare that the heathen, born in ignorance, living in ignorance, and dying in ignorance, will have an opportunity to hear, believe and obey, and thus be saved in the kingdom of God's dear Son.

Some Startling Figures.

I want to give you a few items with regard to the numerical strength of the world. Here are some statistical reports culled from the statisticians of the world: Statisticians tell us "that since the creation of Adam,—about one hundred and forty-three billions of human beings have lived upon the earth. Of these, the broadest estimate that could be made would be less than one billion who were saints of God." (Mill. Dawn, page 99, volume 1.) Now, if it be true that in this life only, probation is granted to men, it follows that over one hundred and forty-two billions have gone to a burning hell forever, or if the Mortal Soulists be correct, gone back to earth. On either supposition, God is defeated and the devil has worked his way.

There are over one billion heathen in the world to-day. It is admitted that the average life of mankind now does not exceed thirty-three years and four months. It follows that this whole mass of heathen will have died within the next thirty-three years and four months and consequently, there will die on an average, thirty million a year, two million five hundred and seventy-six thousand nine hundred and twenty-three every day, three thousand, five hundred and twenty-four every hour, fifty-eight and one-seventh every minute, one nearly every second. In other words, God creates and damns one pagan soul every second of time,

every tick of the clock, every pulsation of the human heart. And this making and damning souls has been going on since the creation of man, or at least since death.

“One billion souls are dying in Christless despair at the rate of nearly one hundred thousand a day.”—General Booth of the Salvation Army.

“Not one-half of the fourteen hundred millions have ever heard the name of Jesus.”—Mill Dawn, vol. 1, page 92.

“There are now living 1,000,000,000 heathens, Buddhists 485,000,000, Brahmins, 120,000,000, Mohammedans, 225,000,000, Parsees, 1,000,000, Jews, 8,000,000, Pagans, 202,000,000. There are 390,000,000 Christians, divided into 190,000,000 Roman Catholics, 84,000,000 Greek Catholics, 116,000,000 Protestants.”—See Encyclopaedia Britannica and Johnston’s Encyclopaedia.

“Mr. Brerewood divided the world into thirty parts, nineteen of them are professed heathens, altogether as ignorant of Christ as if he had never come into the world. Six of the remaining parts are professed Mohammedans, so that only five in thirty are so much as nominally Christians. Since this computation was made many new nations have been discovered. All heathens, many of them inferior to the beasts of the field, more savage than lions.” John Wesley, sermon 65, “General Spread of the Gospel.”

Now, let us learn from that great and good man, John Wesley, what he thought of the fifth part of the world that made claim to be Christians:

“Put Papists and Protestants together—and what manner of Christians are they? Are they holy as He that hath called them is holy? Is there that mind in them which was also in Christ Jesus? And do they walk as Christ also walked? Nay, they are as far from it as hell is from Heaven.”—John Wesley, Sermon 65.

Christ’s All-Sufficient Atonement.

Now, what is going to become of all these millions, all the billions? Let the Bible teach us. In 1st Timothy 2:6, Paul tells us there that Christ gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified of in due time. If He gave Himself a ransom for all, will that ransom fail to the extent that the majority will be lost—or be reduced to nothing, or by being put into a burning hell forever? Answer, 1st Timothy 4:10, speaking of Jesus, it says: “Who is the saviour of all men, especially of those that believe?” Then again Hebrews 2:9: “Jesus, by the grace of God should taste death for every man.” How many will that leave out? Shall He die in vain, or will every man receive some time, somewhere, the benefits of the agonies of Golgotha. The man that denies, that flings a shadow o’er the atonement of Jesus Christ!

In 2nd Cor. 5:14-15, we read: “Christ died for all.” Thus God reconciles the world unto Himself. Again I say, did He die in vain? Will the devil beat Him out of the great majority? Will you sing:

“All hail the power of Jesus’ name,
Let angels prostrate fall,
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all.”

And then listen to the preacher say that he is only going to get a few, and the devil is going to get the great majority? Don’t sing that any more if it is not true, and if it is true, then some preachers are misrepresenting facts.

Luke 2:10, the angels said: "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people." Won't it be glad tidings of great joy to those who go down and be as though they never were—cease to exist? Oh, my friends, that is not the mission of Jesus Christ!

We read in John 4:42: "Christ, the Saviour of the world." Not of a few, He never taught anybody to say "God bless my wife, my son John and his wife; us four and no more. Amen." No; this is something bigger than your narrow-minded, selfish creeds.

John 12:32, Christ says: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto me." How many does that leave out? Was he lifted up in vain? No; Christ, as sure as He made that statement, just as sure as those words fell from the blessed lips of the Man of Sorrow, so surely will they come to pass; and He will eventually, in the due time of the Almighty, in some of the worlds that are without end, reign until He puts all enemies under His feet. And the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death—separation from God will be no more, and all men shall be drawn unto Christ. That is the law of the gospel.

The Devil Defeated.

First Corinthians 15:22, "As in Adam all die (that means everybody). Oh, yes, they say that is everybody. Now, notice—even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The "all" in the one line is just as big as the "all" in the other. We pass on. Revelations 4:11, speaking to the Almighty, the Angel said: "Thou has created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Isaiah 46:10: "My council shall stand and I will do all my pleasure." Can God have any pleasure in the death of the wicked? If He knew the end from the beginning and He created man for His pleasure, is He going to have pleasure in looking over the battlements of heaven into the lurid flames of hell, listening to the screeching and blaspheming of millions? Or will there be any pleasure in seeing the devil fool humanity until the great majority goes back to mud? No; it proves that they will give God honor, and before I close to-night I am going to show you that every creature will answer to the call the of Almighty and give Him honor.

Now, I am going to give you several quotation that have direct reference to the heathen nations, which have not heard of God. Psalm 2:8: "Ask of me and I will give you the heathen for thine inheritance." This is God speaking to Christ. The heathen then, are going to come to Christ. Again, Psalms 22:27: "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord." Not that the great majority are going to be damned. Galatians 3:8: "And God will justify the heathen through faith and all nations shall be blessed." That doesn't show that the majority are going to be damned. Phillipians 2:9-12 (Oh, you will pardon me, this is so grand I will read it, I promised to read this and I will do so.) "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him (Christ) and given him a name which is above every name, and at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth." That is, the inhabitants of heaven, of earth, and hell, are going to bow the knee to Jesus Christ. And what more? "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." How many will that leave out?

Rev. 5:13. Here's the ultimate, the grand final! And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth and under the earth, (you see, heaven, earth and hell) and such as are in the sea, and all that are in

them, heard I saying (now what did every creature in heaven, earth and hell say?) "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

Motives for Divine Punishment.

Why should God punish anybody? There are just three reasons which I want to give you. First, He might apply this punishment, as I have shown you in a former lecture, to burn out the dross and purify the gold within us. In a word, He calls us from sin and would make us righteous. That is one reason for an application of punishment, as you would punish your child, not because you hated him, but to teach him a lesson to avoid that evil hereafter, Heb. 12:6-11.

Second, God might punish us for the benefit of others looking on; to be an example to them and to keep them from treading in the steps wherein we have fallen. But if punishment is eternal, that would not do.

The third and last reason would be out of spite, out of malice, hatred, and we don't so learn of God in the record. So that when He punishes it will be on account of His love, His mercy and tenderness; to educate His children. Thus the goodness of God will finally lead them all to repentance," Rom. 2:4. So Christ taught in all the parables. Just look at two or three of them before I close.

The Seeking God.

In St. Luke's Gospel, chapter 15, you will read the parable of the woman who lost the piece of silver, which represented the kingdom of God. How long did she search for that piece of silver? Until she found it. So God will search for the lost child of His creation even though He journey to the dark caverns of hell. He will find him; for Jesus is on record as saying: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matthew 16:18. And, as I quoted you last Sunday night, "Death and hell shall deliver up their dead," Rev. 20:13. You have thought hell was a place of eternal flame where the culprit would be imprisoned forever. The Bible contradicts that.

The next parable I shall call your attention to is that of the lost sheep, with Jesus the Shepherd. There is the ninety and nine in the fold and the lost sheep has gone astray. Does He say: "Silly little fool, it serves him right! He had grass and to spare; the pasture was good within the enclosure; let him go." Did he say that? No; the record shows that he left the ninety and nine in the enclosure to seek for the wandering sheep, for he was not satisfied with the ninety and nine. He had died for all; He was to be a joy to all; He was no respecter of persons; all were His brothers; He was their brother and God was their universal father. And so we find the shepherd wandering through the woodland and the valleys. But he found his sheep down in the jungle and rejoiced exceedingly over its recovery. How long did He search for this lost sheep? Until He found it. Even so will Jesus do with the lost wandering children throughout all the universe "till every knee shall bow and every tongue confess to the above every name, and at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of is, the inhabitants of heaven, of earth, and hell, are going to bow the knee to Jesus Christ. And what more? "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." How many will that leave out?

All Conquering Love.

One thought more and I am done. The Prodigal Son left home, left the church, he did despite the spirit of truth. "This, my son, was dead

and is alive again." He wandered away, but the father did not forsake him; he had forsaken the father, but the father had not forsaken him. And in time the wandering boy felt the memory of the past looming up; the reminiscences of the dear dead years passed before him; and he said, "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son." And what did the father say regarding his son? "Bring forth the best robe and put it on him; put shoes on his feet; a ring on his finger; kill the fatted calf; let there be music and dancing. This, my son, was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found."

So the last wandering boy will be brought home in the worlds that are without end, and God's entire creation will have found the lost chord and there will be joy in the singing of the holy coronation song, and Christ will be crowned Lord of all. I thank you.

The Different Rewards In Glory

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the Book of Revelations, chapter 22, verse 12, where you will read these words: "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."

The religious world, or, at least, a large portion of what is known as the Christian denominations, has been taught to believe that there are but two places—heaven for the absolutely good, and hell for the rest, which latter is largely in the majority; that if you are not just good enough for heaven, then you are to be everlastingly doomed to flames. In other words, bliss for the saint, and blister for the sinner. The text that I have just read denounces such a theory, from the fact that every man (and the word man is used here in the generic sense, meaning man or woman) is to be rewarded according to his works; or, as another scripture saith, they "shall be rewarded according to the deeds done in the body."

Paul, writing to the Galatian brethren, says in the 6th chapter of his epistle: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Every man and woman knows quite well from past experience, from association with one's fellows, that there are degrees of badness and degrees of goodness among the human family; some who do not profess to be saints are truthful, virtuous, moral, clean, upright men and women. But the church says that unless "born again," the virtuous woman will spend eternity screaming and blaspheming with the lost harlots in the fiery flame of hell; that if she is not a "converted" woman, hell is her doom, no matter how virtuous a girl, how pure a virgin, how faithful a wife, how loving a mother she may have been. It makes no difference; there are but two places—heaven for the converted, and everlasting flames for the unconverted.

Punishment Should Fit the Crime.

I may say that, while this doctrine is the popular doctrine of to-day, it is contrary to all law, either human or Divine. The judges of our lowest courts up to the highest, faithfully deal out justice, inflicting according to the enormity of the offence committed. When I was a child, and could scarcely speak plainly, I learned a lesson that gives the lie for all time to modern Christianity, and the lesson was this: "It is a sin to steal a pin; it is a greater to steal a tater." In that simple statement there is announced a truth that neither popes, cardinals, nor archbishops, have learned; the truth therein reflected that there are degrees of punishment, even as there are degrees in the offences committed. And so, while we say that the popular doctrine is contrary to all law, we will go further than that, and say that it is in direct conflict with justice and common sense. "Well," says one, "would you have us believe that there are degrees in damnation and degrees in salvation? Certainly. If every man is to be rewarded according to the deeds done in his body, as your faces differ, so your life and conduct differ, and so will your rewards differ.

Now, I know it is sometimes assumed that God is going to be merciful,

that He is going to give to a certain class something that they don't deserve, in the way of salvation as the result of unconditional election; and you are taught that men are damned and tortured for ever who are no worse than some who by grace and favor are saved, and that is a serious reflection upon God. God has no right to break His own law, a law by which He would be detected in the action of doing an injustice to any man, whether he be good or bad. If He gives one man more glory than he deserves it is a breach of justice; and if He gives another man more punishment than he deserves, it is a breach of justice, just the same. Let me say to you, God has no pets, God has no favorites.

"Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal. 6:7. We are asked to believe that a man can sow the seeds of sin and crime and misery all his life, and on his deathbed tell God Almighty he is sorry; thus walk into heaven, where the angel choir will stop while the Lord says unto that man "Thou hast been faithful over the few things committed to your trust; take a crown and a harp; I will make you ruler over many things." Such teaching is contrary to all law. The biggest fool of a farmer that ever ran a farm would never think for a moment that he could sow oats and reap wheat, that he could plant potatoes, and as a result get a crop of cabbage. He knows that the thing in kind that he sows, that shall be also reap. And so we believe in the spiritual world that the law of God, being perfect, will not pass over a single kind word spoken or kind act performed without its bringing the result in goodness and reward; nor can we be guilty of an unkind word or unkind deed, but that goes into the sum total of our reward on the other side of the question. And so, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

Degrees of Punishment.

I am not going to say a great deal about rewards to-night, as I wish to deal with that subject later on. However, I just want to say one word. As I believe there are diversities of rewards for the good, so I believe that there are degrees of punishment for the bad. One man said that he would not believe that unless he could get it direct from the lips of Jesus Christ; so, for his personal benefit, I am going to read you one text on this point. It is found in the 23rd chapter of St. Matthew, 14th verse, and reads as follows: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer; therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." The greater damnation? Then there are degrees even in damnation; one man is going to receive a greater damnation than another. Then one won't be as hard as the other to bear, if language is a science to convey an idea. Here is the solid truth presented by Jesus Christ Himself, that some will receive greater damnation than others. In other words, as quoted last Sunday night, some "will be beaten with few stripes, and others will be beaten with many stripes."

The Different Glories.

But now to the different glories. We are told that Christ in the 25th chapter of St. Matthew, from the 31st to the 46th verses, shows here that there are but two places, heaven and hell, the right and the wrong, the good and the bad, bliss and blister; that He teaches this doctrine in the parable of the sheep and the goats. Now, I deny that allegation. There are more than two conditions named in that parable; and it just shows you that a man can formulate a creed which will blind him to the beauty of the Bible. Let us look at the narrative. The parable in question relates

a story something like this: (I will paraphrase it.) That when Jesus Christ shall come in His glory, He shall separate the nations as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. He shall put the sheep on the right hand, and the goats on the left hand. And right here let me say that this is not dealing with literal facts. These are not literal sheep; these are not literal goats. But those terms represent nations—He separates nations as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. We are told that the sheep here represent the saints of God—those who have obeyed the Gospel; and the right-hand blessing means celestial glory in the kingdom of God's dear Son. I do not believe that at all! There is not one word in the story to show that these people who are referred to as sheep are saints of God at all, nor a single syllable that indicates they were ever born again into the kingdom of God's dear Son.

What Jesus Says.

Now, let Jesus tell it Himself. He says to those on the right hand, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Now, let me just say here, I do not want the kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world! If God will answer my earnest pray, He will not give me that kingdom. Why don't you want it? someone says. Simply because I want something better. I would not ride on a freight car if I could get a Pullman! Can you get something better? Yes; I will point it out to you to-night. Now, notice. This reward that is to be imparted to these characters referred to in the story has been prepared from the foundation of the world for these characters. Why? Well, it is not left for us to guess, for Jesus proceeds in the narrative to explain as to why they are to be assigned this reward. He says: "For (that is, because) I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me."

Now, you will notice, dear friends, that here are six good acts performed by these people, for which they are to get a reward prepared from the foundation of the world. Now, you have got to guess at anything more than that. That is what it says. It never mentions the thought that they had faith in Jesus Christ, that they had been baptized, that they had repented of their sins, that they had been confirmed, that they might be made recipients of the Holy Ghost. There is not a hint that any of them ever obeyed the Gospel in the whole record, nor is that reward a Gospel reward. Let me proceed. "Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, 'Lord, when saw we thee an hungered and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took Thee in? or naked, and clothed Thee? Or when saw we Thee sick, or in prison and came unto Thee?'" Is not that a strange thing, think you? Is it not tantamount to saying, "Master, you are mistaken; this is a case of mistaken identity. We never saw Thee in the conditions that Thou sayest we did. We do not know Thee at all." "Then shall the King answer and say unto them: 'Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'" Oh, here is a class that you haven't counted on; here is a class that the parsons have not referred to. We discover that there are more than sheep present, more than goats present. A third class suddenly looms into prominence. Who are they? They are a third class; but I will refer to them later on.

What Does Righteous Mean?

I proceed with the narrative. One says, but, Mr. Evans, He calls these people righteous. I grant it. But what is righteous? Surely right acts constitute righteousness. Is it right for men to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit the sick? Yes. Then, for these righteous deeds they are to be rewarded with a just recompense of reward; but that does not entitle them to what is known as the Gospel reward, called celestial glory in the Bible. There are degrees in righteousness. Turn your attention for a moment to Romans 10:3. Paul here says, speaking to the Hebrews, "You go about to establish your own righteousness, having not submitted to the righteousness of God." Ah, so there are two classes of righteousness! Now, let us see if we can find them out. Go with me to St. Matthew 5:20. Jesus there, speaking to the disciples concerning the scribes and Pharisees, says: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Now, my friends, here is an admission that the scribes and Pharisees had a degree of righteousness, but it was not of the kind that would entitle them to an abundant entrance into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Good enough to go on the right hand and enjoy the reward prepared from the foundation of the world, for the performance of certain good deeds, but insufficient for an entrance into the celestial glory.

I want you to try to get this thought fastened in your minds, that as there are degrees of righteousness, so there are differences in the glory. Paul, speaking in 1st Corinthians, 15:41, says: "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead." Here are three leading glories, typified by the King of Day, the Queen of Night, and her children—sun, moon and stars. And as the stars are differentiated in brilliancy, so the reward will be differentiated in degree. What, then, are you going to do with your man-made system of heaven for a certain class, and all the rest condemned to a burning hell for evermore; or, if not a burning hell, extinction and total annihilation? You go out for a ramble some starry night and you look at the stars. Some very brilliant, others not so brilliant, some still more dim. And, in fact, there are millions of stars that you cannot see with the naked eye; but with the assistance of the instruments invented by men, you can look far away into the milky way and there see hundreds and thousands of stars that at the first glance you failed to behold. So, brethren, there are characters in this world who are rendering a perfect obedience to the perfect law, that emanated from the perfect God, and these are assured the perfect glory, called in this same chapter "the glory of the sun"—the celestial glory, or the glory of the brethren.

As I understand it, the glory of the brethren, the glory of the sun, the glory that is called the celestial glory, is the highest glory; and is prepared for those who from the heart obey the Gospel, and are born again from an old existence into the new life.

The Second Glory.

The second glory, typified by the moon, is the glory of the "sheep," the honorable men of the world, the moral giant, the virgin, the virtuous man or woman, but who has not obeyed the Gospel and been born again. While your churches declare that the moral man is as bad as the reprobate, John Calvin and others, even declaring that the moral man is worse

than the lost, because he, by his moral life made men suppose that he could be saved and get to heaven without the assistance of religious faith—worse than the absolutely bad—I deny the truth of such a statement. I claim that the moral men and women are better by far than the immoral; that the truthful man, though not a member of any church, is better than the liar; that the honest man, though he makes no profession of religion, stands higher in the judgment of the Great Eternal than the thief; that the virgin is a million times better than the prostitute. Let me say right here, that you can see the difference between “churchianity” and the teaching of the Latter Day Saints Church in as clear a manner on this very subject, as in any one thing that I have presented, or may yet present, for your consideration; the difference as between the Church of Christ and the churches of the world.

The Glory of the Stars.

Then there is the “glory of the stars.” The lost will be found, then they will receive that reward typified by the stars. “Oh, well,” says one, “I am afraid you are up against it there. There are men and women in whose lives you cannot see a single thing of good.” I don’t believe you! That is put straight, isn’t it?

I don’t believe in the Presbyterian doctrine of total depravity, and there is not one minister in Toronto could affirm that in a pupit discussion. I don’t believe that God ever made any man to be eternally burned up or annihilated. I believe that there is something of Divinity in every human breast. Every child of Adam is made in the image of his God, and that God has implanted within him that which in this world, or in some of the worlds that are without end, will reach out until it grasps the loving hand of its Heavenly Father. You may have seen some very bad women; you may have seen some very bad men; but if you were thoroughly acquainted with all their life, you would know that they had some good traits beneath that hardened and debased outward character. And the God that has declared the hairs of your head are all numbered, and that not even a sparrow falleth to the ground without His notice, will He pass by the Imperial spirit of men, made in His own image, just because that spirit in the midnight storm of human experience has been stained and scarred with the weaknesses incident to humanity?

Think of the Fatherhood of God, and you will decide that I am right in this matter. You may find some wicked man, in whom it is very hard to discover any goodness; but he is like the stars that are far away, that at first sight you cannot see, but after a steady, penetrating gaze, you may discover their twinkling in yonder sky. So, brethren, let us look into the deep researches of men’s hearts, and we will find there something that can be worked upon for good. You may not be able to see it, but you cannot see a chicken in a new laid egg. But let the hen have it for a week or so, and the egg will be more worthless than ever if you wanted it for table diet. But let that old mother hen keep it for a few weeks longer and she will give you a chicken out of it. I do not know how it is done, but it is a simple every-day occurrence.

So God will view that wicked man under the varied experiences of the worlds that are beyond, and He will bring that man up to such a condition that he, after having paid the penalty for the wrong he has done, will come under an educational training that he will develop goodness within him, and finally be rewarded.

I read a story about the great John L. Sullivan some time ago. He

is said to have been very low down in the scale of morality. It is said that he was passing down one of the streets in the slums of New York. The night was dark and cheerless, a storm was raging. Suddenly he heard the low, mournful moan of a woman. John L. had been imbibing quite freely, but the manhood still resident within him exerted itself. Ploughing through the drift he espied the form of a poor helpless woman at the mercy of a pitiless storm, half clad and with three little children tugging at her skirts crying for bread, and shivering in the blast.

Upon inquiry he discovered that they had been ejected from the tenement house. Her husband having died, she had used up what little means she had; sickness came to the children; she could not work, and the landlord had thrown her out. Well, John L. wanted to kill the landlord, but he could not find him. But his first duty was to take that woman and her children to the nearest hotel, which he did. "Kindly get someone to take care of this poor woman; fix her up; give these children and this woman a bath and something to eat, and clean clothes. Take care of her and I will pay the bill," he said. Pulling out a roll of bills from his pocket, he continued, "if there is not enough there. I will call again." The woman, with tears streaming down her cheeks, managed to say, "To whom am I indebted for the saving of my life and the lives of my children?" Oh, well said John L. to himself, that is the natural inquisitiveness of a woman; always wanting to know. "If it will do you any good, this is the notorious John L. Sullivan."

Now, I am not going to tell you that Sullivan will enter celestial glory and get the glory of the sun, and be a son in the Kingdom of God because he performed that kind act; but I will say that the God that watches the fall of the sparrow will not pass by that dear son's Christ-like deed towards a needy soul, and that some day, somewhere, in the worlds that are without end, when every man's work will be brought into judgment and be made manifest; when the seed sown in this life will bring forth its harvest of fruitage, the act of John L. Sullivan on that night in New York will entitle him to recognition by God, though it only be but the reward typified by yonder twinkling star.

All Good Deeds Rewarded.

I wish to be very careful upon this point: That Sullivan could not buy celestial glory with his money. No man can live an immoral, unjust, or irreligious life, and hope by building libraries or churches or any other good work of philanthropy or by the performance of great work whatsoever, think that that alone will entitle him to an entrance into celestial glory. None can enter therein but they who are born again according to the Gospel law. But, mark you, they will be rewarded for all these good things, although not with celestial glory. Let me show you that from the Bible. Turn to the 1st Corinthians 13:3. This whole chapter is devoted to the exposition of charity—its beauties, powers, and results. Paul says: Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity it profiteth me nothing." So that you see, giving to the poor, building libraries or churches, or any other philanthropic work, will not grant us an admission into the celestial glory—it will profit us nothing touching that degree of glory. But it will give us a reward outside of that glory; for Jesus has not only shown us in the parable of the sheep and the goats that the man who feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, visits the sick and the imprisoned will receive the reward prepared from the foundation of the world; but He also states in

Matthew 10:42, that "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily, I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." Mind you, it does not say that a man who hands you out a drink of water is going to get celestial glory for it; but he will be rewarded, even though it be but the reward typified by the twinkling star. That is the fine justice of God.

When Jesus Comes.

Now, back to our original subject. I shall have little to say to you about the goats, because I discoursed upon that subject a little while ago on the question of "Future Punishment." But I want to draw your attention to that third class, the brethren who have been overlooked when you are made to believe that there are but two classes in this parable, the sheep and the goats. Who are these brethren, and where did they come from? Notice it carefully, now. "When the Son of Man shall come." And the Bible is full of what is going to be accomplished when He comes; not that it's all to be accomplished at the moment of His arrival.

Suppose, for instance, I were to say to you that King George was coming to Canada this summer. The Toronto World would say, "he is coming to Toronto"; The London Free Press would say, "he is coming to London"; The Hamilton Spectator would say, "he is coming to Hamilton"; and The Montreal Star would say, "he is coming to Montreal," etc. But who would say that he was going to be in London, Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, all at the same time? No one; but when he comes, he is coming to all those places, but not all at the same time. So it will be when Jesus comes; there are many things that will be accomplished, but not all together.

Now, I want to notice some of them in rotation. The Bible teaches that when Jesus comes the righteous dead, the saints, from Adam down to the last one that has gone to the tomb, shall be raised to immortality; that the living saint shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye; and they shall all be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall they be ever with the Lord. Now, here is a class at the beginning of the millennium reign that is going to be taken out of the nations. Two shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, the other left. Taken where? Taken to where Jesus will be. Mark the thought well; they are to be ever with Him. It is so said by Paul in 1st Thessalonians 4:13-18. Now, there is a work going on throughout that thousand years of millennium reign, but at the close of that reign something else transpires. But what is it?

This great judgment referred to in the 25th chapter of Matthew, a thousand years after the brotherhood are gathered and are with the Lord, these nations are to be separated on the right and on the left hand. There is none of the brethren among them that have been gathered out a thousand years before, not a saint in all the nations. They are with the Lord. But now the moral and the immoral, the sheep and the goats, are gathered, the one on the right hand and the other on the left hand; when Christ shall reward the sheep with the glory prepared from the foundation of the world. But that is not the glory that He is to give to the saint, brethren. Go with me to the Gospel as recorded by St. John. Jesus says there: "In my Father's house are many mansions."

They were prepared from the foundations of the world; they are the differentiated mansions for those great men referred to. But did He say to the saint, to the brethren, "You are going to get one of those mansions

there?" Not a word of it! Did he say, "I have prepared a spacious place for you from the foundation of the world?" Not a word of it! What did He say? Remember, one is prepared from the foundation of the world. Now, the glory that the brethren were to receive was not prepared from the foundation of the world. But He says to them plainly there: "I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am there ye may be also." Can you see Christ's meaning? The place for the sheep was prepared from the foundation of the world. That is one reason why I said I did not want it. Why don't I want it? Because I want the one that was not prepared from the foundation of the world, the place that Christ refers to when He says, "I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am there ye may be also." That promise was made to His Disciples, and is for those who are His true followers. Again, He said: "That they may be with me, that they may behold My glory." The glory of the sun! My brethren shall be with Him in the glory that He is gone to prepare, and when it is prepared, Christ is coming and the brethren will be caught up to meet Him; and the promise will be fulfilled. "So shall they be ever with the Lord."

Who Are Christ's Brethren?

But it does not say the sheep will be with Him. They will be in the class in the mansions prepared from the foundation of the world, because of the moral good they have performed—feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, and all such kindly acts of love. Who are Christ's brethren? You will remember on one occasion when He was preaching (St. Mark records the incident in his gospel story) somebody came to Christ and told Him that His mother and brothers were outside and wanted to talk with Him. What did He say? In the dignity of His manhood, he answered: "Who is my brother and my mother?" (It is a wonder somebody did not jump up and say, why, the sheep on the right hand). But, no; Christ said: "He that doeth the will of my Father in heaven, the same is my mother and my sister and my brother."

What is the will of God? That we should obey the Gospel. Therefore, the man that obeys the Gospel, the woman that obeys the Gospel—these are the brothers and the sisters of Jesus Christ; and they will receive the "glory of the sun"; they will be with Him in His glory. You talk about earthly ties! People become brothers and sisters, and sons and daughters, in this world under very, very many different conditions. Often uninvited guests come to the brother or sister, son or daughter; but in the Kingdom of God, when we are born again, that is by a higher, purer and better law than the brotherhood of man, as typified in the human family.

The Divine family is far superior to the human family. The human brotherhood ceases at the moment of death; but the brotherhood of the Church of Jesus extends through all eternity. You could not help having your brothers in the world; you were not consulted, neither were they. But in the brotherhood of the church you are consulted; that is an act of your own submission and obedience to the law of God, that transplants you from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son.

My point is illustrated very nicely by a story I read the other day in a Toronto paper. One child said to the other, "Say, your father and mother ain't your real father and mother; they adopted you." "Yes," the other little fellow said, "That's so. But your father and mother had to take you no matter what you looked like; but mine selected me." Do you see the point? The first birth, the first brotherhood, the human con-

ditions, are not to be compared with the second birth, the second brotherhood, the Divine conditions. And while every man is going to be rewarded according to his works, yet only those that render a perfect obedience to the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God will get the perfect glory—the celestial glory in the presence of God and Christ. And that is why the Gospel is called the power of God unto salvation. May we obey it from the heart, and thus be entitled to share in the celestial glory. I thank you.

Faith or Works? Death-Bed Repentance

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 2nd chapter of the Epistle of St. James, 14th verse, where you will read these words: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?"

The subject under consideration to-night is death-bed repentance. One of the leading doctrines of the Reformation was the doctrine of justification by faith; or, in other words, the idea that faith alone can save you; that we are not to depend upon works at all, and, consequently, the moment a man professes faith in Jesus Christ, they tell you that at that very moment he is saved, whether he is on the gallows or on his deathbed, or in the revival meeting. Now, I don't believe that, and my reason for refusing to accept such teaching as truth is because it is contrary to the Bible, first, last, and all the time. This doctrine is so contrary to the teaching of Holy Writ, that you would hardly believe me were I to tell you what the general Protestant church teaches regarding this doctrine. And so, at the risk of being a little tedious to-night, I am going to read you certain statements relative to this doctrine from the leading ministers and some of the churches' disciplines, just to prove what I say, and in order that you may know just what they teach on this matter from their own lips.

The "Faith Alone" Dogma.

Article 11 in the Church of England Prayer Book, on the justification of man, reads as follows: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by faith and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." This is also found in Buck's Theo. Dictionary, page 809, and in the Methodist Church Discipline, published in Toronto, page 6.

In "Gems of Truth and Beauty," published in 1889, page 125, we read as follows: "Bring out from the dust of six thousand years the old covenant of Eden, and on that soiled and torn banner you read the fading motto, 'Do and live.' But what read we on the folds of this banner, which, defiant of hell and the world, waves above Calvary and under which believers march to victory. The eye of a sinner's hope kindles at the sight of another and better motto, for there inscribed in the blood of Jesus, like red letters on snow-white ground, we read: 'Believe and live'; salvation is the only thing needful for man, and faith is the only thing needful for salvation," Guthrie.

The Rev. Dr. Van Horne preached in the very shadow of the Wesleyan University at Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, in April, 1892. The following is copied from The Mount Pleasant News: "What must I do to be saved?" This is the text from which Dr. Van Horne preached to a full house last evening. He said: "This question presupposes two things: first, a desire on our part to be saved from sin and its consequences; from that which is distressing to that which is blessed; righteousness and peace for that which will be useful and ultimately heaven.

"Second, to receive this salvation what must we do? 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' What does this mean? First, we assent that Jesus came into the world to save sinners. Second, we consent with our heart and our will that He came to save us. When these two requisites are fulfilled we will be saved."

Dr. Talmage, in September, 1894, made the following statement: "There is only one road to heaven, and that is the road of faith. There is only one boat to heaven, and that is the boat of faith. There is only one step to heaven, and that is the step of faith. For how much is heaven and pardon offered to you? A million dollars? less than that, a thousand dollars? less than that: one dollar? less than that: one farthing? less than that. Without money and without price you may have it: there is no journey to go, no penance to do. Only one decisive action of the soul: 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.'"

D. L. Moody, the great evangelist, made this statement: "An old man arose in the meeting one time and said the finest thing I ever heard. He said he had been forty years finding out three things: First—'I can do nothing to save myself'; second, 'God expects me to do nothing'; and third, 'Jesus did it all.' You have only to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you are saved.

The Evangelical Alliance makes this statement: "Whosoever believes that salvation is secured by faith in Jesus Christ is evangelical; and whosoever accepts more or less than this as a means of salvation is not evangelical."

Believers' Sins Excused.

Here is another statement from a leading man: "Believers ought not to mourn for sin, because it was pardoned before it was committed." Eaton's "Honeycomb of Justification."

"Good sees no sin in believers, whatever sin they commit. My sin might displease God, my person is always acceptable to Him; though I should outsin Menasse, I should not be less a pleasant child, because God always views me in Christ. Hence, in the midst of adulteries, murders and incests He can address me with 'Thou art all fair, my love, my undefiled, there is not spot in thee.' It is a most pernicious error of the schoolmen to distinguish sins according to the fact and not according to the person. Though I blame those who say, 'Let us sin that grace may abound,' yet adultery, incest and murder shall, upon the whole, make me holier on earth and merrier in heaven." This is a statement of the famous Richard Hill, a friend of the great Fletcher; and it is found in Fletcher's Work, Vol. 4, page 97.

On this same question the famous Martin Luther, on the 1st of August, 1521, wrote to Melancthon the following: "Sin, and sin boldly; but let your faith be greater than your sin. It is enough for us through the riches of the glory of God to have known the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. Sin will not destroy in us the reign of the Lamb, although we were to commit fornication or murder a thousand times in one day." This is taken from a book entitled, "Faith or Fact," by H. M. Taber, page 86.

Pernicious Doctrine.

Now, I may say in conclusion upon this point, there never was a doctrine so sure to breed moral pestilence as the doctrine of salvation by faith alone.

John Wesley, upon this matter, says: "That grand pest of Christianity,

a faith without works, was spread far and wide when St. James wrote his epistle." (John Wesley's 63rd sermon, entitled, "The Mystery of Iniquity.")

Here you have it from their own lips, that it does not matter whether a man commits adultery, murder, incest, fornication, or any other crime, if he has faith in Christ, he is "holier on earth and merrier in heaven." You are told that the thing that is a sin in the unbeliever, sufficient to send him to hell, God will take no notice of that sin committed by one that has faith, for He sees no sin in believers.

One of your writers practically says it like this: "That if a Christian is committing sin, and that in the commission of it God happens to look his way, he just dodges behind Jesus Christ and all that God can see is Jesus when he looks in the direction of the sinner. We are told of the great doctrine from Eden down to Christ, that upon the banner was written, "Do and live," but that that banner had faded away. Now we don't have to do anything; on the Christian banner is written, "Believe and live."

One of their hymns, that is so frequently sung at their meetings, runs like this:

"Nothing either great or small,
Nothing, sinner, no;
Jesus did it, did it all,
Long, long ago.

"Wherefore, weary plodding one,
Wherefore toil you so?
Cease from doing, all was done,
Long, long ago."

And the closing lines has it like this:

"Doing is a deadly thing,
Doing ends in death."

Opposed to Common Sense.

Now, there is where you get the doctrine that a man can serve the devil all his life, and after the lawyers have ate up his farm, and his last dollar in defending him, and he has to go to the gallows; then, the preacher fixes it all up and sends him off to heaven in the thought that the moment he says he believes in Jesus Christ, that very moment he is saved. Or, in other words, a man can serve Satan all his life, and when, with the ashes of a misspent life, he is lying on his death-bed, he says, "Here, Lord, you can take this," the Lord Says, "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." I remark that this doctrine is contrary to equity, to justice, and to all the laws that we have read, either human or divine, on the question of rewards and punishments. It is, moreover, a theory unsupported; except in the frenzied brain of the evangelist, the professional hypnotist, and his dupes.

"Doing"—An Essential Factor.

Now, let us prove that, they say. We have not to do anything; doing ends in death. Let us measure that first. I will draw your attention to St. James' Epistle, 1st chapter, verses 22 to 25: "But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." Jesus says, Matthew 7:21: "Not everyone that saith unto me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter into the king-

dom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Again, Luke 6:46-47 (Christ, too, found the people who thought that faith alone would save them), they regarded Him as the Lord, and He said to them: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Again, John 7:17, we read: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." And John 13:17, says: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." And I could read you a hundred passages and more that fling the false statement into the face of modern "Churchianity," when they teach you that "doing is a deadly thing," that "doing will end in death." And that faith alone is a "good and wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

Faith Dead Without Works.

But let me just for a moment examine that thought of faith alone, for my text says: "Can faith save him?" Now, let us hear the apostle answer. Second chapter St. James' Epistle, 17th verse: "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." Now, just note that carefully. The Methodist Discipline and Church of England (Article 11), says that faith alone is a "good and wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort"; but the Bible says faith alone is like a decomposing corpse, for as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also. The body without the spirit is a corpse. Isn't that very full of comfort! And you know that that corpse in process of decomposition will get worse and worse, till it spreads not only an indescribable stench, but spreads disease also. And as a dead body literally will spread disease among a community, so this doctrine of faith without works will spread a moral pestilence to the soul; and as Wesley says, is "That grand pest of Christianity."

I now draw your attention to the 1st Corinthian Letter, chapter 13. You may read at leisure the whole chapter with great profit. It is a sermon by St. Paul on charity. I just glean a few thoughts from it, as follows: "And though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. Oh, you say, that does not mean a saving faith. Bless your heart, my friend, if you have all faith, how much more faith can you have than all of it? Yet the writer here says that though you may have all faith, and yet lack the essential something else, it will profit you nothing. How can it save you then? In the closing verses of this chapter he says: "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." Why, if faith alone will save you, why didn't he say, the greatest of these is faith?—but he didn't.

The Reformer's Mistake.

Now, I do not wish to speak disparagingly of faith, for I believe with the Bible that Without faith it is impossible to please God; that faith is the great motive power of every intelligent action; and that faith is the first principle of the Christian doctrine. But that faith alone will save you, I believe to be a palpable misconception of Christ's teaching as found in the New Testament. I believe that some of our reformers—good men as they were in many respects—went to the extreme on the question of works. While Romanism was placing its whole trust for salvation on indulgence and penance and such things as that, which was wrong and contrary to the Book, these men went to the extreme in the other direction, when they began to teach and to show that works had nothing to do with our salvation. Here is their strongest point; for it is not fair to give the evidence on the one side and omit the evidence on the other. I am going

to read you the entire verse. Second chapter of Galatians, 16th verse: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

What is The Faith?

Now, there are two points named there; first, something is referred to as the faith of Jesus Christ. I can martial forty texts to prove that the faith of Jesus Christ is the Gospel God sent Christ to preach; which Paul, this very same writer, declares to be the "power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16). That it is unfair to say that the faith of Jesus Christ is wrapped up in one principle called belief; but that the faith is the Gospel economy. Hence Jude could say, "Content for the faith once delivered to the saints"; or, as we have it in Acts 13:8, where Elymas the sorcerer sought to turn away the deputy from the faith; that is, from the Gospel, from the Church, the true Church. Or, as we have it in Romans 1:5, "For obedience to the faith among all nation." That is, to the Gospel among all nations. Again, in Paul's 1st Epistle to Timothy, 4:1: "Some shall depart from the faith." That is, from the Gospel of Christ. The doctrine that Christ taught, the law and the spirit of Christ, as revealed in the Gospel, this is called the faith—not an abstract principle called faith.

The Mosaic Law Imperfect.

Now, what is it Paul is referring to here as the "works of the law?" Mark you, he is not denouncing the works of the Gospel, that God foreordained that we should observe and walk in; but he is denouncing those who refused to obey the faith of Jesus Christ as contained in the gospel ordinances, placing their dependence upon the works of the law—that is, the Mosaic Law. That is to say, they were putting their dependence for salvation in such things as circumcision, the blood of bulls and of goats, the ashes of a red heifer, and all those ceremonies and laws of the Mosaic economy. Paul was trying to urge upon them the thought that that law was imperfect as a means of salvation, "that comers thereunto could not be made perfect." And at the same time, he was giving them a splendid introduction to the perfect and undefiled law of the Lord, which David, in the 19th Psalm, speaks of when he says, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul."

Grace for the Obedient.

Now, we have so much for that strong passage; but here is one that they say is stronger. It is found in Ephesians, 2nd chapter, 8th and 9th verses, which I will read in full: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." "Oh," I hear one man say, "I am sorry you read that verse, for it says there we are not saved by works, we are saved by grace." Let us look at it. What is the meaning of the word "grace?" "Oh," says one, "it means favor." Yes; that is so. Then by the grace of God, or favor of God, we are going to be saved? Yes. Supposing, for instance, that you wanted a favor from me, how would you be most likely to obtain it? Why, by just doing what I told you to do. For you to constantly refuse to submit to the conditions that I imposed upon you, and yet for you to come up with a lot of what the world sometimes calls "taffy" or "soft soap," and say, "you are the lily-of-the-valley, you are the one altogether lovely, you are the chief among ten thousand. I love you, believe in you."

Would that satisfy me, if you continued to disobey me, if you con-

tinued to disregard my wishes? Why, I should be likely to say what Jesus said: "Why do you call me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" "If you love Me, keep My commandments"; "For this is the love of God that we keep His commandments." "And it is not the hearer but the doer of the word that shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." Can you see the point? that if you are to be saved by grace, you can only obtain that grace or favor by complying with the conditions God has laid down. And what are those conditions? Briefly, they are this: You must obey the ordinances of the gospel, the doctrine of Christ. For Paul wrote to Timothy, saying: "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine, for by so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." And again he wrote in the 1st chapter of Romans, "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation."

Works of Man Are Vain.

Hence, to be saved by grace means that by the favor of God, through obedience to His gospel, you may be saved; but "not of works, lest any man should boast." True, not the works of a man lest that man should boast about some invention he had discovered by which you were going to be saved; for God is a jealous God, and no works of man can be placed before the works of God. Let me show you what that meant. Supposing, now, I am a Catholic priest. I build a little place up here, and you sit on one side of it and I on the other, and you whisper to me all that you have done and all you would like to do, and by the confession that you make to me I dole out your pardon. I made this confessional box; that is the work of a man, and God had nothing to do with it. If I saw great good was being accomplished by my little house here in the corner of the church or elsewhere, could I not lie back in my chair and boast of all that I am doing? Do you see? "Not of works, lest any man should boast."

Now, let us look on the other side. Suppose I am a splendid hypnotist or mesmerist, or modern Protestant revivalist, (it is all the same thing), and I have invented a penitent form, and I tell you stories about fire and brimstone and hell, and picture your dear dead mother in heaven looking over the battlements and watching for your approach. By all these stories I make you snifle and cry, and you come up to this penitent form, and I say to you, 'do you feel the power?' and you say, 'Amen, I feel it; I have got the glory in my soul; I have just found it; I am saved! Again, I can lay back and say, it was I that fixed up that penitent form idea,—for it is unknown in the Bible. That is the work of man, just as the confessional box of the other side is the work of man. The apostle condemns the work that man may do, lest any should boast; but does it say that you are not to do the works of God?

Study and Weigh the Context.

Now, let me read the next verse, "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." (Eph. 2:10). Here you have it clearly stated that you are not saved by the works of man—the penitent form or the confessional box; but that you must comply with the conditions, and work the works of righteousness that God has fore-ordained that you should walk in. So much for the works. The great trouble in this theory, as with many others, is that people pick out one isolated passage and begin to make a creed from it. For instance, we read in Romans 8:24: "For we are saved by hope." Does that prove that we must not have any faith nor any repentance nor any baptism—just saved by hope? No! We read in Romans 10:9, "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, the Lord Jesus,

and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead thou shalt be saved.”

Now, says one, you are just saved by belief. Why, there are millions that believe in Jesus and that God hath raised him from the dead, and yet they commit all kinds of crime and are very sinful men, and do not make any claim to be Christians at all; though they may have been taught and raised to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. To take that as an unsupported text, and say that anybody who just says that Jesus is the Christ, put him down as another soul on the way to glory—is not true scripture. That is where the revivalists get most of their converts—often the same people over and over again as each mission comes and goes.

Salvation Includes Many Elements.

Titus 3:5: “According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration.” There, says one, I am not saved by hope, I am saved by mercy. And another says, I am not saved by mercy, I am saved by regeneration. First Peter 3:20-21: “Eight souls were saved by water, the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us.” “That,” says somebody else, “is what saves us. I am going to have a plunge; I don’t have to have any faith or repentance, I don’t have to depend upon God’s mercy, I am saved by baptism.” Now, that would be nonsense, wouldn’t it? To illustrate this, supposing I have a farm here. I am showing you round the land and the buildings, and I say that land produces me fifty bushels of wheat to the acre. See that plough? that plough produces me fifty bushels of wheat to the acre. That harrow produces me fifty bushels of wheat to the acre. That sun produces me fifty bushels of wheat to the acre. The rain produces me fifty bushels of wheat to the acre. Suppose it was all rain and no sun, should I have had fifty bushels of wheat to the acre? Or, supposing that it was all plough and no land should I have been able to produce fifty bushels of wheat to the acre. Suppose, further, I had the land, but the sun did not shine, and the rain did not come, and I had no plough or harrow, should I have secured fifty bushels of wheat to the acre? Of course not! for it takes all these to produce the fifty bushels of wheat to the acre.

So, my brethren, it takes hope, and faith, and charity, and mercy and grace, and baptism of water and of the Spirit, and all the different parts of the Gospel, known as the perfect law of liberty, to produce the conversion of the sinner, and to make him a saint. The salvation of a single soul includes all these essentials. And the man that refuses baptism, refuses hope, refuses mercy and just depends on faith is not really following the commandments of his God, with regard to salvation.

Reward for the Doers.

But, someone says, it is written, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” There is no baptism there, Bishop Evans, it is just believe. Stop, my friend, let me call your attention to the fact that while the word baptism is not there, neither is the word repentance to be found there; and by the same logic that you use when you say you can be saved without baptism, because baptism is not mentioned in the text, you could prove, also, that you could be saved without repentance, because repentance is not mentioned in the text. Let me here say to you again, dear friends, that the great curse is, we build on one text to the exclusion of all others; we place our whole superstructure upon one principle called faith—good in its place and essential to our salvation and lose sight of all the other elements. If we do this, and exclude all the other principles

of the Gospel—repentance, and baptism, and all the rest, we cannot be saved; for Jesus Christ said: “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.” (John 3:5); or, in other words, “If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments.”

The whole Bible supports the doctrine of works as being necessary to salvation. Just a thought on that. “Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap” (Gal. 6:7). What about Luther? What about Hill? who both tell you that you can commit fornication and murder and adultery and that your faith will save you? Again, Ecclesiastes 12:14, we read: “For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Again, we are told in Revelations 22:12: “Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to every man according as his work shall be.”

Injurious to the Country's Morals.

Now, with these thoughts before you, for I must hasten on, I draw your attention to this question: If it is a fact that man is going to be judged according to the deeds done in his body; if he is going to be rewarded according to his work; if he is going to be saved by obedience to the commandments and works that God hath foreordained that he should walk in; if he can only be saved through obedience to the gospel; if salvation depends upon the development of his character along gospel lines; then, how can he step from the gallows into heaven? How can he go from his death-bed through the pearly gates, after he has served the devil all his life? If he is a criminal almost to his last breath, what works has he performed that will entitle him to salvation? Let me illustrate this. Dr. Thomas, of Chicago, a leading minister, listened to Dr. Brown make remarks over a murdered woman. A young girl had married a man. He became jealous of her and shot her down in a moment of passion; and, according to the preacher, she went to hell, for she had never been converted. Without a moment's warning she went to hell. It so happened that the court was in session at this time, and this man, her murderer, was brought up and in a very short time afterwards he was found guilty and sentenced to be hanged; and the same Dr. Brown, in the presence of Dr. Thomas, preached a funeral sermon for him, and he preached him into heaven. The murdered girl went to hell without a moment's warning; the man, with her blood upon his hands and heart, turned round and walked into heaven by an instantaneous conversion. And Dr. Thomas declared that such teaching was hurting the morals of the country, and was putting a premium on crime. The Methodist Church took Dr. Thomas to task for this, and sought to have him tried for heresy because he refused to believe this hellish doctrine. I listened to Dr. Thomas myself in Chicago Theatre, and I may say to you to-night that Dr. Thomas learned much of his common-sense sermons from Latter Day Saintism.

Black Painted White.

Another case. Over here a man by the name of Day took his wife to see the wonders of Niagara Falls, and as they sat upon the brink, she watched that wondrous display of beauty; she gazed upon the wild, white-created foam dashing down its leap of one hundred feet to the river beneath—the spray rising heavenward, like so much incense to its God. She gazed and wondered, filled with the glory of that wonderful exhibition of Divine potentiality, when, as she gazed, the husband got behind and pushed her over. And when she was found, almost every bone in her body was broken; and her stomach contained grass in it, showing that the poor soul had tried to sustain life by eating grass before she died. Day,

in a little while, after lying a few months, and swearing he did not commit the deed, was found guilty. The preacher met him and he claimed to be converted; and it is said that the choir sang as he dropped from the gallows rope, "Safe in the Arms of Jesus, Safe on His Gentle Breast."

Another case. A young man in California by the name of Durant, a professing christian, a church boy. A girl, Minnie Williams, wanted to borrow a book that was in the church library. She met Durant; he insulted her in the sacred temple of his God. She struggled for her honor. Weeks afterwards her decomposing body was found in the belfry of the church, with some of her linen crammed down her throat. The night of that crime, that boy attended a religious service. The evidence showed he sold her rings at the pawn shop. Two or three days afterwards, Blanche Lamont, another beautiful girl belonging to the church, was enticed under some pretext to enter the sacred precincts within, and her body was found, murdered by that wretch. And it is said that the night he murdered Blanche Lamont, without even washing his hands, he went to a religious service. All that money could do was done to try to save that man's neck, but the supreme court decided against him. And so great was the contempt and indignation of the general public in that district for him, that they would not allow his dead body to be buried in a respectable cemetery; and I am told that they reduced it to ashes and flung it into the lake. But just before they put a necktie about his throat he changed his religion—got a new one, and went home to glory!

Since preaching this sermon, some one wrote me they read a newspaper clipping showing Durant was not guilty, by the confession of the church parson who had committed the crime. The courts found Durant guilty. He was executed. But if the parson was the guilty one, it does not change the position taken in this sermon.—R. C. E.

The Hopelessness of Crime.

Brethren, I refuse to believe that a man, with his hands still stained with the blood of his victim can step aside and play on a harp of a thousand strings in heaven. I refuse to believe that a man can change his black cap of criminality for a golden crown. I refuse to believe that the hands now tied behind his back, in a moment can be fingering a harp in the presence of the angels. I refuse to believe that those feet, now pinioned as the result of crime, the next moment can be walking through the streets of the New Jerusalem. In a word, I refuse to believe that when the justice of earth is passed upon a man, and has said that he is unsafe and unfit even to live within the stone walls of an earthly penitentiary, that that character is worthy to dwell in the presence of God, and immediately become an associate with the angels. I don't believe it!

The Triumph of Character.

Now, you may come to me and say, what about the "eleventh hour" in the Bible? What about the thief on the cross? My only reply to that is this: I have shown to you the doctrine that faith alone is not a "good and wholesome doctrine," that it is not "very full of comfort"; but that it resembles a putrefying corpse that will spread pestilence—physical disease on the one hand, spiritual disease on the other hand. I have, moreover, shown you that man is to be rewarded according to his work; that it is character and not reputation that counts before God. I have shown you that a man must obey the Gospel in order to be saved and that the man pinioned on the gallows cannot do that; therefore, your death-bed repentance and your gallows conversion is unsupported in the Bible.

Next Sunday I hope to take up the question: "Was the thief on the

cross a baptized believer? or was he just suddenly converted on the cross? If I live to the following Sunday evening, I will take up your "eleventh hour" question, as referred to in the Bible, and show you that it has no reference to death-bed repentance. I thank you.

Hell--Is It A Literal Fire?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the Epistle to the Hebrews, 12-29, where you will read these words: "For our God is a consuming fire."

I have selected for the subject, "Hell—Is It a Literal Fire?" In former lectures I have taken the position that God sent His Son, Jesus Christ, to establish the true church, and that He did establish the one true church; that God never had two churches but always "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." Eph. 4:1-6. Moreover, that the children of God were to be baptized into one body (I Cor. 12:12-31) and that there were to be no division among them; that they were all to be guided by the Holy Spirit, which would inspire them all to speak the same things, (1 Cor. 1-10). I have taken the position in my previous lectures that the church, established by Christ, in process of time imbibed false doctrine; its members began to lead impure lives, until the church went into apostacy, God rejected it, and then came the human creeds, the un-inspired ministry, which has been a standing disgrace for hundreds of years.

Slanderers of God.

It shall be my duty to-night to show you from their sermons, their songs, and their writings, that on this question of future punishment both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches have cruelly slandered God; that by their doctrine of spite, malice, and hatred as reflected in their sermons on eternal punishment, they have done more to disgust thinking men and to drive the brains away from the church than the combined assaults of atheism and infidelity. The teaching of eternal torment, physical suffering in material fire, has done more to slander our Heavenly Father and misrepresent the Divine attributes of God than all the mythology of the heathen religions combined.

Time For a Restoration.

Now, that is a serious charge to bring against the Protestant and the Roman Catholic churches; but I am going (at the risk of being considered tedious and tiresome) to read to-night from their own works; just the words verbatim that have fallen from the lips of some of the most prominent ministers of the various denominations on this question. It will not do to say that they do not teach this doctrine now. I am thankful to say that since the Latter Day Saints have been pounding away at this inhuman, devilish doctrine, of eternal torment and perpetual spite, that here and there, and now and then, we have some men brave enough to speak out and say, "I don't believe it." And we have some few denominations that have discarded it. But you know that the boast of the Roman Catholic Church is that she never changes; you know that the general church of the Protestant world has taken the position that God has sent her to preach the gospel and to represent Him on earth. Now, if I show from their works that they are not only misrepresenting Him, but that they are guilty of slandering Him and placing Him beneath the very devil himself; then I shall have proved two things: First, that God never sent those men to slander Him; and, secondly, that the time has come for a restoration of

the true church, in which will be preached the true gospel by men who are divinely inspired to speak the words as God has taught them.

Surely, This is Hell.

With these preliminary thoughts, I now direct your careful attention to the reading of what these men have said.

First, the Roman Catholic Church.

Montreal, Quebec, October 9th, 1893, Le Monte says: "That in response to the question of a Cure, the sacred congregation of rites, at Rome, has just declared that absolution must be refused to every one who does not believe that the fire of hell is a material fire." (London Advertiser, Oct. 11, 1903.)

The following extract is culled from a Roman Catholic book published in England by the Rev. J. Furniss (and, by the way, let me say that that is a very appropriate name for this gentleman), in which he describes the purgatorial fires prepared for infants: "The fourth dungeon is the boiling kettle. Listen, there is the sound like that of a kettle boiling. Is it really a kettle boiling? No. Then, what is it? Hear what it is. The blood is boiling in the scalding veins of that boy, the brain is boiling and bubbling in his head, the marrow is boiling in his bones. The fifth dungeon is the red-hot oven, in which is a little child.

"Hear how it screams to come out. See how it turns and twists itself in the fire. It beats its head against the roof of the oven. It stamps its little feet on the floor of the oven. To this child God was very good. Very likely God saw that this child would get worse, and would never repent, and so would have to be punished much more in hell." This fearful slanderer in the garb of religion, with a cross dangling from his bosom, is a custodian of the Book of God, and thus daringly slanders the Almighty.

Is This Writer Sane?

But we proceed. I have given you his statement with regard to the little child. Now, I will give it to you with regard to those who are older. He brings into prominence a girl about sixteen years old, as follows: "The children are asked to listen to the tremendous, the horrible uproar of millions and millions of tortured creatures, mad with the fury of hell. Oh, the screams of fear, the groanings of horror, the yells of rage, the cries of pain, the shouts of agony, the shrieks of despair from the millions on millions. There you hear them roaring like lions, hissing like serpents, howlings like dogs, and wailing like dragons. There you hear the gnashing of teeth and the blasphemies of devils. Above all you hear the roaring of the thunder of God's anger which shakes hell to its foundations. But there is another sound yet. There is in hell a sound like that of many waters: it is as if all the rivers and oceans of the world were pouring themselves with a great splash down on the floor of hell. Is it, then, really the sound of waters? It is. It is the sound of oceans of tears running down from the countless millions of eyes. They cry for ever and ever; they cry because the sulphurous smoke torments their eyes; they cry because they are in darkness; they cry because the sharp fire burns them.

"Third dungeon—the roof is red hot, the walls are red hot, the floor is like a thick sheet of red hot iron. See, on the middle of that red-hot iron floor stands a girl. She looks about sixteen years old; she has neither shoes nor stockings on her feet; the door in this room has never been opened before since she first set her foot on the red-hot floor. Now she sees that the door is opening, she rushes forward; she has gone down on her knees on the red-hot floor. Listen! she speaks. She says, 'I have

been standing on this red-hot floor for years; day and night my only standing place has been on this red-hot floor. Sleep never came on me for a moment. Look, look at my burning and bleeding feet; let me go off this burning floor, only for a moment; only for a single short moment. Oh, that in this endless eternity of years I might forget the pain only for one single moment."

We Think NOT.

"The devil answers her question. 'Do you ask for a moment to forget your pain? No, not for one single moment during the never-ending eternity of years shall you ever leave this red-hot floor.'" "Is it so?" the girl says with a sigh that seems to break her heart.

"Then, at least, let somebody go to my little brothers and sisters who are alive, and tell them not to do the bad things which I did, so that they will never have to come and stand on this red-hot floor.'" 10th Series of Books for Children and Young Persons, by Rev. J. Furniss, C.S. S. R., Pall Mall Gazette, Exeter Hall, page 181.

Query—How can oceans of literal water splash forever on literal fire without extinguishing the flame?

How can hell be a place of darkness and yet be a flaming fire?

How can literal bleeding feet stand on red-hot iron for millions of ages?

Is it true that our Heavenly Father has been roasting and broiling millions of little girls in a red-hot oven for millions of years, and that He will continue to roast these children forever, while they roar like lions, hiss like serpents, and howl like dogs? Or is the Rev. Father Furniss slandering the Children's Friend? Let not the reader say that this horrid doctrine has passed away. The book from which I quote was published in 1886, and the doctrine was confirmed by the Council at Rome in 1893; and let it be remembered that the Roman Catholic Church makes her boast that she never changes.

Dante's Conception of Hell.

Before I leave the Catholic Church, I suggest that you hunt up the illustrated work of the great Catholic artist and poet, Dante. In his "Inferno" you see pictures of the graves bursting open, and the people down in hell in the midst of the flames. Dante in his "Inferno" says:

"He kindled, burned and changed to ashes all, poured out upon the earth. When these dissolved he lay, the dust again uprolled spontaneous and the self-same form instant resumed." That is to say, God burns them to ashes, then burns them all over again; that He burns them over and over again all for His glory, and this thing is going on forever.

Baptist Spurgeon's "Glowing" Picture.

I now pass from our Catholic friends, and draw your attention to the leading Baptist minister of the world. I think the world of Baptists will permit Mr. Charles Spurgeon, of London, England, to speak for them. This is what he says on the subject of hell: "Only conceive the poor wretch in flames. See how his tongue hangs from between his blistered lips, how it excoriates and burns the roof of his mouth as if it were a fire brand. Behold him crying for a drop of water. I will not picture the scene. Suffice it for me to say that the hell of hells will be to the poor sinner, when the damned jingle the burning irons of their torment they will say 'Forever.' Forever is written on their racks, forever on their chains; forever burning in the fire; forever ever reigns." Now, God only knows what Spurgeon had said before this, because in this speech he is making an apology for what he had said previously. Listen to his apology:

"We are sometimes accused of using language too harsh, too ghastly, too alarming, in regard to the world to come, but if we could speak thunder-bolts and our every look was a lightning flash, and our eyes dropped blood instead of tears, no tones, words or gesture or similitude of dread could exaggerate the awful condition of a soul which has refused the gospel and is delivered over to justice. When thou diest, oh, sinner, thy soul will be in torment alone. That will be a hell for it; but at the day of judgment thy body will join thy soul, and then thou shalt have twin hells (Won't that be nice!) Thy soul sweating drops of blood and thy body suffused with agony and fire exactly like that which we have on earth. Thy body will lie, asbestos like, forever unconsumed; all thy veins roads for the feet of pain to travel on, every nerve a string on which the devil shall play his diabolical tune of hell's unutterable lament." "Eternal Punishment," page 327, by Rev. William Corcorane.

These books are sold in your book stores right here in Toronto. I have seen them on the shelves. I have one at home.

The Methodists' Resting Place.

Now, for a look at our Methodist friends on this question of hell. In a sermon preached by the Rev. A. M. Phillips a few years ago, and now on sale at the Methodist Book Room, Richmond Street, Toronto, entitled "Future Punishment," he states that "Christ not only believed in a real hell, but also that it was a furnace of fire." He concludes his sermon with the following poem, entitled "The Lost Soul."

"Infinite years in torment shall I spend
 And never, never, never find the end;
 Ah! must I dwell in torturing despair
 As many years as atoms in the air?
 When these are spent as many thousands more
 As grains of sand that crowd the ebbing shore;
 When these are gone, as many to ensue
 As stems of grass, on hills and vales that grew;
 When these are done, as many left behind
 As leaves of forest shaken with the wind;
 When these are past as many on the march
 As starry lamps that gild yon spangled arch;
 When these are o'er, as many millions more
 As moments in the millions passed before:
 When all these doleful years are spent in pain,
 And multiplied by myriads yet again,
 Till numbers drown the thought, could I suppose
 That then my wretched years were at a close.
 This would afford some ease; but, ah, I shiver
 To think upon the dreadful word—forever—
 The burning gulf where I blaspheming lie.
 Is time no more,
 But vast eternity."

Well, all I have to say about this is that if he was "shivering" when he thought of such a hell, all his shivering would be done this side of his funeral.

Can Anything Burn Forever?

Now, we have often wondered how our good Methodist friend could teach that God would burn a literal body in a literal flame forever, but in the year 1897, I found out the secret. Salt is the secret. But we will per-

mit the Methodist parson to tell his own story, as we read it in *The Toronto Mail and Empire* for February 27, 1897:

“A Methodist parson in London, only the other day, to his congregation, portrayed this pretty picture of hell. He said: “Some people will dare to say there are no material fires in hell. Ah! what a mistake. Hell’s fires are more material than earth’s fires, in that they have one more material element added; that of salt. Christ said in St. Mark 9:49: “For every one shall be salted with fire.” and, hence, while these horrid hell fires have all power to burn terribly, inflicting fearful bodily torture, they at the same time preserve against consumption, and thus do they burn and preserve throughout eternity; thus are the wicked salted with fire; and now again, we enter hell. There is the burning lake heaving and moaning, and hell’s faint gleams shooting from the lake are giving forth a dark red light.”

Query:—Would it not have been a splendid thing if the Methodist parson had lived in the days of the Roman Catholic and Protestant persecutions, when each party, as they came into power, burned at the stake their weaker brother? All they could do was to rejoice, while they gazed on the agony of their burning victim, but the pleasure only lasted an hour or two. Had the Methodist parson been present, revealed his discovery, and had then thrown salt on the blistering victim so as to keep the fire from going out, what an immense amount of extra pleasure those burning stake-torturing professors would have had. No wonder it is written ‘Salt is good!’”

Can You Answer This?

Again, will this wise Methodist parson inform us how hell can be a place of darkness, and at the same time be gleaming with “a dark red light in the midst of a material flame?”

Fenney’s Red Hot Hell.

Now for the Congregationalists! The late Charles Fenney, sometime president of Oberlin College, and one of the great revivalists, when speaking of hell, said:

“We may add and multiply until figures are exhausted. Let each figure represent a million of ages: that after having suffered these pains of hell until these figures are thus exhausted, we have no less days to roll in torment than when we were first cast in.” He also states that “The torment increases eternally, insomuch that they suffer more in one hour of the second thousand years than they did in all the first thousand years; yet it is so hot when they are first cast in that if they were taken out and put into a caldron of red hot potash they would freeze to death instantly.”—(Fenney on “Future Punishment.”)

Query:—Is it true that a person could take their death of cold in a “caldron of red hot potash?” or is the foregoing one of President Fenney’s yarns, told to frighten people up to the mourners’ bench? It is a great pity that the loving, merciful All-Father should be so cruelly slandered by one who professed to be His son.

Further, the Rev. Whittaker, in *The Niagara Falls Review*, September, 1891, says: “The bodies of the damned will be salted with fire, so tempered and prepared as to burn the more fiercely and yet never consume.”

When we read of the horrible Indian massacres, where helpless men and women have been slowly burned to death at the stake, we should remember that the Indian was taught this stake and fagot atrocity by the Roman Catholic Spaniards, who, after robbing and plundering, religiously burned the poor red men at the stake.

They claimed they were merciful as their Father in heaven is merciful; that is to say, as God burned His enemies, so they ought to burn their enemies. But there was one sad thought filled their religious minds; plan and scheme as they would, their victim would soon die. They would at times build the fire quite a distance from the stake; this would cause their victim to suffer more and to live longer. But, alas, plan as they would, he must die; but there was great joy in the thought; they had done the best they could, and now, having spent their fury, they passed their victims on to hell, where their God held a secret, so that He could keep the victim from consuming, and yet keep him blazing forever.

Oh, if the Methodist parson had been with the Spaniard Christians or the Indian heathens, to tell them about the "salt trick!" But he was not; so the fire went out, and the victims were consumed.

Vincent's Diseased Imagination.

The Rev. Dr. Vincent says:—He (God) will glorify His infinite wisdom in the punishment of the damned, and will contrive such tortures for them, that if all the men in the world should join their wits together, and take to their help all the devils in hell, they could not invent the like. Dreadful ingredients will His wisdom find out to pour into the cup which He will put into the hands of the wicked to drink."—(Christ's Sudden Appearance to Judgment,"—page 133.)

Query:—Is it a truth that our Heavenly Father is more vindictive, cruel, spiteful and malicious than the Catholic and Protestant stake, fagot and fire mongers? Are we to believe that He is more cruel than the devil, or than all the devils in hell combined? Mr. Vincent says so, but I do not believe it. He misrepresents God.

Let it be known that by all that is true, holy, pure, kind, just and divine, I refuse to believe God to be the character described as above.

I made that statement in Massey Hall, and some of the parson's friends went to the manager. The latter wrote me a letter about it. I have the letter yet if it is needed (I keep all my letters.) I was given to understand that if I retained Massey Hall I must not make any attacks upon these ministers. And I said: "You can take your little hall; but you can't buy my manhood." If Doctor Vincent could print these things in his book, why could not I read them aloud to the people? The facts are, I have exposed these doctrines until the ministers are getting ashamed of them and they are not preaching them as much now as they used to.

John Bunyan's Vision.

John Bunyan says, in his Pictorial Text Book, page 272:—"All the devils in hell will be with thee, howling, roaring, screeching and yelling in such a manner that thou wilt be at they wit's end and ready to run stark mad from anguish and torment. Here thou must lie and fry and scorch and broil and burn for evermore."

No wonder they put poor John in goal; they ought to have put him in the asylum for the insane.

Benson, on endless misery, says:—"It is the presence and agency of God which gives everything virtue and efficacy, without which there can be no life, no sensibility, no power. God, is, therefore, Himself present in hell to see the punishment of these rebels against His government. . . . He will exert all His divine attributes to make them as wretched as the capacities of their minds will admit."

How's This For Slander?

The Rev. Dr. Boston, in "Fourfold State," page 336, says: "The Lamb

of God shall roar as a lion against them (the wicked); He shall excommunicate and cast them out of His presence forever, by a sentence from the throne, saying, 'Depart from Me, ye cursed.' He shall adjudge them to everlasting fire, and the society of devils for evermore, and this sentence also, we suppose, shall be pronounced with an audible voice by the man Christ, and all the saints shall say 'Alleluia! true and righteous are His judgments! The godly wife shall applaud the justice of the Judge in the condemnation of her ungodly husband. The godly husband shall say amen to the damnation of her who lies in his bosom, and the godly parents shall say 'Alleluia at the passing of the sentence on their ungodly child; and the godly child shall from his heart approve the damnation of his wicked parents, the father who begot him, and the mother who bore him.'

Do you believe that you ever in your life saw a true father or mother rejoice over the punishment of his or her wandering, misguided child? Never! But I care not how far that boy has wandered in the paths of sin, you will still hear the cry from the sad heart of the parent: "Go for my wandering boy to-night, go search for him where you will; and bring him to me with all his blight and tell him I love him still." That is the voice of parentage—human motherhood, and is a million times more divine than the description these slandering priests and ministers have given us of God Himself. There is so much to say on this subject that I hardly know how to get through. I have only just started.

Another Insane Idea.

Listen to Jonathan Edwards, who, to my mind, gives the most cruel representation of the Character of God that ever I have read. I quote briefly from sermon 10, in "Future Punishment of the Wicked Unavoidable and Intolerable." "Some of you have seen buildings on fire. Imagine, therefore, with yourselves what a poor hand you would make at fighting with the flames, if you were in the midst so great and fierce a fire. You have often seen a spider or some other noisome insect, when thrown into the midst of a fierce fire, and have observed how immediately it yields to the force of the flames. There is no struggle, no fighting against the fire, no strength exerted to oppose the heat, or to fly from it; but it immediately stretches forth itself and yields, and the fire takes possession of it, and it at once becomes full of fire, and is burned into a bright coal. Here is a little image of what you will be the subjects of in hell except you repent and fly to Christ."

Query:—How can hell be full of fire? the sinners be as a "bright coal of fire as they burn and roast in the glowing flames?" and at the same time hell be a place of outer darkness? How can the damned through millions of ages be perpetually "groaning, lamenting, shrieking, crying and fighting flames," and yet, at the same time be like a spider when thrown into a fierce flame, when it immediately yields to the force of the flames without a struggle;—not fighting, "but immediately stretches out and yields?"

Again, he says: "Here the saint will be made the more sensible how great their salvation is, when they shall see how great the misery is from what God hath saved them, and how great a difference He hath made between their state and the state of others, who were by nature, and perhaps by practice, no more sinful and ill-deserving than they; it will give them more of a sense of the wonderfulness of God's grace to them. Every time they look upon the damned it will excite in them a lively and admiring sense of the grace of God in making them so to differ. The sight of hell torment will exalt the happiness of the saints forever. It will not only make them more sensible of the greatness and freeness of the grace of

God in their happiness, but it will really make their happiness the greater, as it will make them more sensible of their own happiness; it will give them a more lively relish of His; it will make them prize it more when they see others were of the same nature and born under the same circumstances, plunged into such misery and they so distinguished. Oh, it will make them sensible how happy they are. A sense of the opposite misery, in all cases, greatly increases the relish of any joy or pleasure.”—Edwards’ Sermon 11, “The Eternity of Hell Torments.”

Just Think of It.

Query:—Is it true that God is so unfair, unjust and partial as to send some men to hell who were by nature, and perhaps, by practice, no more sinful and hell-deserving than the saints in glory. Is the Bible false when it teaches the holy doctrine that God is impartial, “no respecter of persons;” that man will be “rewarded according to his works?” With reference to this subject see the following passages of scripture: Deut. 10:17-2; 2 Cor. 10:7; Job 34:19; Acts 10:34; Acts 17:26-27; Rom. 2:11; 1 Peter 1:17; Col. 3:25; Eph. 6:8-9; Gal. 2:6; Gal. 6:7-8; and a hundred other places where it is clearly taught that God is going to do justice to the wicked as well as to the good. If this is true, then, all this slander on the attributes of Divinity should be condemned by every thinking man and woman. The Rev. (?) Jonathan Edwards has basely misrepresented God, and in a shocking manner trailed the attributes of his Creator in the dust of tradition.

The D. D’s in the D. T’s.

Is it true that glorified and redeemed saints will “increase their joy, exalt their happiness and relish the beauties of heaven more abundantly when permitted to ascend the jasper walls of the Holy City and look down in the blazing furnace of a lurid hell, and there recognize the blistered, broiling, roasting, agonizing, shrieking, groaning, crying mother,” that suffered much to give them a name and a place among humanity; the father who toiled weary years to help them in the way; the little sister or twin brother, with whom they spent their childhood days. Oh, this doctrine is so shocking, so dreadful that no heathen, no infidel would ever dare to teach it. No; it was left to Jonathan Edwards, Benson, Boston and other so-called Doctors of Divinity to disgrace the fair name of Christianity by introducing the unspeakable doctrine of perpetual torture, unending malice and eternal spite

Well could a famous agnostic say, when speaking of those who taught the cruel doctrine of eternal pain: “They could see the waves of God’s wrath dashing against the rocks of damnation; they could see tossing in the whitecaps, the faces of women stretching above the crests the dimpled hands of children, and regarded these things as the justice and mercy of God.”

Not an Antiquated Idea.

Some have said that these awful doctrines are no longer taught. While it is true that under the restoration of the fullness of the gospel, in these latter days, the elders have been exposing these false principles of both Catholic and Protestant creeds; that many, by reason of that which they have heard preached by our ministry, and read in our literature, have seen the light and have abandoned those God-dishonoring doctrines, and now denounces them both in the pulpit and the press; yet the creeds remain unchanged and the majority of ministers still stand by the creed. In fact, Presbyterianism without election, predestination, foreordination and a literal fire and brimstone hell, would not be Presbyterianism. And were

Catholicism, Methodism and many other "isms" to amend their creeds by obliterating the doctrine of eternal pain in material roasting flames, they would lose their distinctive plea. We must denounce such teaching whenever the opportunity presents itself.

Here is a description of a meeting a little while ago in Hamilton, as reported by *The Toronto World*, May 6, 1904. (You know *The Toronto World* is just about right!)

"Hamilton, May 5.—(Special).—At the Union Bible Class meeting, which filled Association Hall this evening, Norman H. Camp, Chicago, preached on hell, and went after Rev. Dr. Lyle for his recent utterances on that painful subject. Mr. Camp spent nearly an hour in producing proofs from the Bible that there was a literal hell of fire and brimstone, as real as that which destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. He said he was very deeply pained when he read that Rev. Dr. Lyle did not believe in a literal hell, and he was very sorry that such doctrine had got into so-called orthodox pulpits."

This shows clearly that as late as 1904 people still taught this despicable doctrine.

Let me give you a suggestion of eternity, as given by a Kansas preacher. He says: "If a little sparrow were to dip its bill in the Atlantic ocean and take one drop of water, and then take one hop a day across the country and put that drop in the Pacific Ocean, and then hop back to the Atlantic, one hop a day, until the Atlantic was dry as a bone, it wouldn't be sun-up in hell."

Here is an old hymn that you may have seen:

"Conceived in sin, Oh, wretched state,
Before we draw our breath.
The first faint pulse begins to beat,
Iniquity and death."

That is quoted from an old hymn book.

Here is another:

"There is a never-ending hell
And never-dying flames,
Where infants must with demons dwell
In darkness, fire and chains.

Have faith the same for endless shame
For all the human race
For hell is crammed with infants damned
Without a day of grace."

Did Wesley Really Believe This.

Here is one from John Wesley direct, published in Dublin in 1803:

"No dire decree of Thine did seal
Or fix the unalterable doom,
Consign my unborn soul to hell,
Or damn me from my mother's womb."

In what condition will such a spirit be, after the sentence is executed. Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels?" Suppose him to be just now plunged into the lake of fire, burning with brimstone, where they have no rest day or night, but the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever. Why, if we were only to be

chained down one day, yea, one hour, in a lake of fire, how amazingly long would one day or one hour appear? I know not if it would not seem as a thousand years, but astonishing thought, after thousands of thousands of years, he has but tasted of his bitter cup. After millions of years it will be no nearer the end than it was the moment it began."

"Never where sinks the soul at the dread sound,
Into a gulf how dark and how profound,
When I have writhed ten thousand years in fire,
Ten thousand, thousand, let me then expire."

"At the moment of death man must be happy or miserable, and that misery will never end."—John Wesley, Sermon 55, on "Eternity."

Some have told me that the parsons do not teach the literal hell fire doctrine now. Well, if they do not, so much the better for them, but if not, why not? If they were right in their teaching all these years, why do they change? If they were wrong, then the question comes to this: Did God send them to teach the doctrine of eternal spite and hatred? If not, then they have not been the called of God. But are the self-appointed slanderers of divinity, and as such should be denounced till they repent and confess.

But to show you that they have not changed, only one here and there, I submit the published statements of two of the most prominent clergymen on the American continent.

Dr. Parkhurst on "God of Love."

The Rev. Dr. Parkhurst, in the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church last night told his congregation he believed in damnation. He said:

"Apparent cruelties attributed to God are not a circumstance to the cruelties in nature. Natural laws pay no more attention to man than a dog.

"Saints, as well as sinners were burned in the Windsor Hotel fire and the General Slocum disaster. If God burned up a body He will burn up a soul that gets in the way of His moral laws.

"The God of Love in 1755 destroyed 50,000 persons in the Libson earthquake. He does not amend physical laws to save saints.

"If a man will not accept God's moral laws, then I should say that God would damn him."—Toronto Star, Nov. 20, 1905.

Dr. Torrey in Toronto.

I am going to quote from one more gentleman, who has, by the way, figured very largely in Toronto, the Rev. Dr. Torrey. Listen:

"Dr. Torrey spoke upon 'Hell, its certainty, and what sort of place it is,' a subject of which he said he never spoke without pain. He had tried to believe there was no hell. He wished he could believe that all men would come to repentance, accept Christ, and so hell would be unnecessary. Of course, he saw perfectly clearly that if men would not repent and accept Christ, there must be a hell and there ought to be for the good of the universe and for the glory of God. He did not want to be narrower nor broader than Jesus Christ, who believed in hell and taught it. The preacher took for his text the 29th verse of the 5th chapter of St. Matthew, accepting the revised version, which he believed to be a more apt rendering of the original than the authorized version. The text established, first, the certainty of hell, and, second, the character of hell.

"Dr. Torrey protested against the assertion (I want you to notice this) sometimes made that all scholars had given up the theory of an orth-

odox hell, and insisted that many, himself among them, adhered to the belief in the old-fashioned orthodox hell.

“My text is, ‘And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.’

“Hell is the hospital for the incurables of the universe, where men must exist in eternal, unceasing bodily suffering; it is the insane asylum of the universe.

“Hell is without hope, forever and ever is the ceaseless wail from that restless sea of fire. Would to God those who think otherwise could succeed in proving it. If they could only bring one text which taken in connection with its context, would do so, I’d be the gladdest man alive.”—Toronto Telegram, Jan. 16, 1906, and Toronto Globe, Jan. 17, 1906.

Now, you must not think that I am an evangelist, and therefore can say any old thing and then run away. I live within two blocks of this church building. I hold myself personally responsible for all I have said. Next Sunday night I am going to the Bible on this question of literal fire. Moreover, I am prepared to meet any of those men whose names I have mentioned, or any of their respective brethren who are commissioned as ministers of the churches that I have named. And all I ask is fair play, and half the time, in the largest hall in Toronto with any one of them. I defy them to affirm that the Bible teaches that the wicked are to be eternally burned in material fire, as these ministers have taught.

In conclusion, let me say that I have no fight with any man; I am here in the defense of my Heavenly Father. If you had an indulgent parent, a kind and loving father, and you read the writings of some man, or overheard some man describing your father as the most cruel, vindictive and spiteful of monsters, would you not speak out in defense of your father? You would, if you deserved to be called his son. And I am here in defense of my Heavenly Father and my Elder Brother, Jesus Christ.

Love Your Enemies.

The presentation of these thoughts may call down upon me much persecution, but I have spoken as I felt the subject demanded. If the time comes for me to suffer at the hands of a hireling minister, I shall hope that the Lowly One that suffered assassination on Golgotha will impart unto me strength to fill my mission. I will try and remember that He said: “The servant is not greater than his Lord,” and it will be remembered by you, my friends, that the most bitter enemies that Jesus had to contend with were the religious people of his time and it was the chief priest that paid down the money to secure his crucifixion. I thank you.

The Bible vs. A Material Hell Fire

PERMITS me to draw your attention to the 5th chapter of the gospel as recorded by Saint Matthew, 29th and 30th verses, where you will read these words: "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell; and if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell."

This is the text taken by Rev. Dr. Torrey in Massey Hall when he conducted the great campaign in this city two years ago, and as I showed you last Sunday night, he took the position that this was positive proof that hell was a place of material fire where the bodies of the damned must burn forever. He said it pained his heart to be compelled to believe this doctrine, but he had to believe it because Jesus taught it. All I have to say is this: That statement would indicate that the kind and tender heart of Dr. Torrey was infinitely more merciful, more loving, more tender, more forgiving than that of our Heavenly Father and His Son Jesus Christ, and while I have all respect for the tenderness and love of any human being, yet I think there is no man or woman living on earth that is as loving, as tender, as gentle, as merciful as our Heavenly Father, and the very fact that this appalling doctrine of cruelty is repugnant to the heart of a good man should be prima facie evidence that God is not guilty of that cruelty. Am I asked to believe that the mercy and pity and love of man is greater than that of our Heavenly Father? I would sooner denounce every creed in so-called Christendom than believe that God is the inhuman monster that the church has painted Him to be.

The use of Biblical symbols of fire to make the idea of retribution odious and hideous is unworthy of manly culture and controversy. We may expect it from passionate thinkers, but as an argument it is very shallow. The condition of the wicked is set forth by material imagery, but this should not be literally pressed. Figurative language should not be made into literal. The parsons, as I showed you last Sunday night, both in sermons and writings, have twisted into appalling reality the metaphors and symbols found in the Bible, till they represent God as one that is unthinkable cruel, vindictive and spiteful. The devil is made an eternal jailor, and the great majority of children of men are made a burning, blistering, flaming mass of unquenchable and yet material fire.

Opposed to Science.

Right here let me say no man ever heard of a material fire that was unquenchable. The very fact that Jesus speaks of the fire as unquenchable, shows that it is not material fire. Hell, they say, is filled with perpetual blasphemy, everlasting agony and an eternal wail of pain which is to bring glory to God and perfect bliss to the fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, sons and daughters, friends and neighbors, as they gaze from their eternal home of bliss into the seething flame of the lake of fire upon their damned relatives and friends.

I refuse to believe that, and I shall oppose it no matter what it costs me because it is infamous slander upon God. But they say the Bible teaches it. I don't believe that the Bible teaches it, and to-night I am going to take every passage of Scripture, if I have time, in which fire and brimstone is mentioned, and examine them.

Spake in Language of His Time.

In the first place, I want to examine this text from which Mr. Torrey finds a material flame. Look at this fairly, my friends. Does it mean that you are to gouge out your very eyes in order to save your literal body from going into an eternal flame? Why does God want some man to pull his eyes out in order to escape the flames of hell? If you will read this whole chapter you will see that Jesus is talking about adultery and many other sins, and He simply says in effect: "If you have any controlling sin, abandon it, because God is a jealous God. If you have any habit or sin that is dragging you down, abandon it. Separate yourself from it, because if you persist in any one sin ye cannot enter the Kingdom of God." That is what it means, that you have to separate yourself from the sin that doth so easily beset you. He never intended that a man should pull his literal eyes out because he saw somebody that he lusted after, or because some man was detected stealing, or his hand was likely to go into somebody's vest pocket and steal a watch that he should have his hand cut off and thereby be maimed for life. Torrey said hell was an asylum for the insane. I think anybody that would put a literal interpretation on that passage should be in an insane asylum this side of the grave.

Working the People Up.

Let me show you what this doctrine has done. You cannot all see this picture, but here is a man standing with his right hand placed upon a log and in his left hand he holds an axe. The axe comes down. The right hand is severed from the arm. He ties a handkerchief around it, and when he gets to the village and is asked what's the matter, all the information that he would give was that he had it cut off and cast it from him. The history of it reads as follows: "New Albany, Indiana, November 22, 1906—Insane from religious study, Sanford Engleman, of Byrnesville, literally obeyed the Scriptural injunction 'If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee.' He took an axe and held his hand on a log and cut it off. He comes to the village and refuses to say what he had done with his hand except that he had cut it off and cast it from him."—Chicago Blade, No. 24, 1906.

That is one of the results of this infamous doctrine of physical, literal, material fire in hell that has aroused people in revival meetings until many of them have gone as insane as the preacher himself. I will give you another one in connection with "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out."

This comes from New York. There was a young man named Becker. He attended some revival services at a place called Middleburg, N. Y. It was noticed when the service was well under way that he was listening very attentively, with a wild look in his eyes. The pastor continued his exhortations, when suddenly the young man leaped to his feet with the exclamation: "I have found the Lord. I feel it; I know it." Prayers over the wanderer's conversion were sent up, and so worked on the young man that he joined in with quotation after quotation from the Bible, he became more and more excited and tore his hair. The people tried to restrain him but he sprang upon the platform and with wild eyes, cried out: "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out." And digging his fingers into his eyes he gouged them out until they hung down his cheeks.

I could read all night about the abominable methods adopted by revivalists to get converts at their meetings. Torrey put a literal fire and brimstone hell before the people, and a good many of the people got frightened in Toronto, but the criticisms of your speaker and others have had some effect. I have not spoken to thousands of people in Toronto every Sunday night without my words telling upon the people, and the result has been that Mr. Chapman was here with his campaign last winter he practically denounced the methods of literal fire and said he was going to conduct this one in a different manner and without fire and brimstone, but without these mainstays his meetings were a failure, as many people have stated, both pulpit and press admit it. You take the good music on the one hand and the fire and brimstone on the other hand out of the average church revival to-day and it becomes a very tame affair.

Thinkers Reject Revivalists' Idea.

Now, you may think that is pretty hard on the evangelist, but I will give you a quotation from one of the most prominent Presbyterian ministers in the Dominion of Canada, the Rev. Dr. Battersby of Chatham, who has been a brilliant speaker and loved by nearly every denomination for his goodness of heart. He has this to say with regard to the evangelistic meetings that have been conducted in the City of Chatham for the last twenty years. "Dr. Battersby said he believed the church was to blame for many of these difficulties. He denounced the practice of calling in outside evangelists to do the work of the pastors. These evangelists came, he said, and created a great stir, upsetting the whole life of the church. They put the people through a steaming process and manufactured Christians by the wholesale. They introduce an unstable element and bring weakness rather than strength to the church. I have known, he said, all the evangelists that have been here in the past twenty years and there is not a single instance in which I could not tell you of a good deal of dirty work which had to be done after them and a good deal of bitter feeling to be removed." (Chatham Banner, Oct. 12, 1897.)

My thirty-six years' experience leads me to believe with Dr. Battersby that the average evangelist is a kind of hypnotist, a mesmerist, a sociologist that knows how to tell stories and spin yarns until he can make you believe you are going to hell to-night unless you come up to the bench and be saved. I have heard them talk of fire and brimstone until you could imagine you could smell the sulphur in the room, and then they would say: "Come right up now and be saved," and then tell some long, pitiful story about your dead aunt waiting in heaven or somewhere else until they frighten you to death. Evangelistic work makes cowards of people, not Christians. If a man met me on the street and wanted to trade horses with me without having a look at his horse, I would conclude that his horse had the heaves or was spavined, or something like that, and that he did not want me to look the thing over and examine it quietly. God never asks a man to do that. Come, let us reason together, is what God says, "Prove all things," which means investigate. A man that wants to get you excited in order to convert you is not an honest man, and is taking you for a fool. That is not the gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Spirit and Not the Letter.

Now to the Bible. You will discover from my text that Mr. Torrey was mistaken. It has not the slightest reference to material, flaming hell fire at all. It means that you must abandon your sins or you will be excluded from the Kingdom of God. He that is filthy must be cleansed from his filthiness or as the Bible says: "Let him be filthy still." That is the

thought, and there is not anything from which it can be inferred that hell is a burning flame.

I have a statement here from one of the leading men that I want to read to you on this question: "To the southeast of Jerusalem was a deep and fertile valley called the Vale of Hinnom, or, in Greek, Gehenna. In a particular portion of this valley, known as Tophet, the idolatrous Jews burned their children in sacrifices to Molock. In the reformation instituted by Josiah, this valley was polluted and therefore, became the place for casting out and burning offal and the corpses of criminals. Hence the use of the phrase, 'Fire of Gehenna,' translated 'Hell fire,' to indicate the place of future punishment. Then it has passed into the religious literature of Christendom," Abbott in Dictionary of Religious Knowledge. Art, hell.

Believes in Punishment.

Jesus just used symbolical language to show that mankind would be punished, and by the way some people have got the idea that your speaker does not believe in future punishment. I never said anything in my life to convey that idea. I believe that for every unkind word spoken and for every unkind deed performed, we must meet God, but I believe that God's punishment does not mean annihilation, as taught by the mortal soulists, nor will the victim be cast into a flame of literal fire, to roast and toast and broil for ever, as taught by some parsons.

I believe that the punishment inflicted upon the sinner, will be of such a character, that the victim of sin will be cleansed. He will learn by the things he suffers and to use a figurative expression, "The dross will be consumed and the gold refined." Not by material fire but by a process of law known to God, which will reveal the love of God and this will finally bring the sinner to see his condition and he will repent, and then will come to pass the prophecy that every knee shall bow and tongue confess to the glory of the Father. This is my faith. 2 Phil. 2:10-11.

Turn to Matthew 3:11-12: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire, whose fan is in his hand and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Here the word fire is used twice. A careful reading of this passage shows it to be figurative language. Material fire can be quenched, therefore unquenchable fire is not material. Secondly, the Christian is to be baptized with fire. Is that literal fire? Why surely you are turning things upside down, if you are going to baptize the Christian with literal fire. He is getting the worst of it.

If that word fire in the Bible is to be taken literally then we will have to believe that God is going to brand Christians just like the western cowboys do their cattle, put His mark on them, which is absurd. Anybody who stops to think will know that when God talks about the Holy Ghost and fire He does not mean literal fire. If you literalize the fire then you must literalize the chaff so that is the chaff that is going to be burned and not human beings. That is perfectly reasonable; take it all literally, in which case it does not refer to people at all; or take it figuratively, that is the words are not used in their real meanings but convey an idea, perhaps somewhat similar. The sense of it is this: God will destroy sin.

All is Figurative Language or All Literal.

Now, turn to Hebrews 12:29, where you read: "For our God is a consuming fire." Does that mean that God is a sort of 24th of May bon-

fire, or a great big blaze? Just think about it. You will see that it does not mean literal fire at all. Perhaps it will help you out on this point to look at the 3rd chapter of Malachi and 3rd verse, where, speaking of Jesus Christ's coming, it says: "And He shall sit as a refiner, and purifier of silver and He shall purify the sons of Levi and purge them as gold and silver." The 2nd verse reads: "But who may abide the day of His coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth. For He is like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap."

The query in my mind is why those who literalize the fire don't do the same with the soap. What does it all mean? Simply that He is going to sit as a purifier. That is why God, in Hebrews, is called a consuming fire. He is going to reign in His potentiality until He purifies and ennoble, until every soul shall do Him honor by worshipping Him out of a pure heart. He will apply the law of love until the sin is eradicated, destroyed, banished or as this text says: "He will sit as a refiner and purifier of silver." How is that done?

Two years ago I went into a gold smelter and there saw the gold going through many processes until it comes at last into a great cauldron with seething flames under it. That gold is heated and heated and the refiner stands over it and skims off the dross that gathers on the top and keeps skimming it off, skimming it off until looking into that great cauldron of gold he sees reflected back his own image and then the gold is considered pure. So Christ will continue to work with the sinner until the last vestige of sin is removed and the gold is refined and He can see in the man Himself reflected. Christ within, the hope of glory.

Sheep, Goats and Fire.

Turn to Matt. 25:31-41. Here is told the story of the sheep and the goats. The goats are going to suffer and the sheep are going to be rewarded. To the goats on the left hand Christ says: "Depart from Me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Ladies and gentlemen, the whole of this language is symbolic. If you regard the fire as literal, so must you the goats and the sheep. To treat one word as literal and the rest as metaphorical is illogical and unfair. No man will do it unless he wants to erect a scarecrow to frighten people.

Mr. Hunter, who once had a little tiff with me, said: "You take hell out of this thing and you would not have one convert a week," and I replied that if I had to blaspheme God and misrepresent every principle of honor and justice, of law and order and lie like a horse thief to make a convert, I would see everybody damned first before I would misrepresent God to bring somebody to repentance. The goodness of God leading men to repentance, not hell fire. You can't whip a man into loving you nor frighten him into it. You might scare him so that he would declare he does love you, whereas all the time he would like the opportunity of giving you a solar plexus. If you can't love a spiteful, vindictive cruel man, then you can't love a spiteful God. What right has God to command us poor worms of this earth to love our enemies when He hates with a malicious hatred as some of the parsons say He does. Is it true that God is going to ask men to do what He does not do Himself? If God is busy bearing malice, as I showed you last Sunday night, the preachers claim, then He does not know the meaning of love and therefore I refuse to believe the preachers' description of God or future punishment.

The Rich Man and Lazarus.

Now, to another text. Luke 16 tells of the rich man and Lazarus. The rich man died and went to hell, and he declared he was tormented in the

flame and wanted Abraham to send Lazarus over from Abraham's bosom where Lazarus was then living, to dip his finger into some water and touch his blistered lips, because he was tormented in the flames. Now, let us look at this a minute. I know the word hell is there, the word torment is there and the word flame is there, too. The record says the rich man died and was buried. Where was that literal, physical body of this rich man buried? Was it in a flaming hell, or was it in a cemetery? Common sense tells you that that body went to the common burying ground.

Indicates Consciousness After Death.

When Lazarus died all covered with sores they buried him. Now, if you are going to take the flame literally, you must also take Abraham's bosom literally, as the place where Lazarus is said to have been located. Would you have me believe that all the Christians rush behind Abraham's shirt front, that all the holy people from Adam down to that time are strolling around in glory behind Abraham's dicky? No; that won't do. It's just as absurd to treat the word fire literally. You can see it is just a metaphor, and to describe two things. First, the consciousness of the spirit between death and the resurrection, as I have already shown in a previous lecture, and secondly, showing that death does not end all; that in futurity the righteous who have sown to the spirit shall reap the harvest of peace and joy, while the wicked will have to answer to God and go through a process of punishment wherein they will be purified.

As Jesus said: "They shall be cast into the prison and shall not come out thence until they have paid the uttermost farthing." Matthew 5:26. Not that it is to be everlasting in the sense of being without end. Because some are to be beaten with few stripes and some are to be beaten with many stripes. Luke 12:47. That shows there will be an end to both of these whippings, that when the object of the whipping shall be accomplished the punishment will end. So that there is nothing there to show that literal fire was meant. Hebrews 12:6-11.

Jude 6 and 7, furnished, they say, the best proof of literal fire.

"And the angels which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." 6th verse. How are you going to get around that, you ask. I am not going to get around it at all. I will tell you what it means. In the first place we are told that some of them are under everlasting chains, under darkness. Why, if hell is a place of material fire and everlasting flame, how are you going to get any darkness there. Again, you see it is metaphorical language. Again, "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

What Does "Eternal" Mean?

The word eternal has many different meanings. Eternal has reference to God so that when that great warrior Jeff Davis said by the "Great Eternal" he meant by the Great God. Eternal punishment is God's punishment without any reference to duration. For anything that is eternal or everlasting, touching duration, never had a beginning, never had an end. If you regard eternal and everlasting with regard to duration of time then you have got to believe that Sodom and Gomorrah were burning from the beginning in one direction as well as burning forever in the other direction. Their punishment had a beginning and it is but logical to conclude that it will have an end. You find one end of the stick and there will always be another end to it. Anything that has one end has got another. So that

this passage has no reference to duration at all but they are under God's power; under the power of God's judgment. Now, I will show you this from the Bible. Matthew 11:24, speaking of Sodom and Gomorrah, says: "It shall be more tolerable in the day of judgment for Sodom and Gomorrah than for Tyre and Sidon." That is Jesus speaking. Now, if they are going to burn forever in eternal flame, how is it going to be more tolerable for them than for the other wicked cities. The facts are they did not have the same opportunities as Tyre and Sidon did. Therefore, they will not be beaten with as many stripes, and so their punishment will not be as great as that inflicted upon Tyre and Sidon.

Impossible to Treat the Whole Bible Literally.

Ezekiel 16:48-65 shows that God eventually will redeem Sodom and Gomorrah when He redeems Jerusalem, so that those spoken of in the example taken from Jude will eventually be redeemed also. So much for that.

James 3:5-6: "Even so the tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things. Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth and the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity, so is the tongue, among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell." Would you have me believe that James tried to prove to you that that little member within your mouth was a perpetual bonfire, hell fire in your mouth. While it is small, I know it can be very nasty at times, but it is not a material flame. Anybody that would call that fire material has rooms to let upstairs.

Just Think It Over.

Turning to Revelation 14 chapter verses 10 and 11 we have the hottest one in the whole record. Speaking of the wicked it says, "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb and the smoke of their torment ascendeth forever and ever." "Well, R. C., you will never get away from that," someone says. Let us see. Do you want me to believe this literal fire and brimstone? All right if the word fire and the word brimstone are to be considered literally, then every other word must be treated in the same way. Every lawyer, every logician in Toronto will admit that. Every man that is unstained by a superstitious creed will agree with me that my proposition is fair in this matter. Let us examine it. "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." Has God got some literal wine made out of wrath. I am, perhaps, taking away the best material you have for your next winter's revival meeting, but I can't help that. Come, now, be honest. Is that literal wrath you are going to literally drink, or is it metaphorical language? Next, this wine is poured into the cup of His indignation. I have seen tin cups, brass cups, silver cups, but I never saw a cup made out of indignation. (You mustn't laugh.)

If you literalize one you must literalize the other. Common sense tells you that it is nonsense to treat it literally, it is clearly a metaphore. "And he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone." Why do you want me to literalize the fire and brimstone and not the rest of the story? "In the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the lamb." (Just a thought here. When I was a boy I learned to sing 'I want to be an angel, and with the angels stand,' but if the angels are all going to hell, to perpetually watch that fire, then please excuse me. I don't want to be an angel.)

It's Just as Reasonable as Hell Fire.

"And in the presence of the lamb." They are going to have a young sheep there; a little sheep to watch your brothers and sisters and father and mother burn forever. What an entertaining time that little lamb will have. "Oh, Brother Evans, that doesn't mean a literal lamb." "Oh, does it not? Well, then, don't ask me to spiritualize the lamb while you materialize the fire. That is unfair. The idea that Jesus Christ is going down to hell to watch the dimpled hands of babies and the white bosoms of mothers as they bob up and down in the lurid flames of the liquid lake of fire and brimstone is too disgusting to think of twice over. "And the smoke of their torment." Is that literal smoke? Yes; then there is some literal torment. Did you ever see an ounce of torment or a pound of torment or an inch of torment? Look at it. Common sense will tell you that that can not be literalized. "And they have no rest day and night." But we are told that there is to be no night after a while, so that hits that pretty hard. It would not be very dark there. Why, in this town we are not afraid of the dark with the hydro-electric and the Toronto Electric Light Company going at full speed, we shall not care whether it is day or night. Now, how can it be a place of outer darkness when there is going to be a literal flame? I pass on. It seems to me to require a good deal of patience to think that men claiming to love Jesus Christ will tell you that the business of the Lamb of God is to go down in hell to listen to the screaming, groaning, yelling and blaspheming of millions of God's creatures as they rail in the turbulent flames of material fire.

The Second Death.

Now, I would draw your attention to Rev. 20:14-15: "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death and whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life, was cast into the lake of fire." Now, why do they chop off these words—this is the second death. It shows it is a metaphor; that it is not a literal fire, but it is symbolic language describing a second separation from God where the wicked must depart from the Lord. The wicked will then be punished until they learn obedience by the things they suffer. First Corinthians 15:25-26, says "Christ will reign until He puts all enemies under His feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." So that there is something bigger and stronger even than the second death. But He will destroy it if the Bible is true. Now let us see.

Revelations 21 and 8 says something more about that: "But the fearful and unbelieving and the abominable and murderers and whoremongers and sorcerers and idolaters and liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." It is not a literal lake of fire and brimstone. He does not ask you to believe it. He tells you that that term is descriptive of the condition of the things known as the second separation. That is all there is to that.

They Shall Deliver Up Their Dead.

"Well," says one, "I have thought that hell was the everlasting abode of the damned where they would blaze and broil forever." Now, the verse just before the one I read says: "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them and they were judged according to their works." Rev. 20:13. Here we see that hell, the abode of the damned, is to give up her dead and they will meet before God's throne and there be judged according to their work. Now this is all I need to say, but to support my statement I will quote from Barnes in his notes on the New Testament. The second death means a separation from heaven."

Now, I want to draw your attention for a few moments to the words eternal, forever, perpetual and everlasting. These are just expressions of a condition under which God will work out our salvation. It does not mean forever and ever as to time, but refers to the kind of punishment in store. In a word, life is the normal condition; death is the abnormal condition, and Christ, as we have seen, will reign until He puts all enemies under His feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, that is the abnormal will pass away and the normal will come in its stead.

"For Ever."

Now, to the words "for ever." Sometimes you hear a man say "for ever and ever." Now try and figure out how much longer "for ever and ever" is than just "for ever." Here clearly we see that these words are just expressions conveying an idea. Take a case of one of you men after working hard all day and coming home and finding the wife out and no supper cooked, you might say when the wife returned, "Well, I thought you never were going to come back. I thought you were going to stay for ever." Now you don't really mean that. By for ever you mean that she was going to stay a long time. Jonah is said to have been in the whale's body for ever. And we are told later that that is three days and three nights. Well, if for ever is three days and three nights, perhaps for ever and ever is six days and nights. Of course, I don't believe that for ever means three days. It is just to convey the idea that he was there for a long time. See Jonah 1:17; Jonah 2:6.

In Genesis 17 and 27 we are told that the covenant of circumcision was to last for ever. There is not a man or woman but knows that the covenant of circumcisions has long been abandoned. Christ Himself removed it out of the way, and yet it says that it was an everlasting covenant. Well, we pass on.

In Exodus 21 and 6 we are told of a man having purchased a slave. Later on the slave is liberated, and if he still desires to remain with his master, he has a hole bored in his ear and then when the hole is bored he shall remain with his master for ever. Does that mean that because he has a little hole bored in his ear that he shall never die? Don't tell that to the undertakers of Toronto. It says plainly that every man that has a hole bored in his ear shall serve his master for ever. Well, if that really means for ever and ever that surely is a long time to live as a servant.

Second Chron. 7:16, God says: "I will sanctify that house and My name shall be there for ever, and My heart shall be there, perpetually." It is speaking of the Temple of Solomon. Now, everyone knows that the Temple of Solomon was burnt down until according to the prophecy of Jesus not one stone was left on another, and yet God says He is going to be there perpetually and to sanctify that house for ever.

Jeremy Taylor says that everlasting means only to the end of its own proper period. Charles Kingsley says the word (Aionion) is never used in scripture or anywhere else in the sense of endless (vulgarly called eternity). It always means both in scripture and out of it, a period of time, else how could it have a plural. Grant and Long Debate, p. 190.

Searching After Truth.

Permit me to present some questions that are worthy of your consideration:

1. Would endless punishment be for the good of any human being?
2. If God loves His enemies will He punish them any more than is for their good?
3. If God loves friends, if He loves His enemies also, are not all mankind objects of His love?
4. If God loves only those who love

Him, what better is He than a sinner? 5. As "love thinketh no evil," can God design the ultimate evil of a single soul? 6. If any man does wrong in returning evil for evil would not God do wrong in doing the same? 7. Would not endless punishment be in return for evil for evil? 8. If God hates the sinner, would it not be natural for the sinner to hate God? 9. If God loves his enemies now, will He not always do the same? 10. Would it be unjust in God to be kind to all men in a future state? 11. If all men deserve endless punishment, will not those who are saved miss divine justice? 12. Does divine justice require the infliction of pain from which mercy recoils? 13. If God would save all men but cannot, is He infinite in power? 14. If God can save all men and will not, is He infinite in His goodness? 15. Did God desire universal salvation when He created men? 16. Will God carry His original designs into execution? 17. Can God will anything contrary to His knowledge? 18. Did God, when He created man, intend that a large portion of His creatures should be endlessly wretched? 19. If He did not know all at the creation, is He infinite in knowledge? 20. If God made an endless hell did He do so for the express purpose of burning men in it? 21. Can he truly love God who worships Him through fear of the devil? 22. Can the love of God be changed to hatred? 23. Can the Deity be universally good if endless punishment is meted out to a single soul? 24. Can a good man love and worship a being who has created millions for endless torture? 25. Are those not enemies of God who charge such conduct upon Him? 26. Can it be a virtue to charge a good being with the most abominable characteristics? 27. If God made all things and knew all things; if He made the devil, knowing that he would lead all mankind astray, will it be just to punish mankind for it? 28. Would not a being who would do this be as bad as or worse than the devil? 29. If the devil is the author of endless hell fire, would it not be the noblest thing God could do to put it out?

In conclusion, let me say that I do not wish to antagonize any man, and I would not be purchased to misrepresent any creed, but I am here in the defence of the Bible and in the defence of God and Jesus Christ, as against uninspired paid hirelings who have gotten up the creeds and who have deceived the people and driven them away from the truth. Now, next Sunday night I am going to ask the question if death ends all, then what is going to become of the teeming millions who were born in ignorance, and who have lived and died in ignorance of Christ, who have never seen a Bible. If this life is the end of probation, then what has become of those whole nations that have never heard the gospel?

The Resurrection

NOTWITHSTANDING the grave responsibility that rests upon one that claims to represent Jesus Christ and point men to the sunny way, I am glad that I have the opportunity to stand before you to-night to give some reasons for the hope that is within me. The subject of the resurrection is one that appeals or should appeal to every human being. I am sorry that even on this great subject we must again divide the chaff from the wheat, the truth from the error, the word of God from the traditions of men. Many of us have been taught that at death the saint or Christian goes immediately to a place called "heaven," where they dwell forever in perpetual bliss, and on the other hand, that the sinner who dies unconverted goes immediately at death to a place called "hell," there to turn and twist in the burning flames of literal fire forever and ever—and longer than that if the preacher is an eloquent orator.

Now, if this position be a correct one, then, there is no resurrection. Pray tell me how you can get a resurrection if immediately at death you go to heaven when your body is in the grave, or to hell and your body is in the grave. If your condition is unchangeable, then from the moment of your death, in that case the grandest doctrine of the old and new testaments is a delusion and a snare, the resurrection is a farce. Now, believing in the resurrection of the dead, I am forced to refuse to believe the traditions of men which are diametrically opposed to the word of God on this question. I admit that frequently they talk about the resurrection but if the former position just cited is correct then they just occupy the unenviable position of being very inconsistent in stating their belief in a doctrine to-day and presenting that which contradicts it to-morrow.

The Creation.

I want to present another point for your consideration. Question: "How did God make the world?" Answer: "Of nothing and by His word only." (Catholic Catechism by Butler.) "It pleased God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in the beginning to create or make of nothing the world and all things therein, whether visible or invisible in the space of six days." (Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chapter 4, page 43, verse 1.) "In the beginning He created, that is made of nothing, the matter of the heavens and earth." (John Wesley, sermon 58.) "He (God) called out of nothing the whole universe." (John Wesley, sermon 79.) "Has not God created the heavens and the earth out of nothing?" (Cardinal Gibbons in "The Faith of Our Fathers," page 333.) I have here presented from the Roman Catholic, Presbyterian and Methodist standpoint that God made this world, and one of them goes farther than that and says the universe, "out of nothing." I wonder what became of the remnants of nothing when He got through making this world out of it.

Now, scientific men and men who are regarded as infidels have refused to believe that doctrine, and the worst of it is that many of them have thought that because these leading churches taught that, that they found that doctrine in the Bible. I have a little poem here that is written

on that question, and the church is made to stand for it. So they should do, Christianity should never be blamed for it. It reads as follows:

He took a lump of nothing
 And made the glorious earth.
 Another bit of nothing
 And oceans had their birth.
 Another bit of nothing
 He made the glorious sun,
 And so He worked with nothing
 Until skies and stars were done.
 He took a rib from Adam
 With nothing for a knife,
 And by mixing it with nothing
 Made him a full-grown wife.
 The creeds say God is nothing,
 Has neither form nor sense.
 Can neither smell, hear, feel or see,
 Hence, cannot recompense.
 Has no body, parts or passions,
 The Holy Three is One.
 Invisible and everywhere.
 Can neither go nor come.

Now, that is almost bordering on blasphemy, they say. But I ask who is responsible for it, if it is blasphemy. And I answer Churchianity as represented by the leading men and books from which I have quoted. Now, we do not believe that God made this world out of nothing.

What I Believe.

I may plainly state my faith in this matter as follows: I believe that God has revealed that "the elements are eternal." The creation of something from nothing is not a truth founded on divine revelation. The original words rendered in our language, "create" and "make" are synonymous terms, signifying the formation of a thing out of the original elements, and there is no evidence whatever in favor of the creation of any substance. We are justified in believing that the elements of every substance existed eternally. Webster defines the word "create" thus: "Be-gotten, produced, make, bring forth, constituting new things from matter by shaping, organizing crude."

Why, the very Bible itself in the first chapter says, "and the earth was without form and void," and then God proposes to reveal through Moses an abbreviated account of the organization of this planet out of the eternal elements. There never was a time when God was nothing and existed nowhere, and through billions of ages existed alone in perfect idleness. It is just unthinkable, and, nobody in this world would ever believe it if they had not been taught it in their religious creeds and have feared to question them because of, in early days, the thumb-screw, the rack and the faggot, and in latter days of social ostracism. But I care for none of these things, and having a message to deliver, I propose to give to you the Bible as I understand it.

Jesus said to us in Matthew vi., 28: "Consider the lilies of the field. Why did He say that? I would have you know that there is a deep significance in every word uttered by the Master of Men. He spake as the Father commanded Him, and if you will study the life of the lily, you will see therein a photograph of humanity. But to proceed: The lily comes

forth in the springtime, tender, frail, needing all the care that the botanist and gardener can confer upon it. The human baby, perhaps the most helpless of all animals, comes forth in the springtime of its life, helpless, needing the tenderness and the care of the mother. The lily grows up, reaches its summertime of blossom and bloom and fragrance. The aroma is spread forth upon the zephyrs of a hundred evening breezes. Its beauty gladdens the heart of man in the sunny hours of the day. So mankind has his summer. May the aroma of kind words fill your days. May the perfume of splendid acts performed by you fill the space of your evening hours. During the summertime of your life every day should be freighted with kindness, tenderness and goodness toward your fellowmen.

The autumn shows us the lily drooping, withering, fading, and so as I gaze into your faces to-night I see many of you wearing spectacles, your temples adorned with silver locks, your steps growing decrepit and slow, the once stalwart form bending beneath the weight of years. You, too, have reached your autumn. The lily feels the cold blast of winter winds, the frost is upon it and by-and-by the snows of winter have covered it up, and you say it is dead. So with humanity, we pass from the autumn of age to the winter of decrepitude and death is soon with us. The snow of death will block up the pathway of life and someone will whisper, he is dead. Is that the nature of the lily? Is that the nature of the body?

"Well," said one, "if you just look there is a foot of ice where the lily bloomed. There is snow and frost. There can be no more lily there." But wait. The winter is passing by, the birds are beginning to approach, the warm, amorous kisses of the sun are wooing from the bosom of the earth the sleepy lily and the frost has gone, the ice has passed away, the winter is forgotten, and the sun of spring is in the air, and the lily puts forth her leaves again. Here is the resurrection exemplified in the world of botany, and so with humanity. You place all that you embrace 'neath the clods of the valley in the silent city of the dead, and so far as human instrumentality is concerned, there is no more hope, for death is a king, and we, dead, his bondslaves. But the spring time of resurrection will come and the Bible surely declares it, that the earth shall cast out her dead.

You are willing to believe that God will touch the buried acorn to-day and it bursts into life and activity, and to-morrow you see the oak. You are willing to admit that God will speak to the withered rosebud, and it springs into bloom in the coming spring. Wilt thou know, oh, fellow-travellers to eternity, that you are more valuable than the acorn, the rosebud or the lily, and so in the name of my Master, I testify to you that He has promised to speak to the spirit of man in the intermediate state and that spirit shall come forth and the graves shall be opened, bone shall come to its bone, the body shall rise again, spirit and body shall be reunited and stand upon the earth, finding the lost chord to join in the eternal harmonies in the coronation song when they crown Him who is advertised to us as the resurrection and life, King of All.

All Will Be Resurrected.

Because I believe these things I betake myself to the task of proving to you from the Scriptures, first, that there shall be a resurrection of all men. First Corinthians 15:22 and 23, Paul reasoning with the brethren, said there: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Now, "all" in the one line is as large as the "all" in the other line. All that die, irrespective of whether they are good or bad. All will be resurrected. John 12:32, Jesus says there: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." In the fifth chapter of John, 28th verse, he

says: "All they who are in their graves shall come forth." Paul, writing in the 24th of the Acts of the Apostles, 15th verse, says: "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust." The same Paul, reasoning in the 1st Corinthians, 15th chapter and 13th verse, says: "If there be no resurrection, then is Christ not risen." He tells us also in that same chapter that Jesus Christ will reign until He puts all enemies under His feet and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. And remember that the word death does not mean annihilation, but it means separation of two existing principles. In this case, it means that at death the spirit is separated from the body, the spirit going to God that gave it, and He will consign it to a place, and the body returning to the dust, and at the resurrection the body and the spirit shall be reunited. That is death, that is life. The separation of spirit and body is death, the reuniting of spirit and body will mean life. Revelations 20 and 12, John, in that wonderful presentation under the Holy Spirit saw wonderful things. Among them, he says: "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God." This will be sufficient, I think, to prove to you that there is to be a resurrection of all men that die.

The Righteous Shall Rise First.

My next point will be to prove to you that the righteous, the Christian, the saint, shall rise first. Now, let me say right here that at almost every funeral sermon you ever attended, when the parson reads from his book the funeral service, you heard him consign the victim of death to the grave till the resurrection at the last day. Dear friends, I would not want God to pay any attention to any man that would consign me to the grave for that time. I do not want to come up in the resurrection of the last day. That is the resurrection of the unjust, and if those men would only read their Bible they would read that the resurrection of the last day is the resurrection of damnation, it is the resurrection of those that are not permitted to dwell in the presence of Jesus or of God until a further education and training has taken place in some of the worlds that are without end. That resurrection is not the one promised to the true and obedient child of God.

So you had better get that out of the creeds and out of your society funeral service if you don't want your friends to be deposited in the grave to the last day. Now, let me show you this in 1st Thessalonians, 4:16. Paul reasons that the dead in Christ shall rise first. I am making no argument over that word first. I take it for granted that this immense intelligent congregation will understand that if there is a first spoken of there certainly must be a second to follow. But we support it. John, in Revelations, speaking of the resurrection of the dead, says: "The rest of the dead (that is, the wicked dead) live not again until the thousand years are finished.

"Blessed and holy is he that part in the first resurrection. On such the second death has no power, for they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years." I could not make that any plainer if I was to talk a month. Paul, speaking to the Corinthians, 15th chapter, 23rd verse, says: "Afterwards those that are not Christ's at His coming?" John, 5 and 29, says, in speaking of the resurrection of the dead: "They that have done good unto the resurrection of life, they that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation." Again in Luke 20 and 35, when Jesus is speaking there. He is talking to some people who will be worthy to obtain resurrection from the dead. Now, just a word here as to the word "from" the dead. The resurrection of the

dead and from the dead is a little different. Those at the coming of Christ that shall be raised, they shall be raised a thousand years before the rest. Consequently, they are taken from the graves, and the others left there, so that they are resurrected from the dead, leaving others still in the grave. So that here it is called the resurrection from the dead.

First Resurrection the Best.

Now, to show you clearly that there is one resurrection better than the other. I would draw your attention to where Paul speaks to the Hebrews in 11:35 of the saints of the past having suffered that they might inherit a better resurrection. Now that is clear, concise and emphatic. There is a first and a second resurrection and one is a thousand years anterior to the other; one the resurrection of the just when Jesus comes, the other the resurrection of the unjust at the last day. Paul, in First Corinthians 15:40-42, shows that there are different glories in these resurrections, and it reads something like this: There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, another glory of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead.

How the Dead Will Be Raised.

My next point will be to discuss how the dead are raised and with what body do they come. Job is said to be the oldest writer of the Bible. Some have said that he was none other than one of the sons of Noah. Some writers affirm that Shem, the son of Noah and Melchisedek, the high priest of God, and Job is one and the same person. This is contradicted by critical authority and yet maintained by authorities that are considered standard. However, it is conceded, I think, by all Biblical scholars that Job is the oldest writer in the Scriptures. When suffering financial, domestic and physical tortures, his children having been taken by death, his barns destroyed, his goods ruined and he himself covered with what is known in history as the black leprosy—a reeking mass of corruption from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet—he thought he had one soul on earth to whom he could look for comfort and that was his wife. But when she approached him and saw the reeking mass of putrefaction, she said to him: “Why don’t you curse God and die?” And the old man, inspired by the spirit of God, lifted up his voice and cried: “Oh, that my words were written, that they were written with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever.”

Why, Job, you must have a wonderful testimony that you want to convey to unborn posterity. He wanted it cut out of the rock with an iron chisel and then lead poured in. Thus his testimony would remain imperishable through the ages to come. What was this testimony? Listen: “I know that my redeemer liveth and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold and not another, though my reins be consumed within me.” Here is perhaps as grand a testimony to the literal resurrection of the body as we may find in all the annals of history, but we pass on hurriedly and draw your attention to the golden-tongued prophet Isaiah, who in the 26th chapter, says something like this: “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs and the earth shall cast out the dead. Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers and shut thy doors about thee, hide thyself, as it were, for a little moment.”

How is it that we don’t hear anything about the damp, dark valley

and all that sort of thing, but in this little picture it represents a chamber, a little bed, a tired child, a weary one's sinking to rest till the darkness is past and the day dawns, when as Job says thou wilt call and I will answer thee, for thou wilt have a desire for the works of thy hands." I will call your attention now to the 32nd of Ezekiel. God, it would seem, has taken the prophet out and spread before the vision of his understanding a great valley and the valley was full of dry bones, and the Lord speaks to the prophet and says: "Son of man, can these bones live?" And the prophet said: "Oh, Lord God, Thou knowest." And the Lord said unto him: "These bones are the whole house of Israel, behold they say"—that is the spirits that once inhabited these dead bones, still conscious in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection, they are saying something—what is it? Behold, they say our bones are dry, our hope is lost and we are cut off for our parts, but prophesy into these dry bones and say unto them, thus saith the Lord I will open your graves and I will bring you up out of your graves and when I have opened your graves and brought you up out of them I will bring you into the land that I gave unto your fathers, then shall you know that I, the Lord God have spoken it and performed it, saith the Lord.

Here is a clear picture, showing to us the literal resurrection. Indeed, it goes farther and says: "Bone shall come to its bone." God, speaking through another of the Old Testament prophets, Hosea, says: "I will ransom thee from the powers of the grave and I will redeem thee from death." Jesus revealed to John the Revelator in 20th chapter of Revelations and the 13th and 14th verses that death and hell and the sea would deliver up its dead and they would stand before God to be judged. You thought that when folks went to hell, they would never get out. Here is a clear statement that hell is to deliver up its captive spirits, the sea and the graves will deliver up the captive body and spirit and body will be reunited and shall stand before the judgment bar of God, there to answer for the deeds done in the body. That is called the general judgment but proves the literal resurrection.

Now Paul is very plain on this question of literal resurrection. In 1st Corinthians, 15th chapter, 38th and 39th verses, he gives a beautiful picture that shows that when you sow grain that grain shall sprout out after its own kind, indicating that that body when it goes down shall sow seed and bring forth after its own kind and there shall be the resurrection. Paul, speaking in the same chapter, says: "It (the body), is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption, and when this mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruption, then shall be brought to pass the saying: "Oh, grave where is thy victory; oh, death, where is thy sting." Why, if the grave holds the body forever, then it is, of course, forever victorious. If the powers of death or separation can keep spirit and body apart, then death will forever have its sting, but this prediction will be fulfilled and the spirits shall come forth from Paradise, the intermediate state, the body from the grave and shall stand upon the earth.

Rise in Christ's Image.

"Christ is the first fruits from the dead." (1 Corinthians, xv., 20) Christ was the first fruits of them that slept. (Paul Acts of Apostles, xxvi., 20.) Christ the first that should rise from the dead. Now there are some folks who think there was a resurrection in Jerusalem at the time of the crucifixion. Read Matthew 27 very carefully and you will see

there that "many of the saints arose and came into the city after His resurrection." Now we are told that we shall be like Him for we shall see Him as He is and as we have borne the image of the earthly so we shall bear the image of the heavenly. I want to say something here that is very dear to me. I want to emphasize it and I want you to try and remember it. I have had to do a great deal of praying in my time in order to be halfway right, and I have selected a place in my home where I can go alone, where no human ear can hear or human eye can see—a little clothes closet off our bedroom where, when the door is shut, there is perfect darkness and silence. Frequently I have repaired to that place when I wanted God's special blessing to come upon me in the performance of my work.

I entered that sequestered and lonely spot upon one occasion and pleaded for light, for help, and immediately a personage whom I recognized to be my father appeared before me: He looked perhaps thirty-five years of age. His hair was black, his face was clear without a single wrinkle. He looked just beautiful. I said to him: "Father, when you died you were an old man, worn, bent, feeble, wrinkled and decrepit." A kind of a pained expression came over his face and he said: "Why, Richard, have you not read: 'He shall change our vile bodies liken unto His most glorious body.'" And then he quietly, in a few words, gave me to understand that the resurrection was the great gift of God to humanity in that He would bring about in that resurrection the highest possible spiritual and physical development and perfection, so that in the resurrection you may hope to see your father, who went down with perhaps a hand missing or an eye blinded or some other affliction upon his body. You may not hope to gaze upon the old, wrinkled, faded, worn and decrepit body, but in the resurrection God's wondrous divine potentiality will be demonstrated in that you will gaze upon the resurrected being in the highest possible spiritual, physical and intellectual perfection, that is, the glory of the sun, the celestial glory, the resurrection of the just.

Proof of Christ's Resurrection.

There were those, and there are those now that deny the resurrection of Jesus Christ with the literal body. I shall now prove that Jesus rose from the dead. Matthew 27:62-66, tells the story that they were afraid that the disciples would steal his body away and so they rolled a big stone against the cave door, put a big seal upon it, and had the soldiers guard it, but after the resurrection they were paid to tell falsehoods against the Christians. They have not stopped doing that yet, and so we find that in Matthew 28:4-16, they got up a story and said the disciples stole His body away while they slept.

I once heard a lawyer of considerable fame, playing the infidel, make that argument, and I asked him plainly: "What would you do if they came into court on any other matter and swore that certain persons did certain things while they slept?" He thought perhaps he had better not use that argument any more.

Now, let me give you the evidence of men, not who were asleep, but of men who were awake. In Matthew 28:1-16, we are told that one angel and thirteen men saw Him. Mark certifies to the same thing in the 16th chapter, verses 1-14. Luke 24:1-52, says two angel and fifteen men saw Him. John 20:1-31, two angels and twelve men saw Him. John 21:1-4, says seven disciples saw Him for the third time, and in 1st Corinthians 15:3-8, Paul says He was seen by five hundred persons at one time. Now there has been an argument made that because these witnesses differed they ought to be thrown out of court. Now, the facts

are there, all bare testimony to the resurrection of the dead. Some saw Him on one occasion, some on another. But they all testified to having seen Him. That is the point we are after.

Resurrection Tangible.

Now that the resurrection was a tangible affair, I submit that after the resurrection Jesus walked, talked, ate and made dinner for Himself, and others. John 21:4-15, says: "Jesus made a dinner and did eat with them. Luke 24:42, says He did eat of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb before them." Acts 10:41, says that He showed Himself plainly before witnesses and did eat and drink. After this very positive evidence He ascended into heaven." Mark 16:19 says, Jesus was received into Heaven. Luke 24:51, that He was carried up into heaven. Acts 1 and 11, "The angels testified that He went to heaven." Acts 7:56, Stephen, when being stoned to death, declared: "I see heaven opened and Jesus sitting on the right hand of God."

Jesus Will Return to Earth.

My next point is that Jesus will come again to earth. Acts 1 and 11: "The angels testified as to seeing Him ascend, so shall He descend." First Thessalonians 4:16: "The Lord will descend from heaven." Jesus Himself in the 14th John, 3rd verse, says: "I will come again and receive you unto myself."

With the Same Body.

When He comes again it will be with the same body, says John, 19:37, "They will look upon him whom they pierced."

Eat After Rising.

Now, in closing, let me give you a thought to show that the ultimate glorious condition of the redeemed with Christ will be a tangible one on the literal earth and that Jesus will eat and so will His people in the kingdom that is to come. In support of this I cite Luke 14:15, where Jesus Himself says: "They shall eat bread in the kingdom." In Matthew 26, Jesus at that last supper, that most mournful time, gave forth this promise: "I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine till I drink it anew with you in my Father's kingdom." And in Luke, He says in the 22nd chapter, 30th verse: "You shall eat and drink at my table," and the crowning glories of the invulnerable promise that shines undimmed in all the dark history of human struggle is this: Revelations 19 chapter, showing that the righteous, those that have suffered with me, shall sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb and shall go no more out.

Now, my friends, this is the Bible on the real tangible resurrection. It does away with this froth and foam, this gilded show that takes us beyond the ken of geographical location, and makes everything tangible and real. May God help us to see the gospel as it is found in the Bible, and may we live so that by obedience to the gospel we can develop a character that will entitle us through the merits of Jesus Christ to the first resurrection, that we may dwell with Him on the redeemed earth when He comes in His glory, is my earnest prayer.

Restitution

I WOULD draw your attention to-night to the 3rd chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, from the 19th to the 21st verses inclusive, where you will read these words: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive until the time of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began."

God Has a Plan.

Statisticians inform us that from the creation of Adam till the present day, over one hundred and forty-five billions of men have been placed upon this probation. Theological history informs us that less than one billion have ever embraced Christianity in any form. Many leading ministers tell us that this life is the only probation the children of men will enjoy; that here we must believe and obey the gospel, or be irretrievably lost. We are further informed that God created Adam and placed him here pure and stainless, and in consequence of sin that he fell and incurred displeasure not only upon himself, but upon his posterity; not only upon his posterity, but upon all the animal world; not only upon the animal world, but upon the vegetable world; indeed, that in consequence of his transgression over there in Eden, God cursed the world. But to meet this we are informed that God has provided a remedy, that those who believe in Jesus and serve Him will be saved from eternal damnation, and that, at death, they will go to a place of purity, holiness and perfection, called heaven. While the teeming millions, who have never obeyed the truth will be consigned to endless, seething, fiery, liquid flames.

Will Satan Frustrate It?

Now, it seems to me that this theology misrepresents both God and the Bible. We believe that good is stronger than evil, that light is better than darkness, that God is omnipotent, and that he never met a successful rival. In consequence of this, we affirm that eventually God will redeem the sons of men and bring back the earth and all therein to the conditions that he designed it to enjoy before the fall. Anything short of this would make Satan a successful rival, and rob Jesus of the glory of being the Redeemer of the world.

Were we to be placed far off in the heaven that some have loved to talk about, and this world would be absolutely and wholly destroyed, it seems that it would tell the story of God's defeat. Were the teeming millions, with the exception of a few, to be lost, it seems that it would tell the story of Satan's victory. Were this world to ever remain under the curse of God placed upon it because of Adam's transgression, it would seem that evil was stronger than good.

Now, in order for us to see what shall be restored, we must try and discover what was lost. We turn your attention to the 1st and 2nd chapters of Genesis, and there we read that God created man pure and stain-

less, in his own image. That He made not man alone, but an help-mate for him, a co-equal, one that would love and honor and one that would be loved and honored. And as this is true, we look at them in that beautiful garden, surrounded with all that could make life pleasant. As we listen to the warbling of the birds that are singing their morning praises to the God that created them; and we listen to the babbling brook and the gurgling stream, and the whispering leaves, and gaze upon the flowers whose perfume freighted the air like sweet incense, we discover the first chapter of the story of God's love to the children of men.

Here we see that God gave man dominion over all the world, over the fishes of the sea and the fowls of the air, and over all that was in this life. "Yes," says one, "but God blindfolded him, dug a ditch, caused him to walk in it, and cursed him because he fell." Now, we do not believe this. If I were a believer in the doctrine that God foreordained, predestined and designed that men would be damned, I could not love him; I could not revere or respect Him; I want to show you that God gave to Adam his free agency, and that the men who term themselves infidels, who talk so much about "liberty and freedom," have plainly shown that if they had the running of this world, they would have made us slaves, without the liberty to do as we please.

Adam Had Power to Choose.

God gave Adam dominion over all, even permitted him to partake of the tree of life, that he might live forever. But in order to test this man's love, in order to see whether he was obedient or not, he gave him a law that said he must not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. "Ah," says one, "there is where the Lord made a mistake and acted cruelly; He knew he would eat it." Let me touch that right here. Foreknowledge and foreordination are vastly different. Did God blindfold him? No. Did Adam know the consequence of that disobedience? Partially, yes. Let me illustrate: My brother on my left here owns a large farm. He comes to me and says: "Now, if you will work for me, keep all my commandments, do all the work that I intrust to your care, you shall never know a pain; you shall never have a sigh and you shall never drop a tear. You will live throughout one eternal day, without a pain. But I want to tell you that I am going to leave you now, and there is another individual who, in my absence will come to you and request you to go over and work on his farm. Now, you can do as you please, but let me tell you, if you go and work for him, that his farm is swampy and low, and you are liable to take disease, and you will surely die if you work for that individual."

My brother leaves me to do as I please. After a while this other gentleman comes along, and he tells me a fine story, and finally I am persuaded to go over and work on the other farm. Now, if I get malarial fever, consumption sets in, and death ensues, who is to blame? Just me—not this brother who wanted me to work on this good farm, but me, who refused to work for him and worked for the other man. That is what God did with Adam. He gave him to understand that if he would keep His law and abstain from eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, He would bless him with life, and he would enjoy it abundantly, with all that the word means. Adam chose to serve Satan and break the law, and had to pay the penalty. Why, God shows fair play, you know; He says every man will be rewarded according to his works; and while the wages of sin is death, the wages of obedience is certain life.

Now, Satan came and took Adam aside, and through his wife they had a conversation there, and finally they broke the law, and entailed upon themselves what they had been informed would follow. What more could man expect than that which he received? He used the right of his agency and chose to do wrong, and the consequences or penalties of wrong doing had to be met. When we do right, by obedience to the law, we will receive the blessing; when we do wrong, by transgressing the law, we must receive the curse.

The Poisonous Fruit.

There is a good statement made in the Bible, wherein it is said: "To whomsoever you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are to whom you obey." Well, now, I do not think that God did wrong. I do not think there was any mistake made in this regard. Adam chose to do as he pleased, and he had to accept the consequences. We see him driven from the Garden of Eden. And I might ask, What is this tree of the knowledge of evil? Some have spiritualized it and taken the position that it did not mean a tree; that it was some symbolical expression. Now, your speaker is of the opinion that it meant a tree with real fruit—he will take that position to-night—and that that fruit had an effect upon the physical organization of Adam, and that it poisoned the spiritual fluid that coursed through his veins and robbed him of eternal life. You spiritualize the fruit, I will spiritualize the tree, another will spiritualize the garden, and someone else will spiritualize the man, until we have the whole thing spiritualized. I believe that that fruit had a literal effect upon man's organization. But there was an antidote prepared for that poison.

You remember that after the fall God went to Adam and said, You must go out of this garden. Why? Do you remember the reason assigned? He should be driven from the garden lest he partake of the fruit of the tree of life, and live forever. Now, know this, if Adam had partaken of the fruit of the tree of life, he would have lived forever; and I believe that it was in mercy that God drove him from the garden and excluded him from the tree of life; for if he had lived forever in that condition, utter gloom would have covered his posterity forever; so far as we are informed in the record. But he was driven from the garden. And not only is the man and the woman cursed, but the animal world is cursed with them, and enmity arose between man and beast. Not only this, but the very earth is cursed and appears as swamps, canyons, jagged peaks, lofty mountains, and gloomy dells, with thorns, thistles and briars.

We are told in the 10th chapter of Genesis that in process of time the earth will be divided, become disturbed, and it is becoming worse and worse. And we are informed that in a little while God again cursed the sons of men, confounded the pure and beautiful language that they all spoke, and they were driven as a people who had disrespected God's law, all o'er the land.

Now this ensued as a consequence; we have all suffered the penalty, hence it is said: "It is appointed unto man once to die." We have all had to submit to the dread decree: "The wages of sin is death." Can we ever redeem ourselves? "O no," says the world; "Jesus came, and those few who believe in Him may go to heaven." But the earth is cursed, the animals are cursed, the world at large is cursed; but few are going to accept salvation, and soar away to some other star or world, a beautiful and lovely place called heaven. And in doing so they will acknowledge the almost entire defeat of the great object of God in the creation of this world and those whom He placed upon it.

The Advocates Free.

But I want to introduce you to another individual. We have been accused by the world of not believing in Jesus Christ; that is, of not being orthodox—that we make too much of this doctrine and the other, and that we deny the blood of Christ, and we do not depend upon Christ. I want to show you, friends, that the Latter Day Saints do believe in Jesus Christ, that they look upon him as the hero of every struggle, as conqueror over death, hell and the grave, and as the Redeemer of all mankind. I am going to try to show you that it is Jesus Christ in whom the world may hope for salvation; that he is the lawyer of the universe, that He is the advocate of the whole world, and that his instrumentality will yet destroy the works of the devil.

Tell me that Latter Day Saints do not believe in Jesus Christ! They are teaching the doctrine that Jesus will yet “destroy the works of the devil.” Let me draw your attention to a thought: Suppose that my great grandfather had owned a large farm, but some one by stratagem or in some other way robbed him of the homestead. In consequence he was driven off and his posterity made poor; we have remained poor ever since. But suppose some brilliant, talented lawyer, after investigating the matter to some extent, shall come to me and say, “Now, I believe that there are evidences in the world, if they could be collected together, that would reinstate you upon your great grandfather’s homestead, that would bring back to the family the right and title to this land; and, now, if you will give me one hundred dollars I will institute proceedings against the villain who robbed your great grandfather, and I will win back the homestead for you.” There are many cases just like that, I introduce to you Jesus, as the lawyer of the sons of men. Maybe you do not believe that is right, but if you will turn your attention to 1 John 2:1-2, you will read there that Jesus is called the “Advocate.” That is, a lawyer, an intercessor. And hence, Wesley, understanding something about it, could say:

“He ever lives above, for me to intercede
His all-redeeming love, His precious blood to plead;
The Father hears Him pray, His dear anointed one,
He cannot turn away the pleadings of His Son.”

Now, Jesus is the lawyer who is going to plead the case; we place it all in His hands. He comes to us and says, in effect: “By stratagem your forefather was robbed of the dominion of this world (for Adam had it given to him); you have been robbed of it and of eternal life. But I will win it back for you if you will pay me what I ask.” What is the pay that he requires. “Son, daughter, give me thine heart; comply with the conditions of my law, so that you may be able to develop a character that will entitle you to a residence in the homestead when I have redeemed it.” “Oh,” says one, “you are going to make a regular lawsuit out of this.” I want to know if the Bible don’t represent God as being the judge? I want to know if the twelve don’t represent the jury? Don’t you know that the Bible says that the Saints shall judge the world, and not only the world, but shall judge angels? And the record stated that the devil was once an angel, and that he with other angels fell. Here, then, is a lawsuit going on, and these criminals are to be tried: Somebody is going to try and judge them. The twelve apostles are called judges, and they are to sit upon twelve thrones, and judge the twelve tribes of Israel, and not only them, but the Saints are to judge the world and angels. Here we have a judge, jury, and Jesus is the lawyer. Now, He came for evi-

dence 1800 years ago, and He collected a great deal of it, no doubt. And then he established His law, the gospel, among the sons of men, by which they could begin to develop a character that would entitle them to enter the old homestead, when redeemed. Then He goes away. Now, He says: "Let not your hearts be troubled"; ye believe in God, believe also in Me. If I go away I will come again. Do not be frightened. Your lawyer is going away, but He is coming back again. That was the hope of God's people all along the line, that Jesus would return that the court would yet sit, that Satan would yet be tried, and they restored to their rights.

Satan's Dominion.

Did Satan really get dominion of this world. Jesus Christ, upon one occasion, made a statement like this: "The prince of this world cometh; but he hath nothing in Me." Ah, when the prince came to the first man, Adam, he had something in him, and robbed him of all he had that was worth having. But when he came to Jesus, did he have anything in him? No. He tried him, tempted him, but he fell not. Do you remember the manner of temptation that he offered Him, that on condition that Christ would bow down and worship him he would give him all the kingdoms of this world, and the glory of them? Do you think he would have given him the kingdoms of this world if he did not own them? "O," says one, "Jesus, you know, has told us that Satan was a liar, and for us not to believe him." But, friends, listen. The 4th chapter of Matthew tells us that Jesus was tempted of the devil and that this was one of the temptations. If Jesus knew that the devil did not have dominion over this world, would it have been a temptation?

Let me illustrate: Suppose my brother here is an alien, a foreigner, does not own a foot of land here, and he was to say to me, "R. C., if you will give me your jackknife I will give you the Province of Ontario." Would that be any temptation to me? No. Why? I would say, "Mister, you cannot give me the Province of Ontario, you do not own any land in this country." It would be no temptation to me whatever. If it was a fact that Satan did not have the dominion he proposed to give, what temptation was the offer to Jesus Christ? Why, the very fact shows that he did have dominion, that he was called the "prince of this world," that he had robbed us of the dominion, and that Jesus Christ was the lawyer, and he wanted to bribe Him.

You can find some lawyers who can be bribed. I remember one in particular. Some young people had some land left them, and they got a lawyer to look up the case. The man who had his hands on it was a wealthy man, and he says to the lawyer: "These children do not know much about law; I will give you one hundred dollars to advise them it will be of no use to look it up." The lawyer took the one hundred dollars and told the young people that there was no use of their going to law about it, it would do them no good. They rested on the advice of the lawyer for two or three years, when they happened to come in contact with another lawyer, and he says: "There is something in that, and I am interested. I will get that land for you, and it shall not cost you a dollar if I fail." And he got the land.

They tried to bribe our advocate, but he would not take the bribe. Thank heaven there is one lawyer that will not be bribed. We may look for justice in this regard.

In process of time Satan used every means that lay within his power to crush the work and ruin the reputation of this advocate; and by and

by, when the people were sufficiently wrought up, they killed Him, crucified Him. But don't you know that was a short railroad by which He could go and get evidence from the world beyond? And the result was, He descended into the lower parts of the earth and collected much evidence there, no doubt. Then He ascended to heaven to finish preparing for trial. You remember the poor, despised foreigner exile, there on that little Isle of Patmos; when he was weeping at his loneliness, the lawyer appeared to him and told him of the wonderful things that were to take place; told him of his success. "I am he that liveth and was dead. . . . And have the keys of hell and death."

Then, friends, Satan has the world, he is the prince of this world. And as God said to the Seer. (Doc. and Cov., p. 65.) "And the devil shall have power over his own dominion." "He is the god of this world."—2 Cor. 4:3-4. But thank God, when the judgment sits, his kingdom and dominion shall be taken away from him and given back to Adam and his posterity, and the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our God and his Christ."

"How are you going to get it back again?" Says one, "We do not want it." But if we do not get the world back he will get the body; it will moulder away in the dust. And there must be a restoration; we are not going to get something new, but something is going to be restored.

There Will Be a Restitution.

We have seen how man was cursed, how that he was driven from the garden, how he lost that immortal inheritance; that the earth was cursed, that enmity was placed between him and the beasts of the field. That the land was terribly scourged, and earthquakes made the earth tremble and cut it up, and the land was divided. But Jesus declares He is going to redeem it. How? He will be our advocate and in the process of time our court will sit.

Says one, "Did you ever read that in the Bible?" If you will turn your attention to Daniel 7:22-27, you will read that the judgment shall sit. There is to be a judgment. You will also read in the 20th chapter of Revelations where the criminal in this case will be arrested by a detective sent from heaven. If you have never read it, I will quote: "And I saw an angel come down from heaven having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold of the dragons, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years and cast him into the bottomless pit." Here he is sent to prison and his sentence is for a thousand years.

Now, what is to become of the great world this individual is called the prince of when the judgment shall sit? We read as follows: "And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heavens, are to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." That is just what Adam lost, and it is what is going to be given to his posterity. To have a complete restoration of all things, there must be a resurrection. The holy propnets spake of the resurrection of the dead. Job says: "Oh, that my words were now written! oh, that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though, after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God."—Job 19:22-27.

We are told in Isaiah 26:19: "Thy dead men shall live together with my dead body shall they arise." How beautifully the Lord speaks!

“Come, my people, and enter into that chamber (the grave) and wait for a little moment.”—Oh, how sweet!—“for a little moment until the indignation is past.” Job knew that the indignation had to pass, and said: “All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change comes. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the works of thy hands.” God formed this body, He will have respect for it. And Jesus tells us: “Marvel not, for the hour is coming when all they who are in their graves shall hear His voice.”—John 5:28-29.

Here you discover that the devil will not have a tax title upon our bodies forever, in consequence of Adam eating an apple over there in the garden, but Jesus Christ is the resurrection and the life, and the time will come that He will resurrect them all, and reward them according to their works. So here we have the resurrection. What else do we have? We have a renewed world, the earth, the kingdom reclaimed and given to the people of the Saints of the Most High. We have not only the righteous dead, but the wicked dead, resurrected. We have those who are alive when Jesus comes, being changed in a moment. Here then, we have all raised and the “kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom given to the Saints of the Most High.”

Fir Instead of Thorn.

“But,” says one, “Look at the condition it is in. It is all divided and here are mountains and valleys, hills and dales, and acres of it barren.” Oh, but friends, turn to the 40th chapter of Isaiah, and we read there, in substance at least, that every valley will be brought up, and every mountain shall be brought down, and the crooked places made straight, and the rough places made smooth. Says one, “We have not got the world all restored if you do have the valleys brought up and the mountains brought down; look at the curse of thorns and briars.” But if you will turn to the 55th chapter of Isaiah and the 13th verse, you will read: “Instead of thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree.” Here we learn we are going to have no more thorns and briars, and God is going to bless the earth.

Says one, “That is true; but then look! Even if we have got all the curse removed and the earth brought back to its ancient purity and fertility, look at the animals—look at the enmity that exists in the animal kingdom.” But do you not know the promise was made by God to Joel that the time would come, come when the Spirit of God would be poured out upon all flesh? How does the spirit act when it is poured out upon us? Friends, it does not matter whether you are out listening to the war whoop of the red men, or whether you may be associated with the lowest depths of moral degradation, let the Spirit of God have its effect on you, and it will make you calm, and pure, and holy and merciful in your disposition; and the man that claims to enjoy the Holy Spirit and is a crank at home and abroad, I believe that man speaks an untruth. If that is the way it affects the sons of men—if it makes a man who is sinful and wicked, to be calm and sweet of disposition, pure and holy in his aspirations, don't you believe it will have somewhat the same effect upon the rest of the animal world? “But,” says one, “was there any promise that it would thus affect them?” Yes, friends, in the 11th chapter of Isaiah, from the 6th to the 9th verses, we read: “The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the suckling child

shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord."

Here we discover that Jesus Christ will redeem the world and bring it back to what it once was; take all the curse off the vegetable world, and off the animal world, and will bring the earth back to its ancient purity and resurrect all the dead.

"But," says one, "after having done all this: yet you know the curse is still upon us. Look at us; our language has been confounded, and we cannot understand each other. There was a time when all the world spoke one sweet, pure language, but now look at us." Oh, friends, do you not know that God will restore to the earth a pure language, that all the sons of men may worship Him with one voice? Zephaniah follows it up by saying that, "Then I will turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the Lord, to serve Him, with one consent."—Zeph. 3:9.

How much is left, friends? We have everything restored. "But," says one, "there is one thought more; what is going to become of the world that has sinned?" They will be punished for their sins; and after the punishment is over it shall have the effect upon them to enable them to establish within their hearts a love for God; for God will not punish out of spite, but because of love, to purify the gold and burn out the dross, and by and by establish that which shall destroy the works of the devil. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.

The Tree of Life.

We Latter Day Saints look at Jesus Christ as the hero of every struggle; as the one who shall establish us in purity and righteousness upon the lands of the redeemed and sanctified earth. We look to Him as the "Rock of Ages," as a perfect harbor of safety; we look at Him as the Saviour of all mankind, especially those that are by his covenant relationship in this world and in the worlds to come, and those who shall be His by covenant relationship. Thus we discover Jesus as the hero of all the worlds; as the conqueror of death, hell and the grave, as the destroyer of the works of Satan; as the destroyer of death; as the one who will give life abundantly to all the sons of men.

We have shown you that we were driven from the tree of life, and in consequence had to die. Permit me now to show you that in the 22nd chapter of Revelations, that on either side of the river in the Holy City shall stand the tree of life. Now, this tree of life bears twelve kinds of fruit—a kind for each month in the year; and the partaking of the tree of life will perpetuate life, as it would have done were they permitted to remain in the Garden of Eden. And thus we find Eden restored, man immortalized and the world redeemed, by the Lord Jesus Christ.

I remark that God through Christ will yet redeem all people from the grave and Satan. This must be done, we think, else Satan will be a successful rival. That God will subdue all things and destroy the works of the devil, destroy death, and rescue all from the grave, and ultimately restore a perfect harmony of all the universe, see the following from the Bible: 1 Cor. 51:22-28; Phil. 2:12-13; Isa. 45:11-25; 52:10; Heb. 8:11; Dan. 7:14; John 4:42; 12:32; 1 Tim. 4:10; 2:6; Isa. 66:24; John 5:29; Hos. 13:14.

That the sinner will be punished is evident. We can conceive of but three reasons why our Father would punish His disobedient children. First, from motive of revenge, spite or hatred. Now, the attributes ascribed to God in the Bible are power, justice, goodness, love, mercy and father-

hood. These attributes at once forbid us to surmise that Our Father will punish from these motives. A good earthly father would not punish his children from motives of revenge, spite or hatred, much less our Heavenly Father. The second reason: For the good of other members of His family, who might learn obedience by the suffering of those punished. But this reason fails when we read that all will be judged when the "books" are opened; hence, it will be too late then to learn by the suffering of another.

The third and true motive for God's punishment, is: For the good of his children, to eradicate evil, and if you will allow me the metaphorical expressions so commonly used in the Bible, He punishes them to "burn out the dross and purify the gold," that after they have "paid the uttermost farthing," the last "mite," or in other words, suffered according to their works of evil, then they will see that the "chastening" has been for their profit, and afterwards it will yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness, and they will "be partakers of God's holiness," and yet bow in reverence to the love and power of God who has cleansed them from all unrighteousness, and thus prepared them to receive the reward for the good done in life.

In verification of this, see the following: Heb. 12:5-11; Rev. 3:19; 2 Cor. 5:10; Col. 3:25; Matt. 5:25-26; 18:30-35; Luke 12:59; Rev. 22:12. That the work of punishment and reformation will continue after death is evident from the following scripture: 1 Peter 3:18-20; 4:6; 1 Cor. 15:29; Phil. 2:10-11; Rev. 1:18; Isa. 24:22. Thank God Jesus will win back all the world. Suffering will have an end; death will be destroyed; Satan will be conquered; peace will cover the earth, and God, who is called "Father" more than two hundred and fifty times in the New Testament, will demonstrate to all that He has ever loved his children. Oh, how beautiful are the facts in the Bible, compared with the cold, cruel, revengeful story as told by the theology of to-day that says the devil will reign king of hell, presiding over a roaring, seething, liquid lake, in which is engulfed the largest part of God's creatures, burning in fiery flames forever more; and that this beautiful world will be destroyed and the purposes of God, as revealed in the Bible relative to it, will fail.

When we see the wisdom, love and power of God in sending Jesus Christ to "restore all things," our hearts are filled with love, and we feel to say, Oh, thou, "Son of Righteousness," shed thy power o'er the universe, 'till all will be baptized 'neath the halo of Thy effulgence. Oh, thou "Bright and Morning Star," twinkle in all Thy beauty 'till all shall know and love Thee. Oh, thou "Rock of Ages," may all the mariners on humanity's sea find safety on Thy towering form. Oh, thou "Lily of the Valley," blossom 'till Thy purity shall be reflected in all the souls that Thou hast made. Bloom on thou "Rose of Sharon," 'till the air of the universe shall be freighted with the perfume of Thy love, 'till all worlds shall bow before Thee and pay Thee homage forever more. Amen.

The Antiquity of the Gospel

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 13th Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, verse 8, which reads as follows: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever."

At the outset tonight, let us recall the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, recorded in the 20th Chapter of Matthew, from the 1st to the 16th verses. I will not attempt to read it all, but it may be briefly summed up as follows: The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard. He went into the market place, and agreed with certain laborers that he would hire them for a penny a day. It is said he went out again at the third hour, again at the sixth hour, and again at the ninth hour, and yet again at the eleventh hour, each time making a similar bargain, that they should work for him in his vineyard, saying unto them, "Whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive." And at the close of the day they each received a penny. Those who had worked from early morning seemed to have grumbled a little at the master's generosity in rewarding those who were called at the eleventh hour with the same wages as that given to those who were hired in the early hour, third, sixth and ninth. But he showed them that he was giving them that which was right, that which was fair to all.

Right and Wrong Interpretations.

Now, there are two interpretations of this parable, one is right, the other is wrong. I am going to give you both interpretations tonight, and tell you why I believe one of these and reject the other; you shall then be the jurors and give the verdict.

The popular interpretation of this parable may be given to you briefly as follows: Those hired in the early morning has reference to the little tots that are converted. (As Moody once said, he was converted so early in childhood that he never remembered just when the change came. Well, if he did not remember when he was born again, I don't know who else ought to. For anybody to suggest to me that the greatest gift of God could be conferred upon a soul at such a time and place and age when that soul could not remember, I should grow very suspicious as to whether that soul had ever really experienced the thing it claimed to have.)

Those hired in the third hour, they say, means when a person is converted as a young man or young woman. The sixth hour indicates those who are converted in the mature years of life. The ninth hour in the parable represents those who are converted when they are old men and women. The eleventh hour refers to those who, though they have served the devil all their lives, when the chill of death is upon them, profess conversion. The man who has killed his wife, or somebody else's wife maybe, after lying for a few months, and the lawyer having failed to fix things up for him, repents and is converted. And the parson does for him what the archbishop did for Henry VIII., that miserable wreck,

having married six wives, the murderer of several of them. And yet the archbishop reached that old personification of lust on his death-bed, and said: "If your trust is in the Lord Jesus Christ, and you have not the strength to articulate the word 'Yes,' just squeeze my hand." And with the death twitch upon him, Henry squeezed the archbishop's hand, and that, they tell us, was a case of eleventh-hour conversion.

Past Life Determines Destiny.

That is the first interpretation, and which I don't believe. Briefly, I give you my reasons. Galatians 6: 7, is an epitome of the whole Bible on this question, and it reads as follows: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." From this text we learn that a great many people were liable to be deceived by this false doctrine of eleventh-hour conversion. With hope extended to them, many embrace it and procrastinate year after year, putting off their salvation in the belief that it will be all right, and can be fixed up at the end. They have what they call a good time, serving the devil all their lives; it does not matter, because every Sunday they may hear the gospel if they choose. Even if you kill somebody and the law decides that you are not fit to associate with the criminals behind the penitentiary bars, we will fix it up all right for you. And while the jurisprudence of Canada will not prolong your days even behind prison bars, we will fix it up so that you can become the associates of angels. You can change the black cap for the golden crown; you can change the black robe for the white robe of immaculate purity. The hands now pinioned behind you back, in another minute will be playing on a harp of a thousand strings with the spirits of just men made perfect; and the feet now tied together, with the curse of the land upon you, in another minute will be walking through the streets of the New Jerusalem with the chosen of God.

I again repeat, this doctrine is contrary to equity and justice, and is equal to offering a premium on crime. Such teaching is hurting the morals of our country. That is one reason why I don't believe it.

Next, Matthew 12: 36, tells us that so careful, so just, so perfect, will be the judgment of God, that we shall have to give an account in the day of judgment for every idle word spoken while in the body. Ecclesiastes 12: 14, says: "God shall bring every man's work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Jeremiah 6: 19, the Lord says: "I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts." Here we discover that even man's secret thoughts will be judged. Hence Jesus could say on that same question, "The pure in heart shall see God," (Matthew 5:8). Proverbs 23:7, says: "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he;" indicating that a man will develop character as he may learn to think either good or bad thoughts. No man can tell me that his words will be pure and his conduct will be clean if his thoughts are vile and filthy. The poet has it thus: "I hold it true that thoughts are things, endowed with bodies, breath and wings; and that we send them forth to fill the world with good results or ill." Our own Whittaker says: "The issue of the life to be we weave with colors all our own, and in the field of destiny we reap as we have sown." Ella Wheeler Wilcox goes further than that — perhaps further than some of you would like to go—when she says:

"Somewhere, on some planet, sometime and somehow,
Your life will reflect all the thoughts of your now;
The law is unerring; no blood can atone;
The structure you rear you must live in alone."

Importance of Right Thinking.

Here, then, from the Bible and from the modern poets, we are told that men's reward depends not only upon what they say and what they do, but upon their thoughts. Now, we are told in 2nd Corinthians that the carnal mind is at enmity with God; that the things of God are foolishness to the natural man, that he cannot know them because they are spiritually discerned. And this is supported by the Lord as revealed through Isaiah 55: 8-9. Here we read: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." What is the difference? "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Here we see that it is necessary for us to change our attitude. We find ourselves natural, carnal, sinful; we must change our method of talking, acting and thinking, from the natural way to the spiritual. And how is this to be done? Jesus is my witness upon this point. I submit His evidence, as recorded in the 3rd Chapter of St. John's Gospel, where He teaches us the absolute essential of the new birth, saying: "Ye must be born again." (John 3-7). That is imperative.

Death-Bed Conversion Illogical.

Now, any man that will tell me that either the natural birth or the spiritual birth, with all that proceeds from them, can be enacted upon the gallows or upon the death-bed, in the last moments of life, will give evidence that he ought to be in an insane asylum. When Jesus said: "Ye must be born again" there was some reference to the first birth or He would not have called it a birth. Every sane man knows that the first birth is not the result of a miracle, but of a well-defined law. Proper conditions must precede conception; after conception there must be life and development before there can be birth. So in the second birth we must conceive the good seed, which the Bible calls the Word of God., the Gospel. It must give evidence that it has produced life, in that it produces within us the fruits of repentance, which in turn prepares us for the birth of water and of spirit. And so I say, Jesus confirms this doctrine in the evidence contained in the chapter cited, when the man Nicodemus said unto Him, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Jesus answered and said unto him, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Surely, there have been sufficient reasons already presented tonight to show you that this question of salvation depends upon our hearing the word, believing it, understanding it, its producing within us repentance, which leads to the development of character under the new birth of water baptism and spirit baptisms. Well could Nicodemus ask, "How can a man be born when he is old?" I should like to ask the same question, only in a different way, "How can a man be born again?" That is to say, how can he hear, believe, and obey the gospel, be baptized for the remission of sins according to the scriptures, fulfil the doctrine of birth, of water and of the spirit, when he is on the gallows, or when he is on a death-bed? If Nicodemus saw the great lack in procrastinating that wondrous event until one is old, is it not infinitely greater folly to wait until you have served the devil all your life, and then thrown into the face of God the ashes of a misspent life, and say, Lord, you can have that! There are a thousand reasons that go to show that the development of character, under the new birth, is what entitles you to dwell with the pure and the good in the land of promise, the New Jerusalem.

When the Gospel Started.

Now, says one, I guess you have got the thought that that parable does not mean death-bed repentance or gallows conversion. If it does not mean that, pray tell me what it does mean, and to this task I gladly betake myself.

Jesus, speaking in John 11:9, says: "Are there not twelve hours in the day?" Work while the day lasts. Now, in this parable you are told there are twelve hours referred to. That day hasn't reference to a day of twelve hours of daylight, or our day of twenty-four hours. But the day referred to here is the day of human redemption. It started when the gospel was introduced to Adam in the day of his fall; and that day will end when the crack of doom sounds, and the last gospel sermon shall be preached. . . . That is the day of twelve hours, and I shall divide that day, and show just what was done in that early hour, also in the third, sixth, ninth and eleventh hours.

Only One Way of Salvation.

There are a number of people who would have you believe that Jesus Christ was really unknown until He was born in Bethlehem's barn, 1800 years ago that God had a sort of "back woods way" of saving people in the old times, but it was rather a rough-shod, clumsy way. You will remember I read a statement to you some time ago from a parson that the old way was taken away when from Calvary there issued forth a new way. But my text says: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday"—that is running back to all the past; "to-day"—that takes in the present; "and forever"—that runs down to the end of time. You will not convince me that God has been experimenting on this question of salvation, and that by practice He has become more and more of an expert in the method of performing salvation. It is good enough to say that Bell may have improved upon the first patent of the telephone; that we have improved upon Howe's method in his first sewing machine; that the old style grain cradle has been improved upon by the new Massey-Harris reaper and binder, but when you tell me that God Almighty by practice has found out a better way, and that He has in consequence changed His method, you will prove to me that God is not God, and that this religious matter that is confronting the world is the production of humanity. My hope, first, last and all the time is in Jesus Christ, "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." Consequently, my effort will be to show you that this parable refers to salvation under the one law. The gospel, that in every age, referred to in this parable as hours, the penny a day was salvation. Men might obey it in one dispensation or the other, and as Jesus said: "That which is right I will give you."

Christ—Adam's Saviour.

Now to proceed. From Adam till Noah, I believe is represented the very-early-in-the-morning dispensation. When Adam fell he needed a saviour, and not before. From the first moment of God's mercy toward him, was started the gospel of Jesus Christ, being the power of God unto salvation. But, says one, you don't mean to tell me that Adam, and his posterity to Noah, knew anything about Christ and the gospel. That is just what I mean to tell you. If you prove to me that Adam or anybody from Adam to Noah, was saved without knowing of Jesus Christ, you will just prove to me that Jesus Christ is not the Saviour of this world. You will prove to me, moreover, that He is a saviour on a small scale, and that God has had several methods of saving men. But my Bible is replete with the statement that there is no other name given

among men or from heaven above by which man can be saved but by Jesus Christ. In Revelation 13:8, we read that "He was as a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

Noah Preached the Gospel.

Now, let us go back to those old days and see if anybody was saved. Genesis 5:24, says: "Enoch walked with God three hundred years." Hebrews 11:5, tells us that Abel, the son of Adam, obtained witness of the Spirit that he was righteous; and you know the righteousness of God, is revealed in the gospel, Paul tells us in the last of Romans. So Abel must have heard the gospel. Genesis 6:8-22, gives us the story of Noah and the few there who found favor in the sight of God. "Noah found grace with the Lord, and did all that God commanded him." Second Peter 2:5, tells us that Noah was a preacher of righteousness, and, as already remarked, the righteousness of God is revealed in the Gospel; so that Noah preached the Gospel. But, says one, you don't mean to tell me, Brother Evans, that Noah knew about Jesus, and that he taught repentance and baptism and all that. Yes, that is what I mean, brother.

Well, says one, you must have a different kind of Bible from mine. This Bible that I hold in my hand was bought at the T. Eaton Company here, and was presented to me—the same kind of Bible that you have got. The trouble is, maybe, you have not read it as well as you ought. Did you ever read this in the Bible about Noah and baptism? (1st Peter, 3:18-21): "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing; wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us."

Baptism—Passport Into the Ark.

That is tantamount to saying, briefly, that the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, was preached in the days of Noah. The people were disobedient to the message, and suffered loss; but the eight souls that were obedient were baptized in water, which entitled them to enter into the ark, just as we are baptized in water entitling us to enter into the church, which is the ground and pillar of the truth. Mark you, it does not say they were saved by getting into the ark; it says that they were saved by water, the like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us. Well, says someone, I don't believe that baptism is a saving ordinance. Again I call attention to what Jesus said when talking on this very point: "He that believeth not shall be damned." If you don't believe Christ's testimony, and there is such a thing as condemnation before God, you stand condemned if you reject the doctrine He taught with regard to baptism.

Job Testified of Christ.

Well, says one, I did not know that those old people in the early days knew anything about Jesus. Let me quote you Job, according to some, the oldest writer in the Bible. Some claim he was a relative of Noah and a very near one. He testifies perhaps as clearly as any man in the Old Testament on the question. Read the entire statement as found in the 19th chapter, 25th verse. I just give you a point in it. He says: "I know that my redeemer liveth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." There is not a man living that can give a stronger testimony to Jesus Christ and the doctrine of

the resurrection than that of Job, an early and close descendant of Noah. Four historians in my possession declare that he was one of the sons of Noah. Whether that be true or not I am not saying, but he lived in those early times and knew about Jesus Christ.

Light From the Early Fathers.

Now, I am going to give you history upon this matter to show you that Brother Evans is not the only one that claims Jesus existed anterior to His birth in Bethlehem's barn, and that He appeared to those earlier worthies. First chapter of St. John, 1st verse, reads as follows: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word of God. The same was in the beginning with God," and so forth. If you will read Cruden's Concordance, page 693 on "The Word," he there says that the Word has reference to Christ. "It was Memra (or the Word) who created worlds, appeared to Moses on Mount Sinai; which gave him the law; which spoke to him face to face; which brought Israel out of Egypt; which marched before the people; which wrought all those miracles which are recorded in the book of Exodus. It was the same Word that appeared to Abraham in the Plain of Mamre; that was seen of Jacob at Bethel, to whom Jacob made his vow, and acknowledged as God."

I want you to carefully note these historical statements, because they come from the lips of the early fathers of the church, many of them. "The scripture is full of the Son of God, appearing sometimes to talk and eat with Abraham; to instruct Noah about the measures of the ark; to seek Adam to bring down judgment upon Sodom; to direct Jacob in the way, and again to converse with Moses out of the bush." (Irenaeus.)

"Our Christ conversed with Moses out of the bush, in the appearance of fire."—(Justin Martyr.)

"It was the Son of God who judged men from the beginning, destroying that lofty tower and confounding their language; punishing the world with flood of water and raining fires and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah. He always descended to hold converse with men from Adam even to the patriarchs and prophets, in visions and in dreams, always preparing His way, from the beginning. Neither was it possible that the God that conversed with men on earth could be any other than the Word that was made flesh."—(Tertullian.)

"My Lord Jesus Christ descended to the earth more than once. He came down to Esias, to Moses, and to every one of the prophets." (Origen)

"That it was the Son of God who appeared to Adam immediately after the fall, who, assuming the person of the Father, and the Lord of All, came in Paradise and conversed with Adam."—(Theophilus of Antioch.)

"The angel of the Lord, who appeared to the patriarchs is Christ and God."—(Cyprian.)

Pre-Existence of Christ.

"No language, then, is sufficient to express the origin, the dignity, even the substance and nature of Christ, who will declare His generation? For as no one hath known the Father but the Son, so no one, on the other hand, can know the Son fully but the Father alone, by whom He was begotten. For who but the Father hath thoroughly understood that Light which existed before the world; that intellectual and substantial Wisdom, and the Living Word which in the beginning was with the Father, before all creation had any production, visible or invisible, the first and only offspring of God; the Prince and Leader of the spiritual and immortal host of heaven. The Angel of the mighty council, the Agent to

execute the Father's secret will, the Maker of all things with the Father. The second cause of the Universe, next to the Father. That the Divine Word, therefore, pre-existed and appeared. If not at all, at least to some has been shown." (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, chapter 2.)

"To take the matter from the beginning the Lord God (literally Jehovah, the God that is one in three, created man in His own image; that is a spirit, as God is a spirit. The Son of God was manifested as the only begotten Son, equal with the Father, to the inhabitants of heaven, before and at the foundation of the world. The Son of God appeared to our first parents in paradise in the form of a man, and conversed with them face to face as is generally supposed. He was manifested by similar appearances to Enoch, to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and to many more even down to Moses." (John Wesley, sermon 64, on Christ's Coming.)

"It was the Son of God who delivered the law to Moses, as Jehovah, and who is here spoken of as the angel or mediator of the covenant of redemption." (Wesley's Notes on Acts, 7:35.)

In the above I have given you the Bible and historical statements from the leading men, the fathers of the church, and the brightest mind of the Reformation, John Wesley, all declaring that Christ pre-existed, and that He not only appeared in the early hour of this parable, but in the others hours. Enough of that.

Abraham Heard the Gospel.

Now I come to the third hour of the world's great day; that is, to the days of Abraham, B. C., 1921. Well, Brother Evans, do you mean to tell me that the gospel was preached to Abraham? Yes. Your New Testament says that Abraham was the father of the faithful. How could he be the chief representative, the father of the faithful, if he never was in the faith himself? Oh, I never thought that, says one. But let me show you that Abraham was right in the covenant and must have been baptized according to the gospel law. Galatians, 3:8-9, (You may read the entire chapter with profit, for it all voices the sentiment as expressed in the 9th verse), which reads: "The gospel was preached unto Abraham."

But, says one, it could not have been the gospel of Christ. Stop! Go back just over the page, for there, in the very same letter, Paul declares that there is only one gospel, and that he that attempts to preach another gospel, even though he be an angel from heaven, the curse of God would rest upon him. Would you have me believe that the gospel referred to there as having been preached to Abraham was the gospel that would call down the curses of God? and that Abraham who obeyed it became the father of the faithful. Trade off your creeds rather than appear insane to the people!

Again, Jesus speaking of Abraham, says in John 8:56: "Your father, Abraham, rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it, and was glad." Hebrews 11:13, speaking of Abraham and the rest of the holy men of those early days, says: "These all died in faith." In what faith? In the faith that Jesus was the Saviour of the world. Now, if there is none other name given among men whereby we must be saved but the name of Jesus, how could these men have been saved without believing this same gospel? If you say otherwise, you will just go back on all your Bible.

But let me pass on. Says one, "Brother Evans, now you don't surely want me to believe that Abraham and the prophets were in the Kingdom of God and were born again." Suppose I say no, oh, no, Abraham and the prophets were not born again. Could Abraham be the father of the faithful and not be born again? Would Jesus speak the truth when He said: "If ye were the children of Abraham ye would do the works of Abraham;

he saw my day and was glad?" And yet you can't enter into the kingdom unless you are born again, but I will let Abraham in without being born again?" Wouldn't that be, to say the least, a little inconsistent?

The Two Kingdoms Identical.

But, says one, I don't think it says Abraham was in the kingdom. Let me draw your attention to the 8th chapter of Matthew. This is so good I am going to read it, lest you might think I was making up something in order to fit into my theory. "And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and from the west and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven." So you see they are in the kingdom of heaven all right, or else nobody could come in there and sit down with them.

But, says one, I'll tell you, Brother Evans, there is a difference between the "Kingdom of Heaven" and the "Kingdom of God." Not a bit of it! If you think that the kingdom of heaven does not mean the church triumphant that is born again, but that the Kingdom of God does, I will try to suit you. Turn with me to the gospel by Luke 13:28: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the Kingdom of God and you yourselves thrust out." In one place it is called the Kingdom of Heaven; in another place it is called the Kingdom of God.

Now, then, I again submit Jesus as a witness: "Except a man is born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God; and verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all the prophets are in the Kingdom of God. Therefore, they must have heard the gospel in the early hour, or in the third hour, in the days of Abraham; or in the sixth hour, in the days of Moses.

Moses Suffered for Christ.

Now to the sixth hour. Says one, "Moses was practically the father of the law, and we are not now under the law but under grace." Did Moses know anything about Christ? "Oh, no," says one. Let us see. Hebrews 4:2-6: "For unto us was the gospel preached as well as unto them." Read the full chapter and you will find it is talking about Moses and those that lived in the days of Moses. Again, Hebrews 11:26: "Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt."

Will you tell me that he did not know about Christ, and yet he was willing to suffer the reproach of Christ? "Well," says one, "it may have been so in prophecy, like, you could not get baptism and all that in the days of Moses." No? "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day and forever." First Cor. 10:1-4: "They were all baptized in the sea, and did eat the same spiritual meat, and they did all drink the same spiritual drink. For they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ."

Here it is expressly declared they all drank of a spiritual Rock, which Rock was Christ; and that they were baptized. I did not manufacture that. Here is Christ in the wilderness. Oh, says one, if you had baptism you would have a regular church there. Sure! But, says one, you can't find a church. Can't I? Read Acts, 7:37-38. Christ was in the church in the wilderness, and spake unto Moses." So you see there was a church there.

The Gospel Preceded the Law.

Now, if you turn your attention to Exodus 15:26, you will there read where the Lord pleads with Israel to keep His commandments and statutes. However, that was before the law of Moses was given; they were the Gospel ordinances, no doubt. Exodus 16:28: "How long refuse ye to keep My commandments and My laws?" Remember that was anterior to the laws and ceremonies of what is called the Law of Moses. Paul tells us in Gal. 3:10-24. "The law was added because the transgressions until the promised seed should come, and it was as a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." Added because of transgressions. Yes, they refused to live up to Gospel privileges, and the law was added as a method of training and discipline. But don't forget that the Gospel was before the law, and many of them refused to obey it. In proof of that read Psalms 19:11: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." That was not the Law of Moses, because, Hebrews 7:19, says: "The law (that is the Law of Moses), made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope (the Gospel), did." So you see there was what was called the perfect law. James 1:25, also refers to this law, when it says: "Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein," etc.

Luke 24:44, shows that Moses and the prophets preached Christ. Acts 3:18, tells us that the prophets showed that Christ should suffer. So that in the very early morning and in the third hour and in the sixth hour they looked forward to the coming of Christ, just as we now in the eleventh hour look back to His first coming, and look forward to His second coming.

Present Age the "Eleventh Day."

In closing I want to just give you the ninth hour. Christ and the apostles came with the same gospel message that greeted the ears of Adam in the early hour of the great day; in the days of Abraham, in the third hour of the great day, in the days of Moses, the sixth hour of the great day. So Christ and the apostles came with the same message in the ninth hour of the great day, preaching the same Gospel of faith, repentance, baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, Acts 2:38, and all other Gospel ordinances. After Christ's death they began to change the ordinances, to break the covenants, 2 Peter 1:2-3, to make the commandments of God of none effect. Mark 7:7-13. They killed the true apostles; they introduced false apostles; Rev. 2:2, the church dwindled into unbelief; 1 Tim. 4:1-16, it became numerous, wealthy, wicked, lost the Spirit of God, went into what we now call Romanism; Rev. 12, and in after days Romanism was sub-divided into our Protestant denominations which reach down to the day and age in which we live, which is the eleventh hour.

I shall not take time to give you chapter and verse for this, but in the reading of this sermon these buried statements that I made just a moment ago will be proved from Scripture. Or you can look back to my sermon on the Apostacy for further light on this question.

Next Sunday night it will be my pleasure to take up the question, showing that we are in the eleventh hour now; that the last dispensation is upon us, the hour of God's judgment. I shall try to show by the signs of the times that we are in the eleventh hour, and that the coming of Christ is near at hand. Sorry I cannot give it to you to-night, but it is too late.

Kingdom of God

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 33rd verse of the 6th chapter of the gospel as written by Matthew, where you will read these words: "But seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."

This evening, notwithstanding my love for our Heavenly Father, I feel that I am occupying a responsible position before the sons of men in claiming to be a representative of God and an ambassador for Christ, claiming the right to point men to the ways of life, and while this is true, it brings to mind the knowledge of the wonderful responsibility that rests upon me, and I feel that I should be very, very careful to give the word of the Lord as found in the divine record the proper interpretation. This position is keenly felt by me to-night, as I remember the statement made by the gifted and golden-tongued apostle of other days when he said: "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed; as I said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." Galations 1:8-9.

Now, this being a truth, it seems to me that the preacher should keenly feel his position and carefully watch the lines that he draws, lest by any means in his zeal he may lead men from the truth rather than toward it. The text of scripture selected for the basis of our remarks to-night is doubtless very familiar to you all; it seems very plain to us, it comes to us in such a plain, concise and unmistakable manner that individually we claim the right to embrace the opportunities afforded in it: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God."

Bible Reading a Science.

Now, to be practical, let me draw your mind to one thought. Were I to tell you that it was my desire for you to seek for some man I wanted you to find, it would be reasonable for you to expect that in my telling you to go and seek for such a man I would give you a description of him. I would tell you somewhat of his appearance, describe to you that he had light blue eyes, curly hair, that he was six feet in height and weighed about one hundred and sixty pounds, so that when upon your search you finally came across such an individual you would know whether he was the one you were in search of.

It seems to me that it is but fair to believe that when God Almighty would tell us through the Son Jesus, that we were to seek for the kingdom, that He would so minutely describe that kingdom that an honest seeker would know when he found it; there would be no guess-work about it; he would see by the description and recognize all the environments just when he discovered that kingdom. Were I to tell you to go out and search for a certain individual and you should ask me to give a description of this individual, what would you think of me if I were to reply: "That is the man you want to find, but it does not matter just what he looks like, just believe that he is the man and that is he, no matter who it may

be, just as long as you can work up a feeling in your mind to believe that you have found the proper individual—he is the proper one.

You would not like to have me describe an individual and tell you that as long as you felt that he was the individual, he it was. Yet, in the light of religion to-day, we are told that it is our privilege to seek for the kingdom of God, and immediately some one will rise and tell us that the kingdom of God is within men's hearts, "The Kingdom of God is within you," and while we are ready and willing to acknowledge that there is a statement made to that effect in the scriptures, we believe it is our right to examine this passage and see what Jesus meant by what He said.

There is a science connected with the reading of the Bible. If we follow this line we may never be deceived, we may never have a misunderstanding of it, it is this: "First, who is speaking; second, to whom is the language addressed; third, what called forth the language? If we read every passage of scripture under these conditions we shall never be deceived. Now, let us read this passage of scripture. First, who was it that said the Kingdom of God is within you? Jesus. To whom was this language addressed? To the wicked Pharisees, to a people of whom Jesus said, they were of their father, the devil, and the works of their father would they do, telling them they were filled with all manner of abomination, filled inwardly with dead men's bones, while outwardly they appeared like white sepulchres. Matt. 23:14-33. Surely the Kingdom of God could not be within the breast of a green-eyed hypocrite; surely the Kingdom of God was not resident in that hypocritical denomination of Pharisees who said, but did not. What are we to conclude from this statement? That the Kingdom of God is within you, or a better translation says, the Kingdom of God is among you; that is, the organization called the church or kingdom, the gospel of Christ was within or among them as a nation, not shut up in somebody's heart, but with them as a people; that it was in their midst the Kingdom of God is coming nigh unto you."

"Kingdom" Implies Four Things.

"Now, as we are seeking for this kingdom, we want to inquire for a description of that kingdom so that we may in our search be enabled to intelligently seek and find it. The word "Kingdom" is understood in the Bible to be God's government upon earth, the bride, the Lamb's wife, the sheepfold, the church, all are synonymous, conveying the idea of God's government upon the earth. Now, in going back to the Saviour's time, we may find out just what kind of an organization existed under His immediate control, called the Kingdom of God, or the Church of God. It will be admitted that it requires four things to constitute a kingdom: First, a king; second, laws; third, officers; fourth, subjects. Now, in this Kingdom of God, Jesus was acknowledged even by they who permitted Him to be crucified that He was the King; He was the power by which the Kingdom was governed—its head—and under Him were placed officers. Now, what were those officers? Turning to the fourth chapter of Ephesians and twelfth chapter of 1st Corinthians, we read something to this effect: "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondary prophets, elders, etc., Now, here is the executive department of the Kingdom, here are the officers that were to rule and to govern the Kingdom of God as His ambassadors, as His ministers, as His representatives.

Titus 1, 5. Apostles, Luke 6, 13; Prophets, Act 13, 1; High Priests, Heb. 5, 1; Evangelist, 2 Tim. 4, 5; Seventy, Luke, 10, 1-7; Fishers, 1 Tim. 3, 1; Priests, Rev. 5, 10; Teachers, Eph. 4, 11; Deacons, 1 Tim. 3, 8.

Note the thought, God set them in the church or kingdom, and the book is very, very plain in the statement that whatsoever God doeth, standeth forever. Why? Because His very characteristics are unchangeable—"The Lord is God, the same yesterday, to-day and forever," "the grass will wither, the flower thereof will fade away, but the word of the Lord will endure forever." "I am the Lord, I change not." These are beautiful thoughts and they convey to us the idea that if God set apostles and prophets, and bishops and evangelists, pastors and teachers, priests and deacons, and elders in the church, no man on earth has the right to say they are no longer needed. We are seeking now for the Kingdom; we are finding out just what we may expect to find in the Kingdom of that unchangeable God.

An argument is advanced in these latter days that while the Kingdom was organized with the apostles, prophets, bishops and other officers divinely sent of God in the misty past, that we are living in the bright blaze of gospel light now, and we have no need of these inspired men; that they were placed in the church only until it arrived at a state of perfection, and just as soon as it was perfect they were no longer needed. Let us examine this thought for a moment: Supposing I were to tell you that the people away on the front street, eighteen hundred yards away from here could see to read plainer by the light reflected by this lamp than I could just underneath it, what would you think? Would you believe the statement? You certainly would not.

They tell us that we have not so much need to-day of divinely inspired men as they had right when Jesus was with them, that we are living in a brighter age, that we are in the effulgence of gospel light, when we are eighteen hundred years away from the light that "lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Surely if they could do at any time without inspired apostles they could have accomplished that work when Jesus was here in their immediate presence; but they could not do it, and it seems remarkably strange to me that men of powerful minds will stand up and say to-day is this age of skepticism and priest-craft and superstition and idolatry that we can get along with less inspiration and run the affairs of the Kingdom of God easier now without the power that God placed in the church for that work than they could eighteen hundred years ago. You see upon the face of it there is a fallacy. But let us see.

Squabbling Denominations.

Again, they tell us that they were placed here just until the church became perfect and then they were no longer needed. I tell you that I have twelve apples on this desk and that makes a dozen, and just so soon as I have a perfect dozen I am going to wipe them all away and tell you that I have a perfect dozen after I have destroyed them; it takes twelve to make a dozen to-day as it did fifty years ago, and the man who would take one single apple from that dozen destroys the number, we have not the perfect dozen left. God set these officers in the church and the very moment we take them out of the church, that church or kingdom becomes imperfect. Now, the Book says they were to remain, while the world says they were to pass away. Let us see why these officers were placed in the church.

Paul tells us they were placed there for the work of the ministry; for the perfecting of the Saints; for the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all come to a knowledge of the faith, to the knowledge of the Son of God, unto the perfect man. These are the reasons assigned as to why these inspired apostles were placed in the church. Do we require to have

that same class of work carried on to-day? We think so; we need people to come to the knowledge of the Son of God to-day if ever it was required, if ever we should come to a knowledge of the faith, it is now, and these officers were placed in the church for the express purpose to inspire people by the oneness of faith, to all come to a unity. They say these offices are done away now, but the Book says they were to remain until we all come to a unity of faith. I ask you, have we arrived at that unity of the faith yet?

I am informed that there are ten hundred and thirteen denominations, is that unity? The Bible requires God's children to come into the Kingdom the one church. Just notice how this thought of oneness extends all the way down the line, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all"; "By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one body, the Church of Christ." Having been made partakers of the One Spirit, see that you be of the same mind; see that you all speak the same thing; see that there be no division among you." "Straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leads to life," not straight are the gates nor narrow are the ways, but straight is the gate and narrow is the way—oneness all the way through. The door is opened by the inspired porter and the great Christ enters in the door, not doors.

"Oh, well," says one, "It doesn't matter about these things as long as you are honest and sincere; that is all that is necessary," but the Book doesn't seem to say that. Jesus, in speaking upon this thought, says: "He that climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." It is pretty harsh language, but it is, nevertheless, a truth, because the man who would dare to climb up and try to receive the benefits derived by a member in the Kingdom of God, without complying with the conditions and getting these blessings in an honorable way is certainly a thief. The man who tries to steal the blessings of heaven without getting them through the legitimate channels is a thief; the man who tries to get in and receive the remission of sins without complying with the conditions prescribed by Christ, makes Christ of none effect, and therefore is a robber in that he tries to rob Him of the glory that God gave Him as the Saviour of all men, and if I can be saved without complying with the conditions, I can indeed then say that Christ's work was a failure.

Now, these things are all pointing to the one kingdom. One kingdom with its officers to remain in that kingdom until the effects produced in the past shall have been produced, until we all arrive to the unity of the faith. Now, there is another reason why these officers should remain in the kingdom. Paul assigns in this wise: "That we be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine by the slight of men and the cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." It seems to me that is one of the sweetest thoughts in that whole record. When a man is seeking for the Kingdom of God and finds these officers as laid down in the law, it seems that he has arrived at the amen of his examination, at the omega of his investigation; it is a settled matter that he shall be no more cast to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine. Of course, he will become satisfied when he believes the record made here; and thus we present to you the church having all these officers in it to-day just as it was eighteen hundred years ago, and taking this great Book as a guide, we start out on the search for the Kingdom. We may go to all the denominations and have this very text and let us see what you discover. For a moment let us go together and seek for the Kingdom, this Kingdom as marked out by the Saviour of Man.

En Route For Rome.

We cross the briny deep and go to the Vatican in Rome and knock at the door of His Highness, the Pope comes to the door. Good morning, sir, I am in search of the Kingdom of God. I am informed by some that you are God's vice-regent upon the earth, that you are the head of the church." "Yes, sir." "Is this the Kingdom of God?" "Yes, sir, the only true church upon the earth. We have placed our anathema upon the heretics that have gone out from us. We are the kingdom." "Well, I am glad to hear it, but before I settle this matter I want you to answer a few questions. "Have you any apostles in your church?" "No; we have a Pope." "Pope! Pope! Ah, I don't read anything about the Pope in the law of this kingdom. I have never discovered the word in the New Testament. Have you any prophets in your church?" "No; we have some cardinals." "Cardinals, we don't find the word cardinal in the New Testament in the grade of officers marked out in the Kingdom."

That is enough, if it is a truth we are seeking for the Kingdom as described in this Book, it is our privilege to seek for this Kingdom; it is the first duty of man. "Seek first the Kingdom of God." We must leave this man, lest by the traditions of the elders we make the commandments of God of none effect. We cross the channel and go to Westminster Abbey, and knock at the door. Canon Farrar comes to the door and we say: "You are one of the leading lights of the church, the eldest daughter of the old lady who lives in Rome. You are the true church?" "Yes, sir." How about those people over the way—Rome?" "Rome has apostacized and it is not the Kingdom. Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices the most detestable to man and damnable to God and that for the space of eight hundred years or more." (Book of Homilies.) "We are the light of the world. We are the Kingdom of God." "I am glad to hear it. I was once there and I saw that they had not the kingdom, it was not according to the law and I left them and came to you. Have you apostles in your church?" "No; we have canons." "I don't read about canons in the New Testament. Have you any prophets in your church?" We have archbishops." "Archbishops. I don't read anything about archbishops in the New Testament." "Yes, and we have deans." I don't read of any officers being called deans in the New Testament. You are not the Kingdom of God for in this Kingdom I am searching for there is first apostles, secondarily, prophets, etc., etc.," and so we may advance all the way down the line seeking for the Kingdom among all those who claim to have it and of each denomination we ask: "Have you any prophets in your church?" "No. I will tell you where you find prophets; these Latter Day Saints over the way, they claim to have a prophet in their church and apostles and all that sort of thing; just the same old track that they were on eighteen hundred years ago, they are right on the same old line with the odd foggy ideas, they believe just what they used to believe away down there in the dark and benighted age when the Christ of God arose with healing in His wings as the Light of the world."

This arouses our curiosity, for we like those old-fashioned people, and we go and call upon them. We say: "I am searching for the Kingdom of God this morning, are you the Kingdom of God?" "Yes sir." "I have been travelling a long time and everybody seems to say, 'Yes sir,' to me. My soul's salvation is wrapped up in this thought and I have to be careful about it. I know when I want to go and purchase a piece of property in the land, I run away back through all the deeds and mortgages until I find that my title is clear; I don't take any man's word. I doubt

the veracity of everybody until I have the thing done, and I think I ought to be just as careful about this question of my soul as about the question of my pocket-book, and I want you to produce your documents. Please tell me how it comes you are the Kingdom of God."

One Church Rings True.

A Latter Day Saint strikes right in and says: "Well, away over there in the years past, the great God inspired a little boy to go to meeting, he went and became very much interested with reference to his soul and he saw that there was a conglomerated mass of confusion among those who claimed to be representing the several different churches, all claiming to be the Kingdom, and he started to read the statutes of the government itself and found it was right to appeal to the King himself and learn how it was he could enter into the Kingdom. He went away to pray and an angel visited him. An angel? Yes; an angel. Where does the Bible say anything about angels appearing to anybody? It is all through the pages of that Book. Everywhere, in fact, friends, you can not find an age in all the time of the past, wherever God had a people that He did not bless them with angelic ministrations, but, however, as we tried to show you the other night, in this age of the world an angel was to appear, according to the 14th chapter of Revelations, 6th and 7th verses, He was to appear and bring back the everlasting gospel, the laws of the Kingdom, and, of course, that pre-supposes that the officers to preach this law, or executive department of the Kingdom would have to be restored, and by the way, it does not say that it was to come to some far-away heathen nation alone, but it was to be a universal proclamation of the everlasting gospel, and it was to be preached to every nation, kindred, tongue and people so that every nation, kindred, tongue and people would be void of the gospel, and hence, Wesley, in his 94th sermon on "The more excellent way," told the truth when he said the Christians had all turned heathen again and have no more of the Spirit of God than the rest of the world.

It was true then that the Church of England stated a fact when it said: "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects and degrees of men, women and children have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry and that for the space of eight hundred years or more."

Both these things tell the truth, both tell the facts of a wonderful apostacy and idolatry coming in like a veritable Niagara drowning all the good and pure in the cess-pool of abominable priest-craft, no one having the priest-hood authority, consequently it was made a necessity for the angel to bring back the gospel.

Says one: "I am ready to admit that, but when that angel comes He will come to some great man with long white hair." No; Zechariah says: "When He comes He will come to a young man, and Joseph Smith was about fifteen years of age. Says one: "He will be very well educated in all arts, sciences and literature of the world when He comes." No; wrong again. I believe that Beadle says Joseph Smith was an ignoramus, that his mother was a poor woman who subsisted by the work of her own hands. The Bible says when God would raise up a prophet He would have to confess before the people of the whole world: "I am not learned," and that is what Joseph Smith had to confess. But God says: "Forasmuch as these people (living in this age) draw near Me with their lips but have removed their hearts far from Me and their fear toward Me is taught by precepts of men, therefore, I, (God), will proceed to do a marvellous work and a wonder." You see God was going to do it, the priesthood authority

was going to act again, it was not by the wisdom of this world that we would find out God, but by the spirit of God that would actuate the hearts of those whom he had divinely commissioned as his ambassadors, hence David very well understood it when he said: "Except the Lord build a house, they labor in vain who build it." Ps. 127:1. Showing that men would try to build a church, and it would go down when the storms beat upon it, but when the Lord built a house, whatsoever God doeth standeth forever.

Built on the Bible.

Joseph Smith comes up and tells the world it is their privilege to seek for this Kingdom. Have you prophets in your church? "Yes, sir; apostles standing at the head," etc. "Have you evangelists, pastors and teachers?" "Yes, sir; we have all that the Bible gives us the right to have." And it is remarkably strange that if this Latter Day work is not of God that the counterfeit has become so perfect that you cannot detect it by the detector issued by the government itself. This counterfeit bill is so much like the genuine that it is beyond the power of men and women to see the difference between the Church of God as organized by God in this last dispensation and that organized over there in the centuries ago among the hills of Judea.

As we discover that it is our right, God being unchangeable, to have the same kingdom now as they did then, what about the righteousness of this kingdom? The text says: "Seek first the kingdom of God and its righteousness." The law of it, the doctrine of it, the means by which we can enter into it, that is the righteousness of it. You remember Paul calls it the gospel. In Romans he says: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for therein is the righteousness of God"—in the gospel the law, the doctrine of Christ. Now, what is this righteousness? The law says so very plainly that we are aliens naturally, foreigners and strangers from the commonwealth of Israel, we are outside of the kingdom, we belong to another class. "He that is not for me is against me;" "He that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad and whomsoever ye yield yourselves to obey, his servants you are whom you obey, whether of obedience unto life or sin unto death." We have been serving another king, we have been serving another power, we have been subjected to another potentate.

The Way In.

Now what must we do in order to get into this kingdom of God? He first tells that we must believe that the kingdom exists, and if it exists according to the word, we want then, having had faith in the existence of the kingdom, to learn as much as we can concerning the order of it. We must have faith in God, who organized this kingdom and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and that means a great deal. Then says one, "Just only believe and the whole thing is settled." But how will you believe? You know the devils believed that Jesus was the Christ, and they did a great deal more than some people, for they trembled. There is an idea in the world that if a man says, "I believe in Christ," that it is all settled. To illustrate, when I was in the City of Stratford, Canada, a little while ago, Rev. Mr. Crossley was holding revival services. Mr. Hunter was a good talker. During the revival services, Mr. Hunter had occasion to go down into the congregation and make converts, and he met with a man who had come across the sea, and leaned over to him and said: "Dear brother, do you love the Lord Jesus?" "Of course I do." "Do you believe that He is the Saviour?" "Of course I believe that He is the Saviour; I always was taught that." "Thank heaven," said the preacher, "He that believeth is

passed from death into life, another soul brought to the Saviour," and he marked his name down, "Saved." He passed on, and Bro. Crossley got through singing in a little while, and he came down to the coverts. He struck the same Irishman and he says: "Have you got Jesus in your soul, my brother?" "What's that you say?" "Are you saved, my brother?" "You bet your life I am." Well, you know that astonished the poor preacher, he hardly thought the Irishman understood the position. Now he says, "My dear man, how do you know you are saved?" "How do I know? Why, the other fellow, the preacher, is just after telling me that I was saved. What's the matter with you?" That was all he knew.

The Proper Belief.

Now, friends, we nave to do something more than believe. The greatest drunkard on the street, if you ask him if he believes in Jesus, nine out of ten will say, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, I hope sometimes to be a better man." That is not going to save him, he must do something more; he is still in the enemy's ranks; he is on the wrong side of the army and has not made his allegiance with the proper authorities of the kingdom of God. What must he do? He must have the proper faith. How do I know that he has the proper faith? "He that believeth on me as it is written. He that believeth in me as the scripture hath said." Do you believe in Jesus Christ as the Scriptures have said? "I pray not for these alone but for those who shall believe on me through their words." Do you believe in Jesus Christ according to the words of the Scriptures? If you do you have the right kind of faith, but if you believe in Jesus Christ contrary to that Book, then your faith is likened to a corpse which is dead. If you have the right faith to believe on Him, you will believe on what He said. If you believe on what He said, what is the next thing you must do in order to enter into that kingdom? You must repent of your rebellion against him, you must lay down the weapons of your warfare and come and submit yourself to the conditions prescribed in the law by which you may enter into the kingdom. You must seek the kingdom of God and comply with its righteousness ere you may enter in.

Works Follow Belief.

Says one, "I am willing to have that kind of faith and willing to repent of my sins, but will that settle it? No. There are some other laws we must comply with before we may enter in. I draw your attention to a case on which this very thing was decided. You will find the evidence of the trial away over here in the Acts of the Apostles. There was a whole house full of people who belonged to another kingdom and who were seeking the kingdom of God's dear Son, and being asked what to do, having believed in the King, his ambassadors, these very apostles, told them they must repent and be baptized every one of them in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their sins." Acts 2: 38.

O, says one, "This idea of getting baptized for the remission of our sins, I don't believe that." Then you don't believe in Jesus Christ as it is written because in His name was remission of sins to be preached beginning at Jerusalem. How? They were to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and if you don't believe that, you haven't got the faith in Him as it was written. You haven't complied with the first conditions.

"Now, don't you think the Lord would let me in? I am a poor old man," said one to me here a few years ago. "Don't you think the Lord would let me into the kingdom and give me remission of sins without

being baptized?" I told him I had no objections at all, but I believed that God would keep his word. The Book says that the grass shall wither and the flower thereof shall fade away, but the word of the Lord shall endure forever, and I don't believe He is going to go back on His word. If you let the old man in without complying with the conditions, the old woman will want to follow; the young folks would come and say, "You let them in without obedience, you have just as much right to let me in, and I read in the law that God is no respecter of persons, you have a right to let me in the same as them." It remains a fact that no man can enter in unless he works righteousness before Him in order to be accepted of Him. Jesus in talking upon this very question makes it very plain. There was once a man came to Him by night, he started to flatter him and said: "We know Thou art a Teacher sent from God, for no man could do the works Thou doest save God be with him." Jesus put an end to that, for no true man will either give or take flattery. He says, "You must be born again," you have to be changed, born from an old existence into a new life or you cannot abide the laws of the kingdom. The man did not understand it and said, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Jesus told him, "Verily, verily I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom."

Jesus Meant What He Said.

Now, remember, we are to seek first the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and all other things shall be added. We have found it with apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and preachers, bishops, deacons and elders. Now we are examining the righteousness of it, first faith, repentance and then baptism for the remission of sins. "You must be born of water and of the Spirit or you cannot enter into the kingdom of God." While reading a book in one of the parks some years ago, a clergyman came up, and we got a talking about the gurgling streams and babbling brooks, and whispering leaves, the warbling birds and all those things, and finally he told me the very blooming flowers seemed grander to those who were saved and in the kingdom of God. I suggested that I was quite a lover of flowers, and if my love for them could be developed I would like to have it done. He said, "My dear friend, you have to be saved. Are you saved?" I told him that I hoped I would be saved. Said he, "You are on the road to hell." I told him that I was on the way to Niagara Falls and that he was a little mistaken. He said, "You cannot be saved only as you believe in Jesus and if you don't believe in Jesus you are damned." I asked, "If I believe in Jesus will I be saved?" He said, "Yes." "Please tell me how I must believe in order to be saved." He said, "Except a man be born of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." I said, "Will you please explain this matter to me?" "It is easily done, just be born again." I said, "How can you be born again?" "Well, he says, "My dear fellow, I can't make it any plainer than the Bible." The Bible says you must be born of the Spirit or you cannot enter the kingdom." Said I, "I think I heard my mother read that, and it strikes me very forcibly that it does not read that way. I believe you are wrong. Upon my word there seems to be something left out in that text." I happened to have the little Book about me that had the quotation in it, I turned to it and read, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Said I to him, "Mr. —, what right had you to leave out those words, except a man be born of water?" "O," he says, "I see the devil has been teaching you theology; you are one of those cranks on water baptism; I don't want to have anything to do with you." Said I, "If you go back on water baptism you will find more cranks than I, you will find

out that Jesus Christ was a crank of that denomination, I am only quoting his own words, and if it is crankism to believe in Jesus Christ, then it takes a crank to move the whole machinery of the human family." He said, "Sir, I have been born again," I have got salvation, I have got remission of my sins and I never was born of water. I never was baptized for the remission of my sins." I got very serious and said, "Sir, I am a young man in the slippery paths of youth and far from home. Do you want me to go out from this park believing that Jesus Christ is stamped as a liar? If I believe your testimony I must believe that Jesus told a lie, and are you not doing an awful thing this morning in trying to destroy the foundation upon which my mother's hope for salvation is built and that has influenced me to some degree in life to believe that Jesus is a good man? To convey to me the intelligence that Jesus was a liar, that he made statements that are opposed to the truth, that are misleading in every sense of the word?" "How do I do that?" "Just this way: You tell me as a minister of twenty-seven years' experience that you were born again, that you have obtained a remission of your sins, and that you are saved in the kingdom of God, and you never was born of water. Now, Jesus says, Except a man is born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter in. John 3:1-7. If you have entered in without, Jesus lied. Men cannot get out of it if the plain statement is true. Now, I want you to notice this thought, you may think that you have got the Spirit and yet be mistaken," and we parted.

Try the Spirits.

A man over in the State of Michigan said to me on one occasion, "Mr. Evans, you have made me miserable tonight, you have proved that baptism was by immersion for the remission of sins, but," he says, "I thank God I know I am saved and got a remission of my sins, and I know I am born again, and I never had a drop of water put upon me." "Well now," I said, "Grandpa, you say you know that, that is pretty good evidence, but I was born asking why, and I ask you now how do you know it?" It kind of staggered the old gentleman, but he recovered in a moment and said, "I know it, sir, by the spirit." "Yes, well that was pretty good evidence," but somehow I was not satisfied and said, "Grandpa, you may be honest and sincere in this matter, but I have another question to ask you. You tell me you know it by the spirit. Now, may I ask, By what spirit do you know it?" "What spirit," said he. "Why, my dear fellow, there is but one Spirit, is there not?" I said, "Grandpa, I believe the Lord loves you and he inspired John to write a letter to just such characters as you, upon one occasion, and here is what he said, 'Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, for there are many false prophets gone out into the world.' Now, Grandpa, how do you think the Lord wants us to try these spirits, the spirits that come to those who are really trying to love and serve God? How will we try them, there are many gone out?" He said, "really I don't know just how we are to try them." Try them just by the law, "to the law and to the testimony, and if they speak not according to that there is no light in them." God is light, and in him is no darkness at all, and if there is no God in that spirit you have in you, you had better get rid of it." That is so," said he. "Now," said I, "the law says, except a man is born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God. The law says repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin. The law says that we are to be buried with Christ by baptism." "Now," said I, "Grandpa, if you have received a Spirit that has prophesied to you that you can get salvation, that you can get remission of your sins, that has prophesied to

you that you are born again and are now fit for the kingdom of God, that spirit prophesied to you something that is contrary to the law and having tried that spirit by the law we find it guilty and denounce it as a false spirit."

Friends, please take your medicine. I do not come to you and say you are not honest, you are not sincere, that you have not tried to serve God, that you have not endeavored to love God, but I come to you asking this morning that you try the spirit that has told you, you could get into the kingdom of God without complying with the conditions prescribed in the law. That spirit is not the Spirit of God. The spirit that prophesies to you peace and safety when the clouds of war are abroad in the land, is not true. Now, where are we this morning? Here is the law of induction into the kingdom of God. "Well, says one, "I am ready to have faith in God and repent of my sins and ready to be baptized by one of the ambassadors of God for the remission of sins." Then you are just in the vestibule of the kingdom, just entered through the outer door. There is another ordinance. You may feel strange in this kingdom, being born again from an old existence into a new life and now you want an introduction to all the truths, therein and realize that God is your Father indeed; that you have not only taken the oath of allegiance, but you want your naturalization papers.

Supposing I as a citizen of the government of Great Britain, wanted to go to the United States of America. They would let me live there and I'd go over there. I wish to vote for school trustee, I want to vote for governor or any other officer that is in the gift of this country to bestow upon a man. Would they let me vote? No, sir; they would say: "You are a subject of Great Britain and you have no right here, that is to say, the right of franchise." "Am I to be an alien and foreigner forever and forever?" "Yes, unless you comply with the conditions. You must take the oath of allegiance and take out your naturalization papers." That is fair, isn't it? That is what God wants you to do, to solemnly covenant with Him that you are willing to love and serve Him and obey Him, and you make a solemn covenant to that effect and you seal that covenant by being baptized, and having done that you want your naturalization papers and you are confirmed by the laying on of hands, after which you have a just and legal right to all the rights and privileges in the Kingdom of God. That is the way.

Seek First the Kingdom.

Now, friends, seek first the Kingdom of God with apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, having all the gifts and blessings that were to accrue in this work and then comply with the righteousness, having true faith in God, repenting of your sins, being baptized by immersion for the remission of your sins by a properly authorized and credentialed minister and ambassador of that kingdom, and then receive the laying on of hands for the gift of the Spirit by which you may have the seal of your adoption, by which that telephonic connection between you and the King may exist, and when this is done you may realize then that all other things necessary for your well-being in life shall be granted unto you. Just a thought here.

Think not that your sacrifice shall be so great, you will sacrifice doubt for certainty, sacrifice physical, mental and spiritual weakness for strength you will be a towering granite against which all the opposing arrows may fall powerless. You sacrifice gloom and darkness, sorrow and misery for

light and peace and joy. You sacrifice death for life, you sacrifice mortality for immortality and eternal life.

May kind heaven help you to seek first that Kingdom of God and comply with its righteousness, enter in, be transplanted from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son and the promise is sure that all things are yours and you are Christ's.

May God help you to seek, find and decide is my prayer in Jesus' name. Amen.

Spiritual Gifts—Are They Done Away?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the second chapter and the 26th verse of the Epistle of St. James, where you will read these words: "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

It is true that when the spirit leaves this mortal tabernacle that we are considered dead, the body without the spirit is dead. In the Bible the Church of Christ is called His body. First Cor. 12:27, distinctly says, speaking of the church: "Now ye are the body of Christ." Again the Ephesian letter 1, 22-23, Christ is said "to be the head over all things to the church, which is His body." This body would be dead unless the divine spirit, the holy spirit, the other comforter, the Holy Ghost was in it. The church divested of this divine force is dead. It is separated from God; it is useless, incompetent to produce the results that are testified to follow that church, is without life and therefore dead.

Effects of Holy Spirit.

And so the great promises of God through Christ and the prophets were fulfilled in that after Christ ascended the church was completely organized, the Holy Spirit as an abiding comforter was given to the church. I now draw your attention to one or two passages in support of this position: John 14:26: "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." As long as the church was in possession of this life-giving principle, they would never forget a single particle of the gospel message which is declared to be the power of God unto salvation. When the church was deprived of that Holy Spirit by reason of her sins, she was separated from God, became dead to God and then began to forget the things that Christ had said to her and as a result we have a thousand and thirteen denominations in Christendom, each one contradicting the other and constituting a laughing stock to infidelity. Deprived of that holy spirit they have forgotten the right way. Indeed, as Peter said they would "they have forgotten that they have been purged from their own sins." This spirit as we read here was to bring to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them. When the church lost that spirit she forgot the things that were essential to salvation and now we have the doctrine of men and the tradition of the elders making the commandments of God of none effect. Mark 7:7-13. Hence the conglomerated mass of confusion known to the world to-day as churchianity, which is in open conflict with what is taught in the Bible and known as Christianity.

A Guiding Spirit.

We read in John 16:13-15 a statement like this: "Howbeit when He the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth, for He shall not speak of Himself but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak, and He will show you things to come." Notice the promise. The church endowed by that life-giving principle, the Holy Spirit, is to be guided into

all truth. Christ never shed a drop of blood to establish a non-essential. "Man is not to live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The commandments that we are expected to-day to teach, "the truth," has never been abrogated and yet the parsons of to-day have the cheek to tell us from the pulpit that this is done away, that is done away, these things were good enough for the dark ages, when Christ and the apostles were here, but we have educated men now and they don't need the things that such illiterate men as Christ and the apostles required.

Notice—"When the Holy Ghost is come it will guide you into all truth." We will then regard every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God as being freighted with life and the main—(that is all)—truth not only lives but as Jesus said he shall have it more abundantly.

Gift of Prophecy.

Another part of the work of this spirit as promised in this text is: "He shall show you the things to come." That is making provision for the prophetic office in the church, or more properly speaking for the continuation of the prophetic office in the church, for if that spirit is to show you the things to come—is to predict the things of the Father and reveal them unto you, to testify the things of God, then that is the prophetic office, there is the spirit of prophecy. They tell us now we don't need any prophets, that prophets are all done away with, the gift of prophecy was for the "toy age," when the church was toddling in the childhood days of ignorance, but now in these days of universities and college professors, these supernatural manifestations of the Holy Spirit are no longer needed. Just as soon as we recognize that the church is deprived of this spirit that brings these miraculous manifestations of God's power to this living body of Christ then we cease to have a direct testimony that Jesus is the Christ or as this 15th chapter and 26th verse says: "When the Holy Ghost is come, the spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify to Me."

Got to Work, Too.

We are told that the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Just so soon as the church is deprived of this spirit, then she ceases to testify authoritatively that Jesus is the Christ and we are told in Corinthians: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." He may have been taught by his mother or his Sunday school teacher, but he does not know; he does not profess to have in his possession the knowledge, and hence he is told that he does not require the knowledge any longer. All he has to do, they say, is believe and the moment he believes, he is saved, but the Bible says: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead, and the devils believe and tremble." James 2:19-20. It is not enough to just believe, to give a nominal assent that Jesus is the Christ, but the record says: "This is life eternal that they might know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent."

This knowledge can only come through the avenue that God appointed. We have already learned that one of the offices of this spirit is to reveal the things of the Father unto us, testifying of Jesus, leading and guiding us into all truth. The moment that the church loses that spirit she is dead; just as dead as the body is when it is deprived of the spirit which animates it. A dead church is just as useless and just as powerless to correctly represent God and speak for Him as is a corpse among the human family. We are often told to-day by different denominations that we have the spirit of God, the abiding Comforter, the gift of the Holy Ghost, but

I ask you, how do you know? Do the fruits, the gifts, the signs follow you that followed the early Christian church, and which brought conviction to the people that fell beneath its benign influence? "Oh, you refer to the gifts of tongues, and the gift of healing, of prophecy, of miracles," they say, and I answer "Yes," to which they reply: "Dear Brother Evans, there are no prophets now, these miraculous gifts are all done away; they are no longer needed. We have outgrown those things."

Results Count.

I suppose that many of you have been trying for a month or more to scrape up enough money to buy your winter's coal. You can get it much cheaper now than later on. Suppose I come to you and say: Now, I have some first-class anthracite coal, which I am ready to sell to you for \$1 a ton, the most splendid coal you ever saw in my sheds. Well, you would say: Fill up my bins, quick, wouldn't you? Yes; and then suppose you started to light a fire, and the coal would not ignite, no smoke, no flame, no heat came from it. What would you do? You would make a bee line for my office and tell me the whole thing was a failure, and would want your money back. You would think you had bought a gold brick instead of a ton of coal. But suppose I very religiously would preach, "well, that is first-class anthracite coal, but you know things have changed since last winter. Then coal used to produce flame and heat, but it doesn't any more." How much of that anthracite coal do you think you would buy?

"Well," says one, "do you think anybody is silly enough to make up a story like that." Well, no; not about coal. But apply that to the Holy Spirit. When it was promised the fruitage of that spirit was described in the record, and to-day they tell us they have got that spirit. What is the difference between the coal story and the Spirit story? They tell you if you join the church you will get this Spirit, and they say, just believe you have it brother, and you have it, but it does not act, like it used to, it is not like it used to be in any single respect. The man who receives the gift and power of the Holy Spirit as an abiding comforter will be actuated as other men have been in the dear dead years of the silent past, and if you ever have received a spirit that does not act like that spoken of in the record it is not the Holy Ghost as described in the record. Jesus said: "By their fruits you shall know them." That is true of everything.

Spiritual Gifts Follow.

Now, turn to the 12th chapter of 1st Corinthians and the 1st verse, which reads as follows: "Now, concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." Things have changed since that was said, have they not? If the college graduate who wrote me such a saucy letter, to which he did not dare to sign his name, was reading that, he would say: "Now, concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I am doing all in my power to keep you ignorant." What were the spiritual gifts to follow? This same chapter describes them. The 8th verse, speaking of this spirit says (the whole chapter should be read): "For, to one is given by the spirit the word of wisdom, to another, the word of knowledge by the same spirit, to another faith by the same spirit, to another the gifts of healing by the same spirit, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits, to another diverse kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues, and so on." All these gifts followed the spirit, but they tell us to-day they have the self-same spirit, but there are no prophecies, no gifts of healing, no gifts of tongues, no interpretation of tongues. These are all done away. Therefore, as you decided that the coal was a useless article in your coal cellar, so the same Christian world

has decided that this spirit referred to has not been in activity for a great many years, and that we don't need it now.

This same chapter, verses 27 and 31, reads as follows: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets (good prophets in the New Testament Church); thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles, (miracles in that church); then gifts of healing, helps governments, diversities of tongues." In the 14th chapter and 39th verse, Paul, still writing upon this one question, said: "Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophecy, and forbid not to speak with tongues." Well, says one, I have the Holy Spirit, you can't talk to me. I know I have the Spirit but I don't believe those things are for the church to-day. If I replied to them as they deserve you might say I was naughty or sarcastic, but I won't do that, but I will just say what Paul says about such a character in the 14th chapter and 37th verse. "If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Now, if you have the Spirit, you must acknowledge that those things are the gifts of the Spirit of God, the fruitage of that abiding comforter.

He Told Me So, Anyhow.

"Well," says one, "we have been taught to believe that those things were done away and our preacher reads it right out of the Bible. Where is it. Let me read 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians, and 8th verse: "Charity never faileth." (That is to say the love of God will never pass away, it will grow, develop until they become like Him. Love is an eternal principle, both in heaven and on earth.) "Charity never faileth, but whether there be prophecies they shall fail; whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away, for we know in part, and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." "There," says one, "charity or love is never to be done away, but the gift of tongues is to cease, prophecy is to be done away." When? When that which is perfect is come. But, says one, that is the Bible is it? Well, if you rely upon professors in the theological institutions in Toronto, if you depend upon doctors of divinity here and elsewhere, surely the Bible is not perfect.

I cite you the works of one of the leading theological professors in the city to-day. He says the Bible is very, very unreliable. Indeed, he gives one to understand that it is just cruel for boys and girls to be taught by their mothers in the old farm home that the Bible is the word of God, and then send those boys to a university to find out just the contrary. He tells you that the first eleven chapters of Genesis are not ever history. He tells you that there is not a shred of evidence to prove the story of Adam and Eve, or the flood (and therefore if no Adam and Eve, no fall; and then no need of redemption and therefore no need of a Redeemer; no need of Christ. If the Garden of Eden story is false, you have no marriage ceremony and you reduce the domestic circle to the level of a barnyard). He tells you that there is not a shred of evidence to support the existence of the patriarchs, Jacob, Isaac, Abraham, Joseph, etc., and many other similar things he says, so that your Bible is placed at a very great discount. And as they find the Bible is not perfect, they have to shift from their old statement that when that which is perfect is come, that means the Bible and their arguments against spiritual gifts will not stand any longer.

The Millennium.

Now, your speaker, while he believes that God sent Christ as His greatest and most potential representative on earth and while he believes in the divine authenticity of the Bible, yet he does not believe that the language referred to refers to the Bible at all. When Jesus comes in glory, when the saints who are alive shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye, when the sleeping dead shall arise to be clothed in splendor, when the mists have rolled away and the gloaming and the twilight have passed and we are living in a perpetual sunburst of God's glory then that which is in part shall be done away. That is the limited knowledge with which we labor along now mid the thorns of earth—life shall merge into an unlimited ocean of omniscience. Then shall we not know in part but even as they do in heaven. There will then be no past and no future, but an ever-living splendid present. We shall not need the gift of prophecy to foretell future events. When that which is perfect is come, Christ's celestial glory and celestial church, then that which is in part, such as the healing of the sick, the gift of prophecy, of tongues, etc., shall be done away.

Signs Follow the Spirit.

The Christian Church was promised that certain signs should follow the reception of the spirit and hence the dying legacy of Jesus, the last words He ever spoke, found in Mark 16, 15th verse to the end of the chapter: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."

NOT A GOSPEL, BUT THE GOSPEL THAT I HAVE PREACHED TO YOU, BROUGHT TO YOUR REMEMBRANCE WHEN YOU HAVE OBSERVED ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU. "HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED, BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT SHALL BE DAMNED, AND THESE SIGNS SHALL FOLLOW THEM THAT BELIEVE. Mind you, it does not say the signs will go before to make believers. Christ said it is "a wicked and adulterous generation that seeketh after a sign," but these signs shall follow them that believe.

"In my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak new tongues, they shall take up serpents and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." They tell us these things are done away. Are there no devils now. Then your contention that these gifts are no longer needed is a fallacy and the same with the sick. Well, says one, I would like to see you stay with a rattlesnake. I would like to see you take some poison.

Not a Poison Swallower.

A friend once said to me some years ago: "Here's a little bottle; drink the contents and if you are alive in an hour I will join your church." "Does the Bible say I have to drink poison?" "Oh, yes," he replied, and he cited this quotation about drinking deadly things and doing them no hurt. "Well," I said, "I won't do that, and still I believe the promises of God." Then I explained what that passage meant: If by accident we take some deadly poison into our system that under the administration of anointing of oil, laying on of hands according to the faith that may be exercised, God will counteract the poison's work, and the person will be healed. He said, "I have not looked at it that way." "No," I said, "you thought I would have to go around drinking up drug stores in order to convert infidels, but I am not in that business. To-day that man is an elder in the Latter Day Saint Church.

I met a Christian Scientist yesterday who said he went to school with

me, and I interjected "not long." I said in answer to his query, that I had started to read "The Science of Health," but could not finish it as it bored me—so uninteresting I couldn't understand it. "But it is not necessary for you to understand it," he replied. "Oh, then what's the good of my reading it," I said. "For the good effect it will have on you." "Oh, well, for that I can read the Bible, which is in conflict with your doctrine of healing and I read this statement to him, found in the 5th chapter of James 14-15 verses: "Is any sick among you, let him call for the elder of the church, and let them pray over him anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him."

Oil of Gladness.

"Oh," he said, "I know what you are getting after, the laying on of hands and anointing with oil. We believe in the oil of gladness!" But it does not say you shall anoint with the oil of gladness. The Bible mentions olive oil that the sick is to be anointed with. In Mark we are told they shall lay hands upon the sick and they shall recover. Mark, 6th chapter, 5th verse, says: "Then Jesus laid his hands upon the sick and they were healed," and in the 13th verse: "The apostles anointed with oil many that were sick, and they were healed." Now, I want to show you history to show you whether this is the oil of gladness or literal oil: "This single conspicuous gift which Christ committed to His apostles (Mark 16:18), remained in the church long after the other miraculous gifts were withdrawn. Indeed, it seems to have been designed to remain always, and St. James directs the elders, who were the most, if not the only gifted men to administer it. This was the whole process of physic in the Christian church till it was lost through unbelief."—(John Wesley's Notes on the New Testament, James 5 and 14).

"This was the standing means of healing desperate diseases in the Christian church."—(Wesley's Notes on Mark 6:13). The Ancient Roman Ritual, revised by Pope Gregory (6th century), prescribes the blessing of oil by the bishop and the prayers to be recited in the anointing of the sick. The Venerable Bede, of England, (8th cent.), referring to James 5:14, says: "The custom of the church requires that the sick be anointed by the priests with consecrated oil, and be sanctified by the prayer which accompanies it."—Origin (3rd cent.), St. Chrysostom (4th cent.), Pope Innocent (5th cent.). The Greek church all agree to this ancient practice, "Faith of Our Fathers," by Cardinal Gibbons, p. 439-441.

Catholics Anoint With Oil.

Now, in closing, let me say that while the Catholic church refers to these quotations in support of what they term "Extreme Unction," that church has so far departed from the faith that they have fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy, where it says: "Surely you are turning things upside down," Isaiah 29:16. Anointing with oil and the laying on of hands are practiced in the Catholic church, but only in case of death—the last rite of the church, but in the true Former Day Saint Church, as in the true Latter Day Saint Church, it is as Christ said: "They shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover. The Lord shall raise them up."

Of course, there is the other blessing attending it. If I were going to die to-night, and knew it, I would want these brethren to anoint my head with oil and lay their hands upon me. If it is the will of God to raise us up He will answer our prayers and we will be healed. If He takes us then we shall have the other blessing, and every sin we have committed

shall be forgiven. I would like to die keeping the commandments of Jesus Christ. There could be no sunnier hour, no happier moment than to breathe your last, feeling that you were proving your love for Jesus Christ by keeping His commandments.

James declared that every good gift cometh down from God who is without variableness. Now, here are the good gifts sent down under the influence of the spirit by an unchangeable God. If God is unchangeable He will continue to send down these good gifts, the fruitage of the Holy Ghost to his church as long as that church walks in the faith wherewith it is called, and the church without this spirit, according to the text, is without God; is separated from the Almighty and is therefor dead.

An Unchangeable God.

Oh, dear friends, do not think that our Father has changed. The Bible, describing Him, says: "I am the Lord, I change not," Mal 3:6. It is not the Lord that has changed, but the people calling themselves the Church of Christ, having changed. They have forsaken the way of the Lord and the people are being deluded by the tradition of the parsons. Read Mark 7:7-13, there you will find that they will make the Word of God of none effect by their traditions, and teach for doctrine the commandments of men.

I call you back to the Lord, to the church as organized by Divinity, to the blessings promised those that obey from the heart, the form of doctrine delivered by Christ and His apostles, in place of the contradicting creeds of men, come back to the word of the Lord. No longer believe that God has changed His mind, altered His plan of salvation, or abrogated His promises. If you observe all things whatsoever God has commanded, then His promises will be fulfilled; "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," and again, as in days of old, the divinely commissioned minister will go forth preaching the same gospel with the same promises and blessings. "The Lord working with them, confirming the word with signs following," Mark 16:20. Oh, friends, the world needs the old gospel, cast off the creeds of men and live under the blessings of the Lord.

Faith in God

I WILL call your attention to verse 22 of the 11th chapter of St. Mark, where you will read these words: "Have faith in God."

It is my painful duty to-night to point out to you the fact that there has come a period in life when Jesus can truthfully say, as, according to the prophecies, He will say when He comes: "These wounds received I in the house of my friends." There was a time when every church that claimed to be a Christian church stood in defense of the Bible as the Word of God, against the attacks and onslaughts of what was called Atheism or Infidelity; but we do not hear a great deal from the avowed Infidels or Atheists to-day. The facts are, they are quietly resting on their oars while the popular churches and religious colleges are aping them in their positive denials of the Bible; and the arguments once used by a Pain, a Bradlaugh or an Ingersoll are now finding place in the popular colleges and in some of the leading churches; and as a result, you read of a leading lawyer of Toronto through your own Toronto newspapers but recently, showing you facts and figures to the effect that the great cause of Christianity is suffering to such an extent that the churches are fast being emptied of their former adherents, and that thousands of seats are not occupied at all. This cry does not only come from Toronto, but the world is every day hearing through the newspapers the same complaint from all parts of the country; and that while the churches are paying large salaries for popular preachers, the pews are empty. Men go on in their sins and wickedness, and are protected by the hush-money that they send for the support of the church. I hold myself personally responsible for these statements and those that may follow, and am ready at any time, if called on to give chapter and verse, and day and date for every statement I make.

Some of the leading clergymen, both in the pulpit and through the press, have told us that "we should revise the faith of our childhood concerning the Scriptures; that it is cruel to allow young men and women to grow up in the belief that the story of the creation, the story of Adam and Eve, the story of the Garden of Eden, the story of the Fall, the story of the Flood, as recorded in the Book of Genesis, are literal history, and afterwards to send those boys and girls to a university," where all this old-time nonsense is exposed; and where the boy's Bible, and his mother and his grandmother's faith are ridiculed, might aptly have been added.

Patriarchs Are a Myth Say Higher Critics.

We are, moreover, told by these worldly-wise men that Moses never wrote the first five books of the Bible, called the Pentateuch; that the Book of Jonah is not a sober record of plain facts; that David never wrote the Psalms; Solomon never wrote the Proverbs, the Song of Solomon, and the Book of Ecclesiastes; Job is merely a dramatic poem; Jonah is a parable; Esther and Daniel but romance; that Isaiah did not write the prophecies ascribed to him; that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob never existed—they are but myths; that there never was a Joseph; that the beautiful story about Joseph and his trials and struggles and triumphs is purely

novelistic in its character—no truth about it. In a word, they say that “the stories of the patriarchal period do not hang by a single thread.” And again, one of your great preachers has said: “There is not one whit of proof that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob or Joseph ever existed”; and it is calmly said in effect that when Christ Himself refers to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Jonah, the “whale story,” or anything that these learned men have decided is not true, Christ must be wrong; and it is the duty of the people to listen to the learned men; and that when they speak in opposition to that which Christ taught, you must excuse Jesus, for His illiteracy—for His ignorance, and hold tight to the college professors and the doctors of divinity. These doctors of divinity have been doctoring divinity until by their own confession they have killed divinity! Read “Studies in the Old Testament,” by Rev. George Jackson, B.A., published June, 1909.

I have heard tell of medical doctors prescribing the wrong medicine, and the victims of their carelessness dying; but it now comes that the doctors of divinity are actually denying the Divine authenticity of the Bible, snatching our hope away, and giving us learned treatises that no one comprehends but themselves. And the worst of it is, they are fooling Christian congregations and Christian institutions, in that those Christian institutions are paying them large salaries for reiterating, under a different garb, the monstrous infidelity that their fathers combated; and hence the necessity of my preaching to you the old Christian doctrine that we should have faith in God.

Critics Teaching Infidel in Character.

Now, I have no hesitancy in saying that all this I have referred to is the rankest kind of infidelity. I remember a little while ago that some gentleman did refer to one of these men as an infidel, and he was called on to apologize. Yet I am here to affirm that such teaching is infidel in character—and I do not think I shall be called on to apologize, for I have got the documents. The reason that infidelity is not fighting the popular churches now as it did in times past is because the church, in effect, has said to such men as Ingersoll and Bradlaugh: “You are right, gentlemen; we thought Jesus was right; we thought the Bible was true when we opposed you long years ago. We now ask your pardon; you were right after all; the Bible is not what we and the fathers of the church before us thought it was. We are willing that Jesus take a back seat as one who, perhaps, was honest, but mistaken.”

I frankly admit that some of the old stock have opposed this infidelity in the pulpit and in the college, but they were pitied as old and in the way, behind the times, while the fashionable congregations and the great ministers stood by the new thought and practically pushed the true Bible believers in the background. You will not need to ask any stronger proof for these statements than your own Toronto papers within one year. Should anyone think or say that it is not so bad as I have stated, let me again say that from your Toronto pulpits and college halls there sermons have been preached, and your bookrooms are selling this infidel literature in their thousands of copies to-day; and as a result, the faith of the people is being shaken from centre to circumference.

Christ Genuine or an Imposter?

I take the position that if Christ was mistaken, He was not the true witness divinely commissioned to represent God on earth. Either He was a false teacher or a true one; if false, He was not the Saviour of the world. The doctrine of the atonement must go if the doctrine of the Fall

is untrue. If the theory of evolution is true, and is to take the place of the story of creation as recorded in Genesis, and we descended from the monkey, then we fell upward, not downwards. The crucifixion did nothing for us; Christ's death means little to us. In fact, the smart preachers are beginning to doubt that He rose from the dead. The question now comes to us, shall we revise our faith as the college professor and leading preachers ask us to do, and endorse the new faith as taught by the learned critics of the day? or shall we stand by the Bible as the Word of God and accept Jesus Christ as the faithful and true witness?—that is the point that I want to submit for your consideration to-night.

The world has to decide upon this question; the church has got to meet it. This idea of the choir singing "Precious Bible, Book Divine; Precious Treasure, Thou Art Mine," and the pulpit straightway contradicting the choir and telling the people that the Bible is not the word of God at all, will have to be stopped; and it becomes those who are called of God to represent Jesus Christ in the world to stand in the fore-front of the battle in the defense of God, of Christ and of the Bible, as against infidelity in high church circles.

The Authoritative Christ.

Now, Cowper once said, speaking of the Word of God: "God is His own interpreter, and He will make it plain." And so I hurriedly present to you some thoughts along these lines from the Bible. I may here say that this discourse will be more in the nature of a synopsis than an effort to enter into a lengthy discussion of each of the points raised; but I shall hold myself ready to go into any of these branches at length on future occasions.

First, then, I present to you Jesus Christ as the true witness. (Isaiah 55:4): "I have given him for a witness to the people." (John 18:37): "Christ came into the world to bear witness unto the truth." (John 8:28) Jesus says: "As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." (Revelations 1:5): "Jesus Christ, the faithful and true witness." Now, that is Christ's recommendation as the faithful and true witness; yet you are asked to-day to believe that when Christ makes reference to Genesis or anything that occurred in the first eleven chapters of that book, or when He refers to Abraham, to Jonah or Job or Daniel or Esther—that He is lying under a dilapidated state of miscomprehension, and is to be pitied for His illiteracy and ignorance of the facts. Even if we admit He is honest, we must say, "The poor man was in gross darkness," and that our only hope is to reject Him as being the true witness and to stand by the college professors and the doctors of divinity.

Christ Defends Genesis as True.

Secondly, Christ endorsed the Scriptures as true history. Hear Him. John 5:38-9: "Search the Scriptures; they testify of Me." Here is a clear endorsement of the Scriptures. Luke 16:29: "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." What did He mean by that? Why, He means to say that Moses had revealed to Him the account recorded in the Book of Genesis; that he wrote the Book of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and nearly all the books of Deuteronomy, which are commonly called the five books of Moses. Here, I say, Christ endorsed those books as being trustworthy history—a sober record of the facts. My! how different it would have been if Christ had only studied at Victoria University! How much better it would have been for the world if He had only known as much as the book-writers of Toronto! But we pass on. Luke 24:27:

“Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.” Here is an endorsement of Moses and all the prophets. John 17:17, Jesus speaking to the Father, prays: “Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy word is truth.”

Man a Distinct Creation.

My next point is : Christ endorses the creation story. Hear Him. Genesis 1:27. Among other things, it says, speaking of Adam and Eve: “Male and female created He them”; nowhere hinting that man was first protoplasm, and then he became a mosquito, and bye and bye a bedbug, and after a while a pollywog, and bye and bye a monkey, and after a while a gorilla, and bye and bye a low state of man, and bye and bye man fell upwards till he got to be a college professor! No, not that; not that at all. But He created them man and woman right there in the Garden of Eden. But you are told to discredit this story as mythological; just a little yarn—no real truth about it. That Christ endorses this statement is seen by His quoting it in Mark 10:6, where He says: “From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female”; and you can’t get behind the beginning. Genesis 2:24: “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife.” Christ endorses this by quoting it in Matthew 19:4-5: “In the beginning He (God) made them male and female. And for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh.”

Marriage Law Undermined.

Now, there is something more in the denunciation and rejection of this “Adam and Eve story” than appears at first sight. The man that denounces the story of Adam and Eve denounces the marriage law; he reduces humanity to the level of the barnyard. Where will you find the marriage tie outside of that Book? If the first eleven chapters of Genesis are to be entirely relegated to the realms of mythology and are not true, then you have no marriage law—that is found only in the Book of Genesis. No wonder you have tens of thousands of divorces to-day, and as Sam. Jones once declared: “The train stops in Chicago fifteen minutes for lunch, and five minutes for divorce.” The bonds of holy matrimony are assailed by this infidelity to the Bible; the sanctity of the home is invaded. Just think, one million two hundred and seventy-four thousand divorces have been granted in the United States in fifty years, so states the census report.

You are hearing a great deal to-day about the marriage laws being broken and twisted and turned topsy-turvy by both the Protestant and the Catholic world; but if we throw away the Bible, where is your marriage law? You might just as well talk about marriage in the lower animal world as among men and women.

Ten Commandments Too Binding For Some

Right while I am at it, let me say that you are asked by some of these men to abbreviate the Ten Commandments. The Almighty is so far behind the times; He is altogether too lengthy in His remarks. If He had only been a college-bred individual He would have known something about the science of abbreviation, and He would have cut short the whole of those Ten Commandments. In fact, some men would like to have some of the Commandments entirely wiped out. “Thou shalt not kill” is a nasty Commandment to be kept according to some folk. “Thou shalt not commit adultery” is terribly in the way of some people. Just imagine! God Almighty’s own words, written, as the Bible says, by His own finger upon

the tables of stone, are regarded as too voluminous for the enlightened (?) civilization of the colleges of the twentieth century! Here is one clear case where these men are proving themselves to be "doctors of divinity." They are "doctoring" divinity all right, all right! Shall we stand for it? is the question we must answer.

Genesis 4: 1-10, tells the story of Cain and Abel, and of how Cain slew his brother. Christ endorses that story in Matthew 23:35, where He says, "From the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharius, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar." Again, 1 John 3: 11, 12. "For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother." Hebrews 11: 4, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." I am giving you these passages, and then showing you that they are supported all through the New Testament, so that if they are false as found in the Old Testament, then Paul and John and Christ, these New Testament writers who quote them as true, are to be pitied for their ignorance and their folly.

Genesis 5: 22-23, tells of Enoch who walked with God, and God took him. Judge, away down near the end of the New Testament, refers to that same story, and says, "Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these sayings." Hebrews 11: 5, says, "Enoch was translated that he might not see death." Here, then, you have the great writers of the New Testament endorsing the story found in Genesis—the book that you are told is not trustworthy history.

History Proves Truth of Flood Story

Again, Genesis 6: 12-22, gives us the story of Noah and the flood; and there has scarcely been an infidel writer in all the ages, right down to Toronto divines, who has not mercilessly attacked this story of the flood as being not only improbable, but impossible. How strange, when the evidence of history shows in every part of the globe, both the tradition of the tribes (who, by the way, had nothing to do with writing the Bible), and the evidences of stratas of the earth, even to the highest peaks, of the highest mountains, all go to show there has been a flood, that covered all the earth. The doctrine of the flood is, moreover, told in the language of the Indians; the Aborigines of this continent, have their own history of the flood. But more on that subject in a coming lecture.

Jesus endorses the flood story in Luke 17: 26, 27, where He tells us how Noah entered the ark and the flood came, and how the people were destroyed. But according to these higher critics, we must excuse Christ for His ignorance. He was away back there before these universities were built.

Hebrew 11, 7: Noah prepared an ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world." Poor Paul! What a maze of ignorance must have surrounded that man, when we compare him with the intellectuality of the doctors of divinity! I read a sermon only this week wherein it said that we in this day know more now than Paul ever knew. suring thing! Poor Paul.

Christ Says Abraham Lived.

Genesis 11: 27-32, contains the story of Abraham's birth and subsequent life. And from that on he is quoted and referred to as a real, living character all the way down, till Jesus says (John 8: 56): Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day." He tells us that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living—the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And yet the gentleman of the college tells us that these characters never

existed. How badly fooled Jesus must have been to tell you that God was the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob! when in the language of the books that are sold by their thousands at your Toronto bookstores, you are told that these patriarchs are purely mythical; there is no thread of evidence in all the world to prove that they ever existed. Why, there are hundreds of volumes outside of the Bible that tell of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, of Joseph, and of the other patriarchs. Volume after volume. But we pass that.

Lot and Jonah—Trustworthy Accounts.

The story of Lot and of Lot's wife, that has been ridiculed so much, is recorded in Genesis 19. Poor Jesus! again in the darkness. Luke 17: 28-32. Christ endorses the story of Lot and his wife, and bids the people remember the catastrophe that befell them as the result of unbelief and disobedience; and it is well that the doctors of divinity take the hint, for if they have not been turned to salt like Mrs. Lot, it seems to me that many of them are filling the other prophecy where it says something about the salt losing its savor, and it is henceforth good for nothing but to be trodden down under the feet of men. For I tell you, if you do not put your foot down on these misleading doctrines, you must put it on Christ and the Bible—the issue is before you.

Jonah 1: 17, tells the story of Jonah and the whale. Jesus again is found a false witness, for He states (Matthew 12: 39, 40, and also Luke 11: 32): "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Oh, how foolish He was to believe that fish story, and they begin to tell you that science has proved that the whale never could have swallowed Jonah.

Fish Swallow Men.

I will now read you some notes I have on this matter, that may convince you that these little infidels do not know it all. "It is necessary to observe that the Greek word 'cetos,' used by St. Matthew, is not restricted in its meaning to a 'whale,' or any cetacean, like the Latin cete or 'cetus,' it may denote any sea monster, either a 'whale,' or a 'shark,' or a 'seal,' or 'a tunny of enormous size.' . . . The only fish then capable of swallowing a man would be a large specimen of the white shark (*carcharias vulgaris*), that dreaded enemy of sailors, and the most voracious of the family of *squalidae*. This shark which sometimes attains the length of thirty feet, is quite able to swallow a man whole." . . . The whole body of a man in armour has been found in the stomach of a white shark, and Captain King, in his survey of Australia, says he had caught one which could have swallowed a man with the greatest ease. Blumenbach mentions that a whole horse has been found in a shark, and Captain Basil Hall reports the taking of one in which, besides other things, he found the whole skin of a buffalo which a short time before had been thrown overboard from his ship. "The white shark is not uncommon in the Mediterranean"—Smith's Bible Dict., Art, 'Whale,' page 750: "The white shark is found in the Mediterranean, and has been known to swallow a man entire"—Chambers' Ency., Art, Shark: "It is recorded that a man fell overboard in the Mediterranean and was swallowed by one of these sea monsters (dog sharks), 'keetos,' the monster was killed and the man rescued alive"—Hard Problems of Scripture, by Rev. R. A. Turrey, D.D., in Ram's Horn.

"Pliny, A.D., 50, gives an account of the skeleton of a sea monster 40 feet in length. . . . whose ribs were higher than those of an Indian ele-

phant, that was brought from Joppa and exhibited in Rome by M. Scaurus," Plin. Hist., Nat. 1., C. 4, Ram's Horn, Oct. 8th, 1904.

It will be remembered that it was in the Mediterranean sea that Jonah was supposed to have been cast. We leave the deduction with you.

Teaching of Methodist Discipline.

Now, I have a little statement here that I want to read to you. It is from the Toronto Star of June 2nd, 1911. That is not very long ago. It is headed: Methodist discipline forbids the calling of Christ, God. (This is in a trial for heresy.) One witness says: "To say that Christ is God is to deny the standards of the Methodist Church, or, in fact, any church in the world. Our discipline expressly forbids the commission of this error. The phrase, 'Christ is God' is an unscriptural phrase," declared the witness. The man himself, who was on trial made this statement that nowhere in the New Testament was Jesus called God. He also declared as to the Resurrection: "The most eminent authorities quoted four theories, all of which Methodist ministers of distinction had accepted. He believed in a resurrection, but considered it a spiritual one; thus practically denying the literal resurrection of the dead, as well as declaring that nowhere in the New Testament is Jesus called God.

Christ—God in Man.

Listen to Matthew 1:22: "Now, all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us." Here Jesus is called God. Again, John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And every Bible commentator that I have in my library admits that the "Word" there means Christ—that Christ was in the beginning with God, and that He was God. Or, as Paul said: "He thought it not robbery to be equal with God." John 10:33: "The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God." Here Christ had evidently acknowledged Himself to be God, and they (the Jews) considered it blasphemy. And I suppose it is so considered to-day by the learned men. John 20:28: "And Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God." Here one of the twelve apostles, who is to preach the gospel in all the world, addresses Jesus Christ as his God. And yet the reverend professor, with all these passages plainly written in the New Testament, denies them!

Acts 20:28, you read: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over those which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feel the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Who was it shed his blood for the church? Jesus Christ. He is here called God. First Timothy, 3:16: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." Who has this reference to? Why, any Sunday school scholar will tell you it is speaking of Jesus Christ. Titus 1:3: "But hath in due times manifested his word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of God our Saviour." Jesus was known as the Saviour of the World.

The Great Alternative—Christ or Infidelity.

I want to say in closing, I do not desire any war of words with anybody, but when God's Word is assailed, when the record is torn asunder,

when Christ is placed at a discount, when you are plainly told concerning this august authority, Jesus Christ, that when He differs from the learned men of to-day, you must accept the production of the college even to the rejection of Jesus Christ—then it is high time to speak; it is time to beckon you back to the old paths; it is time to ask you to come back to Christ, to the Bible, to the old-fashioned religion, and not have it said, as it was admitted in the Methodist conference recently, and reported in your own newspapers, that the church to-day was becoming a music hall, that there was more attention given to the soloist and to the choir than to the sermon; that the preacher just merely gave a short address and had become a mere advertising agent; and that there were many in the church that knew absolutely nothing about the true conversion and that they lacked the old-time religion. This was reported, as I say, in your Toronto newspapers this last summer. See *The Toronto Daily Star* of June 14th, 1911, "Methodist Conference on Music and Evangelism."

Now, brethren, is it not time, when we see Christianity slipping away from us, when we see the old-time religion going, is it not time to ask you to throw away your creeds and come back to the true church, embrace the gospel as Jesus taught it, and learn to your satisfaction that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation.

Childlike Simplicity Arrayed Against Worldly Wisdom.

Let me say here that I do not wish to decry or to disparage education, but when I see the colleges are producing such fruitage as I have indicated, I just voice the sentiment as expressed by Jesus Christ when He said: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and the prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight." Matthew 11:25-26. That is why He passed by the great Sanhedrin with its educated priests, and went down to the seaside and called the unlettered and almost illiterate fishermen to become His representatives; and who eventually became the wonders of the world. That is why Paul could say: "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty and base things of the world, and things which are despised hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are. That no flesh should glory in his presence," 1. Cor. 1:26-29.

May God help us to hear the voice of the Good Shepherd and to remember that "He whom God hath sent speaketh the Words of God." John 3:34. The antithesis of that is: "He that denounces the Word of God is not the servant of God."

Divine Faith vs. Human Reason

Showing How Man's Logic is an Unsafe Guide in the Realm of the Spiritual.

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 13th chapter of the Book of Job, verse 15, where you will read these words: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." Our subject to-night is "Divine Faith versus Human Reason." That which we call reason is sometimes the defence of our own little prejudices, and frequently we mistake stubbornness for true faith. To illustrate what I mean by this, I once heard a narrative concerning two women on the question of faith. One prayed for faith that would take no denial, and she testified that after joining the church her husband was taken sick; three of her children were smitten with the same malady. She sent for the Elders and the sick ones were administered to according to the law, "is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, and the prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will raise them up." And this woman said: "I thank God that I possessed that faith that would take no denial, and as a result my husband and three children were restored to health."

A Steadfast Faith.

Another woman rose in the same prayer meeting to speak, bedecked in deep mourning. She said: "When I joined the church I had a husband and three children. They were all smitten with the same dread malady referred to by our sister who has just resumed her seat. I sent for the Elders and they were administered to. First my husband sickened and died, and one by one the dark wave of death carried from me my three children, and to-night I am alone in the world. But I know this gospel is true and I have faith in God, and amid the gloom I can look up through the clouds and say: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him."

I appeal to you, personally, brothers, and sisters. Which of these two women, think you, possessed the gift of faith? There are many of us "Sunshine Christians;" we are all right when we are getting what we want, when both God and man seem to be at our elbows, pouring in upon us every desire, crowning us with success; but in the hour of adversity, when our way is thwarted and our human desires are not granted, how many of us actually sulk and pout about it and sometimes even reach the conclusion that there is no God? They begin to reason it out, as they call it, from a human point of view, and finally drift away from the church and from God into unbelief.

The Foolish Wise Men.

Now, I want to examine these two propositions, Divine Faith and Human Reason. We are told by the Lord in the prophecy of Isaiah, 55th chapter, verses 8 and 9: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways, saith the Lord." Well, you might ask, what is the difference? Just this, God answers it: "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways and My thoughts

than your thoughts." Now, there is the difference, my friends, between what we would think about a matter and what God would think about a matter. Some have declared that we do not require the spiritual gifts of the gospel now, in this great day of colleges, with the wonderful advantages that are ours. Now, God forbid that I would speak one word disparagingly of education, but I want to draw the line between what Josh Billings call "book larn'" and true education.

There are many that go to college and it really is their ruination. Someone has said: "A little learning is a dangerous thing." They are built up in their own conceit, and they begin to criticize God, His word, His methods, His church, His doctrine, by what the professor has said, until, as we learned last Sunday night, it is cruel to teach a young man or woman that the Bible contains true history, and then send them to a university to find out that they have been mistaken. But to-night I am going to show you that the education of this world, college and university education, never was intended to enable you to understand God—nor will it equip you to preach the gospel. Human education, the human reason, is as far from right as the heavens are from the earth, as we have already learned to-night.

In support of this, I draw your attention to 1st Corinthians, first chapter, 19th verse: "For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this word? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." This is more fully stated in the next chapter, 14th verse: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." It would be very profitable if you were to read these two chapters on this theme, for they show conclusively that the wisdom of this world—what we call the learning, the education of man, whether natural or acquired ability—cannot decipher the mysteries of heaven nor rightly divine the Word of Truth. In order to do that one must have the Spirit of God.

This is made apparent from another point of view. It is but fair for me to say that perhaps some of the best educated men in this world, from a university point of view, may be found in the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Critics Disagree.

I go further than that and say that some of the best educated men in this world are found in the Baptist ministry; some others in the Methodist ministry; others in the Presbyterian ministry. And yet you cannot find four men that differ more widely than do these four bodies—each with the Bible in their hands, giving their human reasons why the other three are wrong. It will not do to say that they are not honest, nor is it proper to question the sincerity of these people. But it is a fact that honesty and sincerity never made a truth out of an error, and the fact that honest and earnest educated men differ on this question of religion as wide as the poles should be prima facie evidence to you that the world, by its wisdom, knows not God; that the university can never impart the key by which we may find out God or correctly present Him to the world. And so I read in Job 11:7: "Canst thou, by searching, find out God?" And in Ecclesiastes 3:11: "No man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end." I think that will be enough on that point.

Noah, the Baptist.

Now, I am going to show you that the grandest things in the Bible, the most splendid conditions that we find there, the most marvelous manifestation of Divine interposition, from Genesis to Revelations are ridiculed by human reason; and the universities and colleges are fast pushing their students away from these things with a sneer, and with pity in their voice they are speaking kindly to those who are so ignorant and old-fashioned as to really believe these things are true. For instance, from a human point of view, please examine the command that God gave to Noah to build an ark, as found in Genesis 6:13-22. I am ready to acknowledge that this is a wonderful story, so wonderful that when it is measured by human reason, the scholar out of the church, and frequently in the church, say that it is not true at all—there never was a flood. The Bible History and Biology, page 51, speaking of the flood says: "The flood came according to the Hebrew version in 1656. The Samaritan says that it was in 1307; the Septuagint says it occurred in 2262; Josephus declares that it occurred in 1556. According to the calculations of Patrick Cockburn the number of human beings born would be not less than 1,677,721,600, or 600,000,000 more than the present population of the world. He took the Hebrew date, but if we take the Septuagint, the number may be doubled, if we deduct 600,000,000 for mortality, there would be left as large a population as now exists on the whole globe." Bible Hist. Rev. P. 51. So that the world had an immense population at the time of the flood, when God gave that commandment to Noah to build an ark out of Gophir wood, and pitch it within and without, and then gather in the birds and the cattle and all that. But you can scarcely ever read the story now before an educated man but what he laughs at you.

I am going to show you more fully at some future time that the histories of many nations testify that the flood really occurred; but my point to-night is merely to show you that measured by a human reason men are rejecting the story of the flood. It required a great deal of faith on the part of Noah to just stand up before those people and say, I am the only man Divinely commissioned to represent God, and you that have claim to serve Him by the millions are wrong. And if you don't believe the gospel and obey it and be baptized, so that you can enter into this ark that I am making, every one of you will be drowned. I can readily understand how they looked upon him as a crank, and regarded him as insane. But the New Testament, taking up that question, shows that he was a "Preacher of Righteousness"; that is, he preached the gospel, for therein is the righteousness of God revealed, we are told in Romans, 1st chapter. And while you may not think he preached baptism, he did, for 1st Peter, 3rd chapter, distinctly declares that the "eight souls were saved by water, the like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us." Why, you ought to get converted to the idea of immersion, even the earth itself was there immersed!

But Noah believed contrary to human reason, contrary to all the learned men that surrounded him, and God saved him and his house because of their faith, which led them to render obedience to the commandments of God.

Faith Says, "All Things Are Possible."

I draw your attention now to Genesis 12:7, also Genesis 15:5, where you read the story of Abraham. Abraham, according to the histories, was considered a very popular man in his time, but God, wishing to perform a marvelous work through him and his posterity, saw that it was necessary for Abraham to make a wonderful sacrifice, for in the making

of that sacrifice he would demonstrate to God that he loved Him and believed on Him. You must not think it was an easy task for Abraham to perform.

I just draw a brief picture of it: He is 75 years of age; he is called on to leave his home, country, relatives, early associates—leave them all. (I believe the record says he took with him his nephew, Lot.) In the 15th chapter the Lord appears to him and gives him to understand that his seed is to be more numerous than the stars of heaven; and in 18th chapter of Genesis the Lord says that Sarah, now an old woman (and Abraham one hundred years old), is going to have a child, and that this child and his posterity, according to the promise already made to Abraham, will be more numerous than the sands of the sea or the stars of heaven.

Human reason laughs at that now, and laughed at it then. Even the woman in the case, Sarah, when she heard that she was going to have a baby, tittered right out in the face of the Lord. And the Lord said: "Sarah, wherefore didst thou laugh?" And the woman had the brazen impudence to look God fair in the face and lie about it. Said she: "I did not laugh." Ah, but God said: "Thou didst laugh." Well, she was just measuring this promise by human reason; she regarded it as an impossibility.

Now, I want to read a little history on this very matter. God made two covenants with Moses. Genesis 12:4, the first covenant made with Abraham, when he was 75 years old—that is, 1921 B. C. And Genesis 17:1, the second covenant made with Abraham, when he was 99 years old; that is 1898 B. C. The time between the covenants was 24 years, or nearly so. Galatians 3:16, shows that the first covenant was the Christian covenant. Genesis 17:10, shows clearly that the second covenant was the covenant of circumcision. It was 430 years before the law that the Christian covenant was made. Now, under that first or Christian covenant this child was promised, and it was then that Abraham gave evidence of his Christian faith and believed God, though to do so he ran up against human reason.

Now God is going to test this great man's faith. Genesis 22:1-13, will tell you about the Lord appearing to him. Isaac is now fast blooming into manhood. Quite a stripling of a boy. His years, coupled with the wonderful promise, had endeared him to his father Abraham. He loved him very dearly, and the Lord comes to Abraham at this time and practically puts him to the test. God had taken him from his country, from his friends; He had even separated him from Lot, his nephew. He was wandering about in a tent—never built himself a house. And now the Lord comes out and He says: "Abraham, take thy son, thine only son, and go to the Mount Moriah, and there offer him as a burnt offering upon the altar before me."

The Sacrifice.

Apply human reason to that, you who think you have been tempted and tried; you who think you have been called on to make great sacrifices. I just imagine that I can see poor old Abraham, now nearly 120 years old; the reminiscences of the past flooding in upon him; and he says: "Why, from this child is to spring a multitude of nation—that is God's promise to me; He gave him to me that I might recognize him a perpetual miracle. And now I am commended to put the knife in his heart, to slay him upon the altar as a sacrifice." Apply your human reason to that, and where will it bring you? It will bring you to a direct refusal to obey God.

I watch poor Abraham in imagination. He commands his servants to

get the mules ready, takes his blankets, and starts off on the lonely journey of three days' travel. I think I see him on the first night, bowed in prayer, recognizing that every moment and every step is drawing him nearer to the time when he must kill his own boy. I can just barely imagine what that prayer would be, as he looks up to the cold, unanswering stars, with no heart to pity and no word to be heard from the unrelenting heavens. Doubtless, after a sleepless night he journeyed on again, praying again the second night. But the third day's journey brings him to the mountain. He would bid the servants sit in a certain place while he and the boy ascend the mount. The altar is erected, the wood is prepared, and then as a heart-crusher, just as though the very deep researches of the heart had to be stung by the stupendous character of the sacrifice demanded the young boy, Isaac, comes to his father and says: "Father, here is the altar, here is the wood, but where is the sacrifice?"

Think of it, you folks who think you have made sacrifices for the gospel! Abraham replied, doubtless with tear-stained face and trembling lips, "God will provide the sacrifice, my son." And with that he grabbed his boy and tied him hands and feet, and placed him upon the altar; unsheathed his knife, raised it heavenward. Oh, stop for a moment; put yourself in his place. Is there any wonder that he is called "The Father of the Faithful"? In the killing of this boy, it meant the blasting of every prospect, the undoing of every hope, the destruction of every promise God had made to him. But it was his duty to obey; it was God's right to command. And when he had performed the last move, the muscles of his hand grasping the knife, the knife about to descent, and when God had tested him to the uttermost, He spoke, saying, "Abraham, slay not thy son." And turning, Abraham saw a ram caught in the thicket nearby, took it, and performed the sacrifice.

Paul, in Hebrews 11: 19, gives us some little hint of the conditions. He seems there to argue that while the boy was to be killed, Abraham thought God was able to raise him up again; he knew that God would not lie. He knew that it was his business to obey God; God would take care of the results and bring to pass His wonderful promises. He could not delve deep enough nor soar high enough to give any human reasons for this act, but it was his business to obey. He did obey, with the result as stated.

Now my friends, there is something peculiar about that. On that same mountain David made sacrifice. There was the threshing floor of Ornan, of which you have heard so much in reading about David. It was, moreover, on that mountain that Solomon dedicated that wonderful temple that glittered with gold in the morning sunbeams. It was on one part of that same mountain that Jesus Christ was crucified. So it is said in "Bible History and Biography," page 87, in Gardner's Encyclopedia, page 671, and many other authorities supporting this statement: "No wonder Abraham was called the Father of the Faithful."

The Cynics' Doom.

I draw your attention now to Genesis 19: 1-26, where you read the story of Lot and his wife. Human reason comes up again here, and denounces that story as a fable. But science (read report of Lynch and others), has gone to the bottom of the Dead Sea and taken up some of that old sulphur, remnants of that very tempest, with which the City of the Plains was destroyed. You remember the commandment, "Escape for thy life; stay not in all the plain; turn neither to right hand nor to the left. Escape to the mountain. Look not behind thee." Not much of a

sacrifice, you think, as you read it. But come back for a moment to the City of the Plains; measure the sacrifice that Lot and his wife was required to make with any little sacrifice you may be called to make. Lot had acquired wealth; he had raised up a family; two of his girls were married to the citizens of that place. When Mrs. Lot has gone to these two girls that were married and told them the revelation of their father, their husbands laughed her to scorn. The girls, if I may use the common expression, had married out of the church, and must now take the consequence. But their having married out of the church—married to those who were not of the faith—did not minimize their mother's love for them. But she was commanded to leave the city and all that was there. The home went up in smoke; all that they had was destroyed. Those two daughters went down in the awful catastrophe, and Mrs. Lot, Mr. Lot and the two young girls that were not married made their escape from the doomed city.

Think of the sacrifice; measure it by human reason. Where was there any human reason that would demonstrate the Divine authenticity of the instructions given to Lot: "Get out of this city; it is going to be destroyed by fire to-morrow." You would say, "Well, where is the foundation for that? Where is the proof for it. You educated men would get around and say, "That is but an hallucination of some frenzied brain." You would have rejected it. But Lot had faith in God; Lot's wife and the girls also had faith in God, but their faith was tried, and Mrs. Lot forgot that when God speaks men should obey. Mrs. Lot forgot that there were no big and little commandments with God; that they are all big; that we must obey implicitly every commandment that God gives. And while she left the condemned city and sacrificed her home, yet in a moment of doubt she looked back, committing the act that she was positively told not to do. "Look not behind thee." And immediately she did so she was turned into a pillar of salt. I know that the world does not believe the story. Be that as it may, let me read you what someone has said about it: "Lot's wife did turn back to view the city as she went from it, although God had forbidden her so to do, was changed into a pillar of salt; for I have seen it and it remains at this day. That it was standing then is also attested by Clement of Rome, contemporary of Josephus. As also that it was in the next century attested by Irenias. Whether the account that some modern travellers give be true that it is still standing, I know not," (Josephus' "Antiquity," book 1, chapter 1, page 40. Wiston Edition) and notes. Again, "Near the sea on the west side is Sodom Mountain, which contains a salt stratum; while a short distance from the base is a column or figure on an oval pedestal, which is of saline property, except the apex, which is limestone. This pillar is supposed to be the transformed wife of Lot, a supposition which Josephus also expresses." (Talmage's Story of Bible Lands, page 114.) The point I want to make is that human reason would reject such a story, such a commandment as God gave to Lot; but Divine faith inspired him to leave the city and he was saved.

What Caused Jericho's Fall?

I now call your attention to Joshua 6: 1-20, and I will here admit that measured by human reason this commandment would be rejected by almost anybody. God commands Joshua to go and take the City of Jericho. He goes up to the city, but discovers that it has massive walls. All the implements of war in their possession were inadequate to remove so much as a single stone from that great wall; so Joshua appeals to

God. (You know, in those days God used to speak to His people.) And this is what the Lord told him to do—and from a human point of view, if you ever heard anything more silly than this I should like you to tell it to me. God says (paraphrased), “Walk around the city once; do it for six days, and the seventh day walk around it seven times. Blow on rams’ horns and shout, and the wall will fall.” Hump, says someone, think of that; walk around the city! Why, the people had been doing that for hundreds of years. Walk around it seven times in one day—why, what good would that do? They did it, however; but there is no account that a single stone was moved. The priests took up the rams’ horns as commanded, and blew on them, but this performance did not cause a stone to shake. Then the people shouted, and the record says the walls fell down. Well, some folks say that that never transpired, and that no one has ever been able to discover any ruins of Jericho. Let us see. The following is taken from the Toronto Telegram, January 28, 1899: “Find Walls of Jericho”—German Archeologists’ Expedition uncovers the walls of the city—“Excavations which have been carried out on the supposed site of the ancient Jericho by the Deutsche Orient Gesellschaft have given interesting results. After a week’s digging the exterior wall of the vanished city, consisting of three parts was encountered at the depth of eight feet below the surface. The natural rock foundation is overlapping with a loam and fine gravel, a metre or so deep, upon which a sloping rubble wall, heavily bulging externally, is super-imposed to a height of twenty feet, the breadth being from six and a half feet to eight feet, enormous blocks are partially employed for the lower part of the wall. Every interstice is more carefully filled in so far as to offer no advantages to the implements of destruction of a hostile force. Upon this imposing foundation is the fortification wall proper, built of clay bricks. Half of the 900 yards—the length of the walls—has already been uncovered.”

So much for the infidel attack that says no such a place ever existed.

But now, while you are thinking about it, what was it that caused those walls to fall down? Was it the walking around, or the blowing on horns, or the yelling?

A Leper’s Faith.

I am going to call your attention to another point, and then I presume I must close. Second Kings 5: 1-14. Here is related the story of a man smitten with leprosy. This dreadful malady had baffled the powers of all the learned physicians of that time. But he hears the testimony of a little girl about the great prophet of God, Elisha. He comes to him, decked in all the splendor of his office and he regalia of state. He presents himself at the door of the prophet’s house, but the prophet never came out. Now, apply human reason to this, when it is remembered that he brought gifts to the value of \$77,940 with him to give to that prophet, including ten changes of clothes. Yet the prophet never came out to see him, but sent his servant telling him to dip seven times in Jordan. 10th verse: “Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean.” Now, says one, if that is not a fairy yarn, I don’t know what is. Yes, measured by human reason, I admit it is a simple story. You might argue thus: “Will you tell me that a disease that has baffled the skill of all the physicians can be completely cured by just getting doused seven times in the water, head over heels. Well, it does look rather silly, doesn’t it? And so this leper thought as he turned away in rage with the words, “Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?”

and he strutted toward home. But the prophet could afford to be splendidly independent. He didn't have the leprosy; it was the other fellow. Again I say, it was God's right to command, and this man's duty to obey. But the trouble was, he didn't believe God; he was measuring this thing from a merely human point of view, and so rejected it. Travelling homeward, the servant came to him, and said: "My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? how much rather then, when He saith to thee, 'Wash, and be clean?'" And that that evidently struck a chord in the man's breast, and he knew that the servant had told the truth. Did he not come to do some great thing? Did he not come prepared to buy that coveted blessing with that great hoard of wealth, that was rejected? Oh, if the rich could buy salvation from their standpoint, in their way, every rich man would have it hidden away in some great bank vault! But you can't purchase it that way. You must have that faith that will enable you to say, "Not my will, Thy will, O God, be done," and then that love that will submit to the commandments of God. And so this man, I say, thought the matter over and turned round and went back to muddy Jordan. I just imagine I see the motley crowd that followed him home. How human reason would yell, "There goes a foolish man down into the water, but see, he has come up again, and there is no effect, he is not changed. But he goes down a second, a third, a fourth, a fifth, a sixth time and still no change. But watch him the seventh time, for he comes up with his flesh upon him as pure and as clean and as healthy as a baby's. Measure that by human reason, and it is not true; but Divine faith made it a living reality to that man.

Faith's Achievements.

Now, in closing, let me ask you, Do you think it was that walking around the walls of Jericho, or that yelling, or that blowing of rams' horns that caused the walls to fall down? You say no; it was this: "God gave the commandment; the people threw aside human reason and rendered implicitly obedience to the commandment. They loved God; they believed in Him; and they gave evidence of their faith and love by rendering obedience to Him. What was it that cleansed the leper? Was it the waters of Jordan, the dipping seven times? No, for if there was any medicinal properties in the water of Jordan to produce this wonderful effect, why, all the lepers would have gone down there and dipped themselves. But the prophet says there was only one leper healed in that time. What was it then? The man repented of his rebellion against God; he exercised his faith in God; he did as he was commanded to do; and it pleased God, and God gave His blessing.

Oh, says one, that is it; that is faith versus human reason. Yes, Well now, in closing, what do you think about baptism by immersion for the remission of sins? Oh, you say, I don't think water baptism will soak out sin. No? Human reason again. But the Bible says that upon a proper faith and a genuine repentance, we must be baptized for the remission of our sins. The Bible declares that they went down into the water, and they came up out of the water. Human reason says, "Oh, I don't think there is anything in the water. True, I don't think there was anything in the yelling to cause the walls of Jericho to fall down. I don't think there was anything in the water of Jordan that cleansed the leper. But we have admitted that it was the loving obedience to God, and the exercise of faith in the command that seemed to be contrary to human reason. Why, then, will you not come with me a little farther and see the

necessity of baptism for the remission of sins? God sent John to preach baptism for the remission of sins, and Jesus endorses John's preaching. He commanded the disciples to preach it, and they taught it and practiced it. Moreover, the Bible is quite clear, saying, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Act. 2: 38.

Now, which is going to govern you in this matter, human reason or Divine faith? Christ settles this matter by saying, "Verily, verily I say unto you, except a man is born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God"; John 3-5. And clinched it by saying, "If you love me, keep My commandments." John 14:15, 23.

That God may help you to throw aside this human reason that measures or seeks to measure Divine things by human thought, and to receive with meekness the ingrafted word, which is able to make you wise unto salvation, is my prayer.

The Bible Supported By Profane History

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the prophecy of Daniel, 2nd Chapter, forty-fourth verse, where you will read these words: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."

Sometime since, in Western Canada, I met a gentleman who took the position that the Bible was the word of man, that it was deception from beginning to end. After listening to our discourses several evenings, he said he was willing to say that if there was any truth in the Bible, the Latter Day Saints had it; but he doubted the Great Book, he believed it was a book of lies, that it had been written by certain men for the purpose of securing and maintaining undue influence over their unthinking dupes. Now, to my mind, the Bible proves itself to be of Divine authenticity because of the literal fulfillment of the prophecies recorded therein. We will examine a few of them tonight, so far as we have time and ability and the Spirit of God to assist us. We will try to lead your thoughts into two channels: One the sacred history, and show that it is supported by profane history; so that if, perchance, there may be some present who have no faith in the Divine authenticity of the record, called the Bible, we hope that we may be enabled to convince them by the history of nations, showing forth the fulfillment of these prophecies, that there is a God, and that He has ruled, and is still ruling, the destiny of nations; and that He has revealed His mind and will to the sons of men in the prophetic declarations found in the Bible; and that many of those prophecies have met with a literal fulfillment. Our text refers to a kingdom that God is going to set up in the days of certain kings.

Matter Is Eternal.

The history of this world, so far as we have it in the record and according to the chronology which we have, states that the earth was created, or organized, from existing elements, or matter, about four thousand years before Christ was born. I might state here that I do not agree with the thought as stated in some of the creeds, that God made this world out of nothing about four thousand years B. C., but I do believe that matter is eternal, and that God condescended to reveal to Moses but a brief history of this world, after He had organized the matter into the conditions in which man found it.

Date of the Flood.

The next great event was the deluge, which took place in the year 1556 of the world, or two thousand three hundred and forty-eight years before Christ. After the deluge it is said that the world was peopled by the family of Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth; and it is further said that Shem went to Asia, Ham to Africa, and Japheth to the islands of the sea in Europe. The first kind of government was the patriarchal or that of

the father of a large family, to which succeeded the monarchical or government of kings. But a king in the early days of the world was simply the chief of a tribe, or the ruler of a small territory. Nimrod, the great grandson of Noah, appears to have been the first person who assumed sovereign authority. About one hundred years after the deluge he built Babel, the germ of the celebrated City of Babylon, and three other cities in the same territory. About the same period Asher, a son of Shem, built Nineveh on the Tigris, which was called after his successor, Ninus. Babylon was conquered by Ninus and gradually enlarged by him, and also by the celebrated Semiramis, his wife, who reigned after him. These celebrated characters laid the foundation of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires, which constituted the first great monarchy of antiquity.

The Empire of Babylon.

I now introduce to you the young and gifted prophet, Daniel, where he is called upon to give the interpretation of a dream of King Nebuchadnezzar's. The interpretation of the king's dream given to Daniel, as recorded in the 2nd Chapter of this prophecy, together with Daniel's vision of the four beasts, as recorded in the seventh chapter, gives the history of the kingdom of the world from first to last, and shows how in the latter days God will establish His Kingdom, never more to be thrown down. I now invite you to a careful examination of these kingdoms from both the sacred and profane histories. The Babylonish empire in this vision is known as the head of gold. In the 7th Chapter of Daniel the same empire is recognized under the similitude of a lion. Under Nebuchadnezzar, whose doings are recorded in holy writ, Babylon became the greatest monarchy which the world has ever known. Nebuchadnezzar conquered Egypt and attacked the Syrians, then the greatest commercial power of the world, and after a siege of thirteen years destroyed their capital. He also carried the Jews captive to Babylon and thus put an end to their monarchy. (See Jer. 25: 8-12.) The number of victories gained by this king, the extent of his conquests, and the magnificence of his capital, began at last to fill his mind with pride and vanity; he became insane and was for a time driven from the society of men, and he lived for seven years with the beasts of the field, eating grass like the oxen. He was, however, restored to his mind and kingdom, and died within a year after, acknowledging the only Living and True God. His death occurred 567 years before Christ.

Modern Testimony to Bible Truth.

Those critics who hunt for flaws in the Bible, and who think they have found one in the relegation of the mighty and powerful King Nebuchadnezzar to the society and diet of the beasts of the field for seven years, will find poor consolation in support of their views from the following clipping taken from The Kansas City Journal, of several years ago, headed: "Man Who Lived As An Ox, Dies."

"KOMOKO, Ind., June 24.—Dr. Edward Stanton, a character of this place for sixty years, died to-day, aged eighty years. Some years ago Stanton lost his practice and fortune, and it affected his mind. Since then he has imagined himself an ox, and grass and hay was his principal diet. He walked on all fours in the pasture of the country farm, grazing constantly with the cattle, horses, and sheep. He almost lost his power of speech, and of late years his conversation consisted of guttural sounds, resembling those of an animal. He died suddenly, with mouth and stomach filled with grass. It is thought poisonous herbs killed him."

Cyrus Takes Babylon.

But to resume. The last king of this great empire was Belshazzar. The manner of his death and the destruction of his kingdom, I will now proceed to relate. Cyrus, who afterwards became the king of the Medes, having added to his domains all the kingdoms of Asia Minor, marched into Syria and Arabia, which submitted to his authority. He next entered Assyria for the purpose of reducing Babylon. Belshazzar having met him in battle and been defeated, fled to his stronghold, to which Cyrus immediately laid siege. It is said he took the place, as was predicted by the prophets. (See Jer. 25:12, 13; Isaiah 45:1-13), though it was for good reasons considered impregnable. The walls were built of brick and cemented with bitumen; they were 350 feet high, 87 feet thick, and 60 miles in circumference; and where they were not surrounded by marshes they were defended by towers filled with armed men. Of these towers there were two hundred and fifty. The city, when Cyrus laid siege to it, was furnished with provisions for twenty years; besides, there was within the walls a large extent of ground suitable for tillage and pasture. After two years of fruitless attempt to invade the place, Cyrus succeeded in taking Babylon by extraordinary stratagem. He chose a night which he knew would be devoted by the Babylonians to feasting and drunkenness. He had the course of the Euphrates River, which flowed through the city, turned into the great lake, made to receive its superfluous water. This lake was thirty-five feet deep, thirty-six square miles in extent. The water being thus diverted, made the river fordable, and the troops were enabled to enter the city by its channel. This they did about midnight, both at the place where the river enters and where it leaves the city. Belshazzar was surprised, and slain in the midst of his impious revelry; and his kingdom, as the prophets had announced to him, was divided and given to the Medes and Persians (Dan. 5: 24-31).

The Jews Restored.

Babylon was captured by Cyrus in the five hundred and thirty-eighth year before the Christian era. By the capture of Babylon, the Jews were liberated after a seventy years' captivity, as had been predicted by the Prophet Jeremiah. Cyrus not only permitted them to return to their native kingdom, but encouraged them to rebuild their city and temple. Esdras and Nehemiah, and Zerubabel, were their leaders on this occasion. (See Ezra 1:2, Isa. 55:1-13; Jer. 51, entire). In Daniel, second chapter, this monarchy is known as the arms and breasts of silver. In the seventh of Daniel this same kingdom is described under the similitude of a bear. Cyrus was the founder of the Medo-Persian empire, the second great monarchy of antiquity. He was one of the most celebrated monarchs of all times. He it was who blended the Medes and Persians into one kingdom. He died honored and beloved, not only by his own people, but by the numerous nations which he had conquered, and so great, so enduring was his fame, that we find his name celebrated in the annals of the east, the writing of the Greeks, and the record of inspiration.

Tyranny and Blood-shed.

On the death of Cyrus, his son, Cambyses, succeeded to the empire. The son was foolish and vicious as his father had been wise and virtuous; he killed himself with his own sword by accident, thus the world was delivered from his cruelty and oppression, and an impostor took the throne. The latter was soon dethroned and slain by seven Persian nobles, and the crown was given by lot to one of their number, called Darius. He was the last of this line, and was conquered by Alexander the Great, in the year

330 B. C. In Daniel 2:32, of the metallic image, the stomach and thighs thereof represent this kingdom; and in Daniel, 7th chapter, it is under the similitude of a leopard.

Death of Alexander.

The Greek or Macedonian Empire was the third great monarchy of antiquity. Alexander the Great, at the age of twenty-five, left his native country with an army of thirty-five thousand men for the conquest of the world. He attacked the Persians upon the banks of the river, plunged his horse in and directing his army to follow. They crossed and attacked the Persians, who sought to oppose them on the banks with many times their number, but were ignominiously defeated. Alexander the Great then went from nation to nation, bringing all under subjection to him, and having conquered the world, he died at Babylon at the age of thirty-two years. When Alexander died in the year 323 B. C., his kingdom was divided into four kingdoms by four generals of his army. These kingdoms were known in history as Egypt, Syria, Macedonia and Thrace, with some other regions of Asia Minor. (See Dan. 8:19-25 and Dan. 7:6.) All these kingdoms were overthrown by the Romans, who established the fourth great empire of antiquity, some twenty-five years before the Christian era.

The Roman Empire.

The Roman Empire in the metallic image, Dan. 2nd chapter, is known as the legs of iron, while the seventh chapter of Daniel describes it as the horned beast. Rome is said to have been founded by Romulus, from whom it took its name, about seven hundred and fifty years B. C. Rome was constantly at war with surrounding nations, and every battle brought them territory and power. This spirit of conquest led the victorious Romans from kingdom to kingdom until the entire world then known became subject to their sway. About the period of the Christian era, the Roman power was at its height.

In verification of this statement, that the fourth great monarchy was at the zenith of its power when Jesus was born, during His life, and for some time after His crucifixion and ascension, I submit the following: First, Jesus was born in the days of Herod the King (Matt. 2:1; Luke 1:5; also "Jewish Antiquities," by Josephus, 18th chapter, Whitson edition, page 472); second, Herod and Pilate were Roman authorities; they both tried, and Pilate condemned Jesus to death (see Luke 23, Matt. 27, also Joseph's Jewish Antiquities, 18th chapter, verses three and four; also Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. 2, 16th chapter, pages 16-17); third, Caesar Augustus was Emperor of Rome, and about the time of Christ's birth sent forth a decree that all the world should be taxed (see Luke 2nd chapter, 1st verse; also Josephus' Antiquities, book 18, chapter 2, page 474); fourth, Roman soldiers arrested Christ (Matt. 27), and hung Him on the cross; pierced His side with a spear, and cast lots for His vesture (John 19:1-36); Fifth, a Roman seal was placed on the stone of the sepulchre, and Roman soldiers watched the grave (Matt. 27:27-66).

Jerusalem Destroyed.

From the prophecies of the Bible and writings of Josephus, Gibbons and other historians, we learn that the Roman Empire was in power before Christ's birth, during His life, and for hundreds of years after Christ had gone to glory. I have been very careful upon this point, because upon it depends much which may be seen later on. About forty years after the death of the Saviour, Titus, a Roman general, laid Jerusalem waste, destroyed the walls, burned the city. The soldiers also destroyed the temple by fire; they slaughtered the Jews, until the blood ran down

the streets to such a degree, that history says it extinguished fire in many of the houses. Many of the young and strong were sent as slaves to the Egyptian mines (see Jer. 44; Hosea. 9). Others were sent into the provinces that they might be destroyed by wild beasts. During these days there perished for the want of food, 11,000; 97,000 were carried away during the war; 1,100,000 perished during the siege (Josephus, book 6, chapter 8-9), Archbishop Usher says there were 1,337,490 Jews slain or otherwise destroyed during seven years (see Josephus, book 6, chapter 9, page 737). There were 1,758,690 Jews slain in all the different parts of the land during the great war. (Testimony of the ages, page 707.) While, as you may see, the historians differ to the extent that we cannot tell the exact number that perished. But all agree that many thousands were slain by this power. This, the Roman Empire, is known as the iron kingdom in Daniel 2:40, did "break in pieces"; or, as Daniel 8:19-25, says, a king of fierce countenance would "destroy the holy people." Thus the history shows that this Roman power did destroy the Jewish nation, took Jerusalem, laid low the mighty and holy people. Many of the primitive Christians, also the Saviour of Men, were slain by this Roman Kingdom.

The Church Fell From Grace.

We have here furnished indubitable testimony that Christ lived, organized his church, and suffered crucifixion during the days of this fourth monarchical government, the Roman Empire. We will now proceed to show as fully as our ability and time will permit, that that church went into an apostacy. In Matt. 11:12, Christ foretells the destruction of the kingdom that He there established, in these words: "From the days of John the Baptist unto now, the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." The Bible and other histories show that the officers and subjects of that kingdom did suffer violence, and the law was changed; and finally the kingdom, as established by Him, was destroyed. As Christ dated the beginning of the destruction with the death of John the Baptist, let us see how he died: (Matt. 14-10). John was beheaded in Jerusalem. (Matt. 27). Jesus was crucified in Jerusalem. History differs regarding dates in some few places, as to whom and where the leading officers of the Kingdom of God were killed, but all agree that they suffered martyrdom.

Christ's Apostles Were Martyrs.

I will not quote from the celebrated author, Rev. J. A. Wood, in "Perfect Jewels," page 250. He says: "Matthew suffered martyrdom by the sword in Ethiopia; Mark was dragged through the streets of Alexandria until he expired; Luke was hanged upon a tree in Greece; James the Great was beheaded at Jerusalem; James the Less was thrown from the pinnacle of the temple, and beaten to death with a fuller's club at Jerusalem; Philip was hanged at Phrygia; Bartholomew was flayed alive; Andrew was crucified on the cross; Thomas was pierced through with a lance; Jude was shot to death with arrows; Simon Zelots was crucified; Mathias was beheaded."

I have assisted the above quotations with references from Bishop Noethan's works on Christianity. Prior to the martyrdom of the faithful, they saw and foretold that the kingdom established by Christ would be destroyed, until finally the Church or Kingdom would be engulfed by the Roman Catholicism. Note the following: False prophets and apostles and teachers, would come in place of true ones. (Rev. 2:2; Cor. 11:13; Acts 15:24; Matt. 24:10; 2 Peter 2:1-22; 2 Tim. 4:3). Men in the Kingdom were to apostatise from the true faith and lead many after them. (Acts 15:2; 2 Tim. 4:3; Jude 18). Hear the sad and bitter wail of Paul, when

just before his martyrdom, he saw the apostacy of the church. (2 Thes. 2:1; 2 Tim. 1-15). This shows that not only the heavenly ordained officers were to be destroyed, but that also the law of the kingdom would be no longer respected. They changed the ordinances and broke the covenants (Isa. 24:5), and God poured out the Spirit of deep sleep upon them, and their fear toward God was no longer by the law of the kingdom, but by the precepts of men. (Isa. 29). John, the beloved apostle, whom they tried to kill at Rome by putting him in a caldron of boiling oil, but who escaped by the power of God, was soon after sent an exile to the Isle of Patmos. There God showed him the awful condition of the few churches that were then struggling for an existence. (See Rev. 3:1-6). Time passed and the apostate church, now depleted of true apostles and prophets, had her headquarters in a city of seven hills. All who have read history are aware that Rome was once called the City of Seven Hills. (See Gibbons' Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. 1, page 536; Smith's Bible Dictionary; Article Rome, page 588; Gardner's Christian Cyclo; page 788; Newton on Prophecies, page 527; Barnes on Revelation, pages 239-346-434). These agree with Rev. 17:9. The revelation clearly indicates that the headquarters of the Apostate Church would be in the City of Seven Hills, known to the world as Rome. Gibbons in his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. 1, page 36, says: "Christ applied the epithet of the mystery Babylon to the seat and empire of Rome.

Suffering For the Faith.

It will not be expected in this short address that I should martial all the historians in support of the statement that the Roman empire drank the blood of the saints; but those who wish to read of the sufferings of the early saints and the apostacy that ensued, are requested to read Gardner's History of Christianity, Vol. 1; Gibbons' Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire; Vol. 2. The Christians suffered everything in the way of torture as long as they were faithful; they were nailed on crosses, sewed up in the skins of wild beasts, and exposed to the furious dogs; others were smeared over with combustible material and used as torches to illuminate the darkness of the night in the gardens of Nero. (See Gibbons; Vol. 2; Chap. 16). The Christians gradually gave way, and finally, it is said, after the conversion of Constantine in the early part of the fourth century, the church rapidly merged into the Romish state. The Rev. Father Richard Brennan in his History of the Catholic Church, speaking of this event, says: "On the third day of October, 312, Constantine was about to engage in a battle at the Melvian Bridge, which is before the gates of Rome. He saw with extreme anxiety the superior forces of his enemy, and his heart was filled with sad forebodings of an unfavorable result; when, happening to raise his eyes to the clouds, he beheld a brilliant cross, bearing the inscription: 'In-hoc signo vinces.' By this sign thou shalt conquer.' He at once attached the sign of the cross to his imperial flag, and soon gained a brilliant and decisive victory over his opponents. Immediately all the cruel and bloody edicts against the Christians were repealed by the state, and glorious temples were erected for Christian worship."

The Church's Fatal Compromise.

John Wesley in his 94th sermon, speaking of this event, says: "The Christians had all turned heathen again, and had no more of the Spirit of God than the rest of the world." He denominates the so-called conversion of Constantine as a fatal period. The church, now under the care of the Roman emperor, became proud, austere, dictatorial, and domineering. She vied with the heathen around about her for supremacy, and in order to induce them to join the church, incorporated into what they

called the Christian system, many of the heathen rites and forms and ceremonies. Thus she went deeper and deeper into the cess pit of idolatry, until the Reformation was brought about by some of her sons: Luther, Wycliffe, Calvin, Knox and others. The Book of Homilies, appointed to be read in the churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth, page 258, on the Pearls of Idolatry, says: "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects and degrees of men, women and children of all Christendom (a horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more."

Thus we have proved that the kingdom as established by Christ in the days of the Caesars, cannot be the one referred to in the language of my text, because it was established in the days of the fourth monarchy; it did not break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms, and it did not stand forever, but went into an apostasy, as the prophets and Christ said it would. This, the Roman Empire, known as the Iron Kingdom (Dan. 2nd chapter), did break in pieces and bruise; or as Daniel 7th chapter, called it—The great beast with iron teeth, which would destroy and break in pieces; or as Daniel, 8th chapter says: A king of fierce countenance would destroy the holy people that is the apostles and primitive Christians, including our Saviour were slain by the authority of Rome.

Explanation of Daniel's Vision.

Having traced the Kingdom of God as established under the Caesars of Rome, from its organization to its destruction and apostacy, let us follow the Roman empire, the fourth great monarch of antiquity, or the iron kingdom of the metallic image, as described in Daniel, 2nd chapter, verses 41 to 43, where Daniel describes the lower extremities of this great image. He says of the feet and toes of the image were part of iron and part of clay. He foresaw that the Roman empire should be divided; it would be partly strong and partly broken. The clay represents the religious, while the iron the political, conditions of the divided empire. History shows the Roman empire was divided into eastern and western empires, A. D. 395. The capital of the former was Constantinople, and the latter, Rome. In the 7th chapter of Daniel, he is perhaps a little plainer in his description, and goes more fully into the division of the Roman empire. He shows that the fourth kingdom, or beast with iron teeth, is to have ten horns. It is described in the second chapter as ten toes. Both of these refer to the kingdoms or kings that shall rise out of the fourth beast, or iron kingdom. Thus we discover that the fourth monarchy, the Roman empire, is to be divided into ten kingdoms.

The Ten Kingdoms.

We shall now proceed to show from history that such did transpire. "This fourth empire was governed in a different manner and by other maxims than any of the preceding, and in process of time it was divided into ten kingdoms, which have been thus numbered in the eighth century: First, the senate of Rome, 2nd the Greeks at Ravanna; 3rd, the Lombards in Lombardy; 4th, the Huns, in Hungary; 5th, the Alemanes, in Germany; 6th, the Franks in France; 7th, the Burgurdians in Burgundy; 8th, the Goths in Spain; 9th, the Britons; 10th, the Saxons in Britain. They are indeed reckoned up in several ways by different writers, according to the dates assigned to their enumeration; but in general it is clear that they were nearly the same with the principal kingdoms in Europe at this day. It is certain that the Roman empire was divided into ten kingdoms, and though there might be sometimes more and sometimes fewer, yet they were known by the name of the ten kingdoms of the western empire.

("Cause and Cure of Infidelity," Nelson, page 76). In the above he is supported very largely, not only by Scott, but by Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Lloyd, and other writers which we have in our possession.

We Are the True Church.

In conclusion, permit me to say, that I have produced this evidence for two reasons. First, to answer the skeptic by showing that the prophecies of the Bible were wonderfully supported, in that their fulfilment is clearly shown by the history of the nations, and thus proving the statement made by Daniel—"There is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets and maketh known to the King Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days." And second, I have shown the fallacy of the claim so frequently made, that the church or kingdom established by Jesus Christ, in the days of the 4th monarchical government was the one referred to in my text, which should never be destroyed; which should not be left to other people; which would consume all these kingdoms, and stand forever."

I have given proof both from the Bible and the history that that church established by Christ in the days of Caesar went into apostacy; thus it did not fill this prophecy. I hope that I have impressed upon you another fact, clearly shown in our examination this evening; namely, that while Christ set up His church in the days of the fourth monarchy the Roman empire, and it was to go into apostacy, that in the latter days, in the hour of God's judgment, or in the days represented by the metallic image in its ten toes, as seen in Dan. 2nd chapter, or as the ten horns of the beast in Dan. 7th chapter, which both refer to the division of the fourth monarchy into ten kingdoms, that in the days of these ten kingdoms which the history already cited proved existed in the 19th century. God would again set up the kingdom, or establish the church, which should never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand forever.

The hour is late, your patience perhaps well nigh exhausted, but permit me to leave this closing thought with you: We claim as Latter Day Saints that this prophecy was fulfilled in the restoration of the gospel, the setting up of the kingdom, the organization of the church, in the early part of the 19th century, under the prophet Joseph Smith. In proof of this, I invite your attention to my former lecture, on "The Restoration of the Gospel" as it appeared in the Toronto World. In a future lecture I will continue this line of argument, and again show that the reformers so read the prophecies that they looked forward to the time when God would fulfil his promise and re-establish the church upon the New Testament plan, with inspired apostles, prophets, bishops and elders, and the spiritual gifts and blessings such as made the Church of Christ in the first century of the Christian era the wonder of the world. I thank you.

The Godhead

THE subject under consideration to-night is the Godhead. Permit me to draw your attention to the 17th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 22nd and 23rd verses, where you will read these words: "Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' Hill and said ye men of Athens I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious, for as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription: 'To the unknown God.' Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship Him declare I unto you."

From this reading you will observe that the Athenians were considered by the inspired Paul to be a superstitious people. The history of that people supports Paul in this statement. They have very many Gods, the God of Battle, the God of Love, the God of Rain, the God of Harvests, and the God for this, that and the other thing, and it would seem that in their superstitious idolatry they had finally concluded that having made a God for just about everything, they thought perhaps they had forgotten to make a God for some particular thing, and so in order to be on the safe side, they just made another one, and on it they wrote, "To the Unknown God." It will also be remembered that Paul recognized that they were a religious people and were devout and he acknowledges their devotion, but I apprehend that you will agree with me that devotion to that which is wrong will not make it right. In other words honesty and sincerity will never make a truth out of an error, and so Paul, denouncing their idolatry, yet took there very statutory for his text to present to them our Heavenly Father.

It is my pleasure to-night to present to you the Gods of Churchianity, and as Paul drew their attention to their God of marble, so from the catechisms and prayer books and confessions of faith, I am going to read to you the description of the God of the various churches, and in doing this, I wish to serve two purposes; first, to acknowledge that the main body may be devout in their worship, and second, I read their own definition of God from their own books, so that it will make it impossible for me to misrepresent them, and so I betake myself to the task, stating here and now I am reading the answer that the books of the various churches, which I have here in my hand. If I represent their idea of God as I find it in their own books, and if it looks silly, if it is contradictory to the Bible, please don't abuse me, but correct your theology. If the God described in your books is not the true God, get rid of it, and come to the God of our fathers, the creator of the heavens and the earth, the God described in the Bible. I may add here before reading these books that if the God described in the Bible is not the true God, then we have no Christianity and I humbly confess I know no other God than that described in the Bible. If the Bible, which contains the description of God, as given by the apostles and prophets and Jesus Christ, is a false description, then excuse me and lay the blame where it belongs, on Christ, on the Apostles, and on the prophets of the Holy Book. Our contention is that we stand with Paul to-night and perform the task and in the language of the text, say: "To the Unknown God whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." Now,

for a definition of the God of Churchianity, as given in their own books:

Roman Catholic—Question: "What is God? Answer: God is a spirit, eternal, independent, infinite, and immutable, who is present everywhere, who seeth all things, and governs the universe. Question: Why do you say that He is a spirit? Answer: Because He is a supreme intelligence, who has neither body nor figure, nor color, and who cannot fall under the senses."

Doctrine and Scriptural Catechism of the Catholic Church, by Rev. P. Collot. Published in Montreal.

Question: What are the five senses of animal life? Answer: "Smelling, tasting, hearing, seeing and feeling." Webster's Dictionary.

Church of England: "There is but one living and true God, everlasting without body, parts or passions, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power and eternity, The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost." Church of England prayer book. Article 1.

Presbyterian Church: "There is but one only living and true God, who in infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit; invisible without body, parts, or passions; immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of His own immutable and most righteous will for His own glory, most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and with all most just and terrible in His judgments; hating all sin, and who will by no means clear the guilty." Con. Fath. Ch. 2, Art. 1.

Methodist Church: "There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."—Methodist Discipline. Published Toronto, 1886.

Baptist Church: "We believe that there is but one God. We believe that God is revealed to us as the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Each with distinct personal attributes, but without division of nature, essence or being.

Manual of Baptist Church, Port Colborne catechism.

Churchianity claims that the God worshipped by them is the true God, and is referred to in the Bible. I answer, there are many gods referred to in the Bible, and I confess that the God described in the church creeds is spoken of in the Bible. In fact, there is a splendid discription of their god, recorded in the one hundred and fifteenth Psalm: "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; neither speak they through their throat." Now, you will admit that the gods here described is not the true God of the Bible, but they are idols, so your speaker is forced to believe, that the modern god, that can neither hear, smell, taste, feel, see, or speak, having neither body, parts or passions, is not the true God, but an idol of man creation. The Bhagavat Gheeta, one of the Hindoo aracular writings, speaks thus of Deity: "Being immaterial, he is above all conception, being invisible, he can have no form, from what we behold in his works we may conclude that he is eternal, omnipotent, knowing all things, and present everywhere. God is one creator of all that is, God is like a perfect sphere, without beginning or end." Ancient History, p. 240.

The religion of India, being older than any of the churchianity of the present time, it is possible that ancient mythology has in some way furnished the definition for the modern God. You will discover that there is not a great deal of difference between the heathen idea of God in this regard, and the description of God as given in the creeds of churchianity, nearly all of them defining God as being without either body, parts, or passions, everywhere and all over at the same time. A splendid definition of nothing, for you cannot conceive of a being that has neither body, parts or passions, that is all over at the same time, and that can neither see, nor hear, nor taste, nor smell. If that is not an "unknown God," so far as the Bible is concerned, then nothing is unknown. It shall be my purpose to-night to show you that the God of the Bible is an entirely different being to that described by the churches, and before I enter the discussion I want you to know this point, that if the church description of God is correct, then the Bible is not worth the paper it is written on, but if the Bible be the word of God, the truth, then your creeds are not worth the paper they are written on. And before God to-night, as jurors on this case, you must reach a decision and give a verdict as to which is true, the Bible or the creeds.

We propose and state unhesitatingly that we will stand by the Bible to the exclusion of every man-made creed that contradicts it. Now, do not get angry because I am trying to show you the difference between churchianity and Christianity. Now, to the Bible. Genesis, chapter 1, 26th and 27th verses, which reads as follows: "And God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness," so God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him. I have abbreviated this in order to reach the point that man was made in the image and likeness of God. To illustrate, suppose I have the marble figure of Napoleon Bonaparte on my left, would that not give you a fair conception of what he looked like? Someone would say that is the very image of Napoleon. That is to say, that is a good representation—it looks like him. Suppose on the right side I have a good photograph, or, as we used to call it, a likeness of Queen Victoria, and someone who has seen her would testify that it is a good likeness. Would that not give a pretty good idea of what Queen Victoria looked like? Now, God, in order to advise humanity just what He was, gave us a standing representation of Himself in the form of man. But someone tells me that that image means that man is the image of God morally. Well, now, that won't do, because some of the creeds that take that position, make out that man is morally depraved, while God is absolutely pure. Man is born in sin and shapened in iniquity, so you cannot take that position. But let us see if this word image and likeness can be fortified.

I draw your attention to the 5th chapter of Genesis, 3rd verse: "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth." Now, here are the words image and likeness used in regard to Adam and his son just as you read it in the first chapter concerning God and Adam. If one does not mean that Adam looked like God in form, then the other does not mean that Seth looked like Adam in form. He that would try to muddle these plain statements in order to support his creed, would make the Bible a book of nonsense, and at the same time would teach his hearers that language is not a science to convey ideas. Permit me to call your attention to another clear statement of facts: Gen. 32:24-30. Here you read of God appearing to Jacob, blessing him, changed his name from Jacob to Israel, and Jacob said of that memorable meeting: "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved."

Exodus 24:9-11, we are informed that Moses and seventy-three others of the elders of Israel "Saw the God of Israel." They describe Him as having a body, speaking of His hands and feet, and at that time they did eat and drink. Then Moses left the other elders and went up with God in the mountain, and Moses was there forty days and there received the tables of stone, on which God had written the Ten Commandments.

Genesis 33:11, "And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend" from the reading that follows it would seem that Moses or the people had displeased God, and He would not permit Moses or the people to see His face. But He said to Moses: "And the Lord said, behold there is a place by Me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock, and it shall come to pass, while My glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand, while I pass by, and I will take away mine hand and thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen." It is evident from reading the Bible and the different translations that at times God permitted men to see His form; they talked of His hands, His face, His feet. But it is also true that at times (perhaps, by reason of sin), (as some translations of the Bible show), that God would not permit, even His servants, to see His face, while as in the case just referred to, He permitted Moses to see His "back parts," but not His face, at that time. There is no parable about it, no metaphorical expression there, but the clear statement that Moses saw God and talked with Him face to face, just as one man would see another man and talk with him face to face. Jesus Christ speaking in John, chap. 5, 37th verse, of His Heavenly Father, says: "Ye have neither heard His voice, nor seen His shape." I emphasize voice and shape, for a God that has neither body, parts nor passions, has neither voice nor shape, but here Jesus Christ indicates that God has both. Hebrews 1:1-3 states definitely that Christ is the express image of His Father's person. Here God is a person and Christ is just like Him, the express image of His Father.

The next point, God has passions. What are passions? Love is a passion, hatred is a passion opposite to love. Anger is a passion, indignation is a passion, jealousy is a passion, wrath is a passion and the Bible describes the Almighty as having all these passions. Exodus 20 and 5: "I, God am a jealous God." That is clear that God has the passion of jealousy. Again, John 3:16: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." This shows that He has the passion of love. Now, I wish you to read at your leisure Nahum 1:2-6, He, God, is said to have the passions of jealousy, anger, fury, indignation, wrath and vengeance.

Here God has passions and the most wonderful exhibition of one of His passions is that He so loved the world that He gave His son to save it. But you tell me if God has body and parts and passions He is not present in person everywhere. I could keep you all night on this point, but shall only draw your attention to a few passages of scripture in support of the allegation just made. Genesis 11 and 5th tells the story of the wicked people building a tower to climb up to heaven in the case of another flood, and it says the Lord came down to see the city and the tower. I could not make this any plainer if I talked a month. If He came down, He was not here before His arrival. Genesis 18:1-33, gives the history of the Lord and two angels appearing to Abraham and after conversation and association with him for some time, it says: "The Lord went His way and Abraham returned to his place."

Now, you may tell me that this reference of the Old Testament refers to angels. Well, they speak of God and they speak of the Lord. Others may say, "Oh, no; it was not God, it was Jesus." Well, suppose it was, would you have the Son to be greater in power than His Father. You

speak of father and son, and both separately or altogether, have neither body, parts or passions, the only father I ever heard of that did not have a body and the only son that did not have a body. Mark you, the three of them is without body, parts or passions. Now, if you make out it was the son that appeared, yet it would not prove that God was omnipresent in person. It would not prove that God had no body. Let Jesus speak of this Himself, John 16:28: "I came forth from the Father into the world, again I leave the world and go to the Father." If that is true, then the Father is not omnipresent in person. Jesus came from heaven to the world, leaving the Father in heaven, and He taught us when you pray to say "Our Father which art in heaven." Luke 11:2. He locates God as being situated in heaven and the Bible supports that in many places.

I want to now draw your attention to Revelations 21:2-4, where you will read these words: "And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, and I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He shall dwell with them and they shall be His people and God Himself shall be with them and be their God, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain for the former things are passed away." Here we are told that God is first in heaven and the city leaves Him and comes down from Him to earth. Does that not prove that He is not omnipresent in person, and we are told that the tabernacle of God will be with men. I am not discussing that the body of God will be of the same gross material as ours is now. There are many different kinds of material, or matter. We are not discussing that to-night. Suffice it to say that God has a body, and that He comes and goes, and is not omnipresent in person, but that He has a real body is true, just as in the resurrection we shall have a real body and the promise is that He will wipe away tears from our faces, and will dwell with us, showing that He will be here personally, when this world will be redeemed.

Now, I wish to take another position: That God is omnipresent by His power. Psalms 139:7-9. I read this because it is a particular point: "Whither shall I go from Thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven Thou art there, if I make my bed in hell behold, Thou art there, if I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me." Notice "whither shall I go from Thy spirit?" God is everywhere present, but it is by the power of His spirit, and not in person. We are told here He is in heaven, but we are also told that He is in hell; also in the sea. The facts are God is in hell by the power of His law. He is in the sea by His power and hence we read: "They that go down to the sea in ships, see the glory and power of God." If God is in hell in the same way that He dwells in heaven, why did not Jesus teach them to pray: "Our Father, which art in hell," or better still, our Father, who art everywhere? The truth of the matter is, that God is everywhere by His power. The king of day while baptizing the world neath the halo of his glory, shows forth the power of God. The pale queen of night while in her majestic march through the heavens, exhibits the power of God. Ah, my friends, we see God moving in His matchless power as we listen to the wild roaring thunders, or the gentle zephyrs, in the wild white-crested waves, or in the babbling brooks. The very flowers beside the path bear testimony of the power of God. We see Him everywhere by His power, but not His person. Only those saints who

have developed character, have been highly favored to behold His face. But the promise is that "we shall see Him face to face."

But we are informed by these creeds that God is invisible. Let us see. If God is invisible, in that no one ever has seen Him, and no one ever will see Him, then down goes every hope held out in the Bible, if the blessed hope of seeing God, and dwelling in His personal presence is snatched from us. Then the Bible is a book of misrepresentations from Genesis to Revelations. I have already shown you tonight, that Moses and seventy-three elders saw Him. How Moses and Jacob saw him face to face, as a man speaketh to his friends. The Old Testament is supported in this doctrine by the writers of the New Testament.

Paul, in writing to the Hebrews, referring to those things I have read concerning Moses seeing God face to face, says: "For he endured as seeing Him who is invisible." Heb. 11: 27. Now we may ask, to whom is God invisible? The answer is: To those who are not yet prepared to see Him, or in other words, to those who are not "born again." To those who are carnally minded. But to those that make their calling and election sure, is the promise made "they shall see God." Paul informs us that the natural man, that is the unregenerated man, can neither see or know the things of God, but he promises that those that are born again may know the things of God. 1 Cor., 2: 1-14, and the Master Himself, supported this statement that when man is born again from the old existence into the new life he will be no longer blind, but may see. John 3: 3. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Christ also promised, saying: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." This is supported by the promise made to John, when in exile on the lonely island of Patmos, the Lord graciously shewed his true servant things to come. Here is what is said, "And I, John, saw the Holy City, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven. prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, and I heard a great voice out of heaven saying: "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." Rev. 21:2-4.

Take the hope of God coming to dwell with His people, and in a real way, wipe tears from their eyes, and remove sorrow from their hearts. and when you have taken those invulnerable promises away, you have crushed hope out of the saint's heart, and Christianity becomes a blank, an empty thing. Ah, my friends, I know that I preach a gospel that is not popular. I present a faith that is in direct opposition to the creeds of churchianity. But let the ice of tradition, priestcraft and idolatry as found in the cold and lifeless creeds, melt before the warm, loving promises of God, as found in the Bible. We need the old gospel, with its golden, glittering, invulnerable promises back again, to stem the tide of infidelity that has come in upon the world like a flood.

There is a real God, with body, parts and passions. He will come and dwell until the last pain will have passed away. When the last cry of sorrow is hushed. When the last tear shall by His own dear hand be wiped away. When with Him the saints shall dwell in the Holy City, with its golden streets, its pearly gates, its jasper walls, and God himself will illuminate this celestial splendor with the never-ending brilliancy of his own glory and personal presence. Compare this condition of things as

promised in the Bible, with the cold, contradictory and nonsensical, unreal dreams of the creeds, and you will see the power and love of God compared with the churchianity of man, and God grant that seeing the difference, you will have the courage to come out from Babylon and prepare for the coming of the King.

In conclusion, permit me to say that the Latter Day Saints, like the former day saints, stands out separate and distinct from churchianity on this question, and we sink or swim on this question. The first vision had by the prophet Joseph Smith, in the spring of the year 1820, while in prayer, 'neath the towering trees on the rear of his father's farm, he says, among other things: "When the light rested upon me I saw two personages, (whose brightness and glory defy all description), standing above me in mid air. One of them spake unto me, calling me by name, and said (pointing to the other): "This is my beloved son, hear him." Ch. His., Vol. 1, Ch. 2, P. 9.

If that vision is true, then God and Christ, as father and son, appeared to Joseph Smith, as separate personages; if it is false, then the claims made by Joseph Smith, for a restoration of true Christianity are false.

This vision is in harmony with the Bible, and I am willing to risk my hope for salvation on the Bible doctrine of the personality of God, as taught by Joseph Smith, and the Bible, prophets, and apostles, Jesus Christ Himself supporting it, as the record shows clearly.

May God help you to become acquainted with the true God, who may come to you tonight as the "Unknown God" is my prayer.

The Unchangeability of God

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the Book of Malachi, 3rd chap., 6th verse, where you will read these words: "For I am the Lord; I change not."

The subject for our consideration tonight is the unchangeability of God. If there were no other assurance given to us throughout the entire Bible, the text that we have selected ought to be sufficient, and is indeed a foundation upon which we may all build our hopes. But this is not the only text of scripture that supports the allegation that God is an unchangeable being. Both the New Testament and the Old is filled with statements declaring this great truth, that God is unchangeable. James, the brother of our Lord, in his letter, 1st chap., 17th verse, writes of the "Father of Lights with whom there is no variableness, neither a shadow of a turning." Here we have something very emphatic, that he does not deviate to the right, nor to the left, not a shadow of a turning. Paul, speaking of Jesus Christ, in Hebrews 13 and 8, refers to Him as follows: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever." The term may be understood as follows: Yesterday, referring to the past; today, embracing the present; and forever, referring to an undying futurity.

It is well that we have the character of God thus fortified in the record, because of the unenviable condition and the conglomerated confusion into which churchianity has fallen, compelling it to perpetually contradict God, and by way of an apology for their human systems, when confronted with the invulnerable and unchangeable promises of God, they whimper out, "Oh, well, things have changed; God does not demand that today, that's no longer needed, and this is abrogated." All this miserable subterfuge is a reflection upon the unchangeability of God.

God Is Not Fickle.

I am here to say that God is not a vacillating, fickle-minded, wavering being. If He were can you not see the vortex of despair into which the human family would be hurled? Where would we find security? Upon what could we base our trust? Hope would be assassinated, faith would be mangled, and trust in God would be destroyed, for if God changed in one matter, who is to say that he would not make up his mind to change in every other matter, and therefore where would be our security? Where our safety? Again, for God to change would make Him different to what He once was. He could not differentiate and be the same. He would either be better by change, or worse. He would either know more or less.

Now, just grasp whichever horn of this dilemma you wish. Will you tell me He has changed, and therefore is better than He used to be? If so, then there was a time when He was not as good as He is now. If the change has made Him to know more than He used to know, then He is not an Omniscient Being, and destroys the omniscience of God. In other words, to declare that He is limited in knowledge is at one stroke to deny the existence of an infinite being, for if He is finite in knowledge, finite in goodness, finite in power, then you have limited Him to the realm of

humanity, to say the least, and have stripped Him of the glory of divinity, if God has changed, how can you trust him? If he has become a vacillating or fickle-minded God, then there is no invulnerability about any promise He has made, yet the Bible says the promises of God are yea and amen.

Faith to All Generations.

Now, I believe with these thoughts before you, you have reached the conclusion, or at least have been converted to the great truth that God is an unchangeable being. The record informs us that God knew the end from the beginning, and therefore demonstrates the impossibility of His ever having been experimenting with the human family with regard to the best method of redeeming fallen humanity. We are forced to the conclusion that God being omniscient, and unchangeable, therefore His law devised by Himself for the reclamation and salvation or redemption of the human family must of necessity be an unchangeable law. I find that the Bible supports this allegation, also in Isaiah 59 and 21, the Lord says: "My word shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seeds' seed forever." This is supported in a statement found in Psalms 119: 89-90, where we are told: "Forever, oh Lord, Thy word is settled in Heaven, and Thy faithfulness is unto all generations." That is to say, God in Heaven, in the spiritualistic world, in the grand councils of eternity, devised a plan and inaugurated a system of law by and through which He would redeem man, and that law is unalterable, as unchangeable, as invulnerable, as the God who made it. It was settled in Heaven, He tells the Psalmist that he would be faithful to all generations.

Well, now, says one, now don't you think He would abrogate some part of that law. I remember the great Spurgeon, perhaps the greatest Baptist preacher that the world has ever known, in a lecture which he delivered in London, England, made a statement something like this: "You do not wear the same style of hats, or shoes and other clothing that your grandmothers and grandfathers wore. Things have changed to satisfy the development of man." Right here, let me interject the thought that if Brother Spurgeon lived tonight and had to sit behind a merry widow hat he would not declare that the change had been for the better. Again, he proceeded to say that the sewing machine, invented by Howe has passed away before the development of ingenuity and skill as we find it in the New Williams, the Wheeler and Wilson. The early threshing machine has passed away before the triumphant march of ingenuity and the development of skill, and so it is with the gospel. The gospel of the 19th century must be fitted to the people of the 19th century. We must develop with the times, or words to that effect.

His Plan Is Perfect.

Now, let us examine this. I admit freely that the sewing machine of Howe and the threshing machine of the Marsh boys has no place with the Massey-Harris thresher, or the New Williams' sewing machine. But why? Well, you say experience, study, examination, research, has developed the mind of man. I grant all that, but you just try to apply that to God and to the gospel and where does it bring you? You have practically to say this, that man has developed so rapidly that the Almighty has had to kind of sit up nights in order to study out a better scheme for redemption than He had formulated in the old days when He did not know so much. In a word, you tell me that God has to change His laws, His gospel, to suit and please and accommodate the education of man in the

twentieth century. I deny that with all the emphasis within my power. God, He is an unchangeable being on the one hand, while man is fickle and vacillating on the other.

Man Must Develop, Not God.

Man's highest development will be obtained when he thinks like God, when he sees like God. God has not got to hurry up in order to keep step with man, but man must rise in order to reach the throne upon which God reigns; that is the difference, my friends. Therefore, my contention is supported by this word that God's law is plain, His gospel is as unchangeable as He is Himself, and so I learn in the 19th Psalms, from the 7th to the 11th verses, something like this: "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul." Oh, said one, you are not converted according to the law. Well, many people are not, but the man that is converted in God's way is converted under the power and influence of the law of God, and hence the law of the Lord being perfect producing the desired effect, that is the conversion of the soul; two points are made there. First, the law of the Lord is perfect. Can you change a thing that is perfect and leave it perfect? If you make any alterations the thing that is perfect becomes imperfect. If that law had the effect desired, namely, the conversion of the soul, that's the desire of hearts, that's the ultimate of our desires to become converted to God, and the law of the Lord produces this change. It did it in the dear dead years of the past. Let that same law be put in operation in the same way and it will produce the same results to-day as it did in the days of old. That's what the world is crying out for. The potentiality that will bring redemption is what the world needs, and it is found in the unchangeable law or gospel and not in vacillating, contradicting churchianity.

His Word Shall Be Forever.

You may think that I am very strong on this matter, and very positive, but I cannot be more positive than the law itself. I draw your attention to Ecclesiastes 3: 14, 15 verses. They are so beautiful, so emphatic, that I crave your indulgence while I read them just as they are in the record. "I know that whatsoever God doth, it shall be forever. Nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it, and God doth it that man should fear before Him. That which hath been is now and that which is to be hath already been, and God requireth that which is past." If I were to talk a week I do not know that I could make that any plainer. It shows forth this wonderful truth, the unchangeability of God, the unchangeability of His plans, the unchangeability of His laws to all generations, or, as we read a moment ago, these facts were all settled in Heaven and can never be changed by general conferences, by any synod, by any diocese, by any man or set of men. I am ashamed to tell you that I have attended ministerial gatherings when puny man by human resolutions has sought to make inoperative the commandments of Jesus Christ. All I need to say to that is that it is a folly and a shame that such should occur among those professing Christianity, and God will never endorse any emendations tacked onto His commandments. In support of that I draw your attention to a New Testament scripture, Paul's letter to the Galacians, 1: 6-9. Paul had been travelling in a section of country where the people were getting real smart. They thought that they could improve upon God's plans. They had not denied the gospel in toto. Oh, no. If the leaders made an attempt of that character, the people would get their eyes open. A counterfeiter has for his object to make the counterfeit as near like the genuine as possible, so as to be able to deceive the people

without detection, and there is more counterfeit gospel circulated in the world than there is counterfeit coins, and the counterfeit is frequently more cleverly executed with regard to money than to gospel work.

Let Him Be Accursed.

But to the text. Paul, writing to them concerning their effort to change or make some counterfeit gospel said: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel, which is not another, but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." Here you will discover they were making the claim to preach the gospel, but they had made some change to please themselves, and Paul would not accept the alteration, but denounces it as a perversion of the gospel. They wanted to change it a little you see. Now listen: "But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed, as we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that you have received, let him be accursed." You notice the unchangeability of the gospel. It must not be perverted. No, not even by the angelic host, much less the resolution made by some quorum or council, conference or diocese.

Paul makes this point very clear. In Second Corinthians 11: 4-15, I quote the main points there made on the subject: "For, if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with Him. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ, and no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light, therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works."

A Silly Position Taken.

The time has come dear friends, when the people claim to have the Spirit of God, the Holy Ghost, but the fruits of the Holy Ghost, as described in the Bible, are not with them. In fact, they say that the gifts that were the fruitage of the Holy Ghost in Bible times are all done away. Hence, it is apparent that they have received "another spirit," and all that we care to say further on this point is that Satan has inspired "deceitful workers," and while they claim to admire the apostles of the Lord, they are false apostles in that they misrepresent the apostles of our Lord, while they claim to represent them. Sure, it is a fact that Satan's ministers have transformed themselves to appear as the ministers of righteousness, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. That is to say, even Satan will inspire people to make gospel claim in order, if it were possible, to deceive the very elect.

This same writer, in his letter to the Phillipians 3: 16, makes a statement that is worthy of your consideration. He says: "Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing"; and in Galicians 6:16, "and as many as walk according to this rule, peace be unto them." Now, you have a two-foot rule. The law says 128 feet makes a cord of wood. Supposing you advertise that you have a cord of wood for sale that only has 120 feet in it. You would be arrested for fraud. How would they decide that? By the rule. But suppose you were to whine out, Oh, I did not go by that rule, I have a rule of my own. "There are not 12 inches to the foot with me. I have one that about 8 inches makes a foot with me." What do you

think the magistrate would say to you? Brethren, you must be judged according to the rule. You must be weighed according to the scales, and the man found tampering with the scales is in a business that will bring him to the prison.

Meddlers Will Be Punished.

Well, the man found tampering with God's rule, with God's scale, he is in trouble here, and he will be in more trouble hereafter. You may not think that God has scales, but you will remember that it is said of some "thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting." (Daniel 5: 27.) There are weights and measures there, and rules there. There is a standard by which we are judged in statement, in creed, in gospel, and if it is not according to this unchangeable rule then we must reject it.

Our Creed.

The Latter Day Saints are considered a peculiar people, because they are endeavoring to walk by the same rule of law laid down by Christ and His apostles. They insist that God said what He meant and meant what He said, and the word of God must stand even though the creeds of men fall. They will not accept the creeds of men in place of the word of God, and we make bold to say that where the creeds contradicted the word of God, that the creeds are wrong, and the word of the Lord is true and will stand forever. We are teaching the same gospel that Christ and the apostles taught: Faith in God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; repentance, baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; the resurrection of the dead, the eternal judgment, the personal reign of Christ with His saints upon the earth, and the redemption of humanity through obedience to the unchangeable gospel. We refuse to compromise the word of God in order to be popular, but we stand in the old path marked out by the Master of men, and invite you to come to Him in His own appointed way, we call upon the people to embrace the fulness of the gospel as it is found in the Bible, as it was presented by Christ and His accredited representatives in the past, declaring to the people that God will accept them on the same terms that He accepted others in the dead past.

In closing, permit me to present a little picture, with the hope that it will emphasize the main position taken in this discourse. Christ said: "For whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and of My words, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when He shall come in His Own glory, and in His Father's and of the holy angels," Luke 9:26. Now, supposing that I reject all the creeds of men that differ with the words of Jesus, and stand up before the world in defence of every word He spoke, of every doctrine He taught, of every principle He advocated, will I be afraid to stand before him in the presence of His Father and the angels, when I can truthfully say, I was not ashamed of a single doctrine you taught, of a single principle that you advocated? ah, no, my friends, I believe that He will claim me as His child, and say to the Father: Father, here is one that was not ashamed to acknowledge My gospel just as I preached it. Now let him enter into my glory, let him partake of the rest that is provided for those that have kept My words. But, on the other hand, if I am ashamed of His words and declare that they have lost their virtue, and that something else have taken their place, I will fear to meet Him; I will call for the mountains to hide me from His presence. May God help us to believe Christ.

Our testimony to you in closing is that if you will render a perfect obedience to the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God, the perfect salvation will be granted to you according to the invulnerable promises made by the unchangeable God. I thank you.

Apostasy

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 11th chapter of the gospel as recorded by Saint Matthew and the 12th verse, where you will read these words: "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force." These words fell from the lips of Jesus Christ Himself, thus predicting an apostasy, a falling away of the church that He established.

The words kingdom of Heaven, sheepfold, bride, lamb's wife, are synonymous, conveying the idea of God's church or kingdom upon the earth. According to this prophecy of the Master, this kingdom or church was to suffer violence, and violence would take it by force. Now what do we mean by the word violent. Webster's definition is vehemency, profanation, outrage, wrath; so that in the process of time the evil force would abound, the church would be profaned and the power would overcome it. Now the word apostasy is defined by the dictionaries as follows: "renunciation of a religious faith." (Webster.) "This consists in the total renunciation of Christianity by embracing either a false religion or no religion at all. The offence can only take place in such as have once possessed the true religion." (Blackstone.) "Apostasy is of three kinds: that from the Christian faith; that from ecclesiastical obedience, and from a religious profession or from holy orders." (Catholic Dictionary.)

Kingdom Suffers Violence.

Now we want to follow this kingdom or church right from the days referred to by the Master—the days of John the Baptist—and we find that this forerunner of the Master met an ignominious death; he was beheaded. That was violence and force. A little later Jesus Himself was crucified, thus meeting a violent death; following that, we have the death of the apostles by violence. Peter is said to have been crucified head downwards; Paul beheaded; James the Great assaulted with clubs and thrown from the pinnacle of the temple; Thomas pierced to death; Bartholomew stoned, and so we might go on showing that every apostle met an ignominious death at the hands of mobocracy, save possibly John the Revelator. It is said that he was thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, but by the power of God made his escape, and there is no authentic account of his death and history records the fact that he is the only apostle whose grave cannot be located. Some are of the opinion that he never tasted death but is still living according to a promise said to have been made to him by Jesus Christ.

Not only did the apostles themselves suffer, but Jesus suffered—not only Christ but His followers. Indeed it is said by the Master Himself: "All that live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."

It hateth me, and it will also hate you. If they call the master of the house Beelzebub, what will they do to the household? The servant is

not above his master, and the time will come when they will kill you. They will think they are doing God's service."

Paul Prophecies An Apostasy.

The saints continued to suffer as long as they continued to live right; as long as the faith was kept inviolate so long did the fierce fires of persecution rage, and under this persecution men and women failed in courage and became more or less mixed up with the world to avoid persecution. No one likes to be ostracised. No one likes to incur the displeasure of their fellowmen, and so the church gradually lost the spirit, began to conform to the things by which they were surrounded and began to take on the complexion of other denominations. The world was gaining in power and the church gradually was losing its distinctive plea, until we learn in Matthew 24:12, "Because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold"—the church, losing a degree of the spirit, becoming more and more worldly, went farther and farther into sin, Second Thessalonians 2: 7; Paul, speaking of the apostasy of the church and describing the man of sin that will assume to be like God and sitting in the temple of God, declares further that there will be a falling away and "the mystery of iniquity doth already work." Acts 20:29,30, where Paul again in prophecy says: "After my departure wolves shall enter among you, not sparing the flock, and men of your own selves will draw away disciples after them." Second Timothy 3:13, he says: "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." Again in Second Timothy 4: 3, 4, he declares that they will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears who will turn away the people from the truth and they will be turned into fables—a gradual departure from the truth to false doctrine and into the practice of iniquity. Titus 1: 9-11, Paul says: "They will teach things they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." That was the curse of the ministry then; it continued to be the curse; it is still the curse, for men sell themselves, put to silence their own conscience and worship at the shrine of a big salary and they teach that which is the most popular, which will draw the biggest audience and create for them the largest salary. I grant you that there are noble exceptions to this, but it is a fact that "the hireling ministry careth not for the sheep." That is a statement made by Jesus Christ. While they don't care much for the sheep, they do like their wool.

Paul, speaking at Corinth, First Corinthians, 5: 1, says: "There were fornicators in the church," and the condition of the church was so bad then that they had delved into worse sins than had been named even among the Gentiles. Even before the death of Paul we hear him bemoaning the fact that the church was going into all manner of iniquity. His epistolary addresses to the several saints are filled with this cry of iniquity that was coming into the church in the first century, and so he says to Timothy, so great had been the apostasy even at that time, Second Timothy, 1:15: "All they who are in Asia are turned away from me." Just think of that, my friends; the whole country of Asia, every former day saint that had embraced the gospel of God's dear Son had gone into apostasy. He relates how the ministry themselves were leaving him. "Demos hath forsaken me," and so he calls to mind a number of the brethren that had left the ministry for the evil of the world until Paul cried out in one of his statements, "Only Luke is with me," but he prayed that God would continue to have mercy upon them.

What Peter Himself Says.

Peter, speaking along these lines, gives evidence. He says: "As there were false prophets in the past, so shall there be false teachers among

you (the church) who shall privately bring in damnable heresies." Second Peter 2:1-2. Permit me to read from a work entitled, "The Faith of Our Fathers," by Cardinal Gibbons, page 87-88: "Our blessed Lord in constituting St. Peter prince of his apostles, says to him: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' Christ makes here a solemn prediction that no error shall ever invade His church; and if she fell into error, the gates of hell have certainly prevailed against her. If the prediction of our Saviour about the preservation of His church from error be false, then Jesus Christ is not God, since God cannot lie. He is not even a prophet, since He predicted falsehood; nay, He is an impostor, and all Christianity is a miserable failure and a huge deception, since it rests on a false prophet."

Not so fast, Mr. Cardinal. Christ did not say that the church would not fall into error. He never hinted that the church would not imbibe heresy. There is nothing in the prediction that says error would not come into the church. Christ did not say that the church would not fall away, and furthermore, Christ had no reference to the individual Peter. Christ would have been in big business to build his church on a man who after that statement was made, cursed and swore till the air was blue with profanity, declaring time after time he did not know Jesus Christ. Peter was mistaken many times in his life, and Paul, writing in later years, says of Peter: "I withstood him to the fact because he was to blame." That is a poor sample for a Pope that is infallible. Jesus knew the church would fall, as the statements already given prove, but the principles upon which the church was built would not change. That divine rock, the eternal revelation that Jesus was the Christ was the power upon which the church was built and the gates of hell should not prevail against it. Mark that little word "it." That did not refer to Peter. He did not refer to Peter as an "IT," but he referred to the principle, the great principle of divine communication from God to man would continue to reveal the centralizing truth of Christ, the truth around which all our hopes and aspirations revolve, the grand central illuminating truth that will glorify the whole world eventually—that truth that Jesus is the Christ. That is the great point that even the gates of hell shall not prevail against. Not the church organization at all. The cardinal is mistaken. Jesus was not a false prophet, but the church did fall. I will take that up in a later sermon. Peter himself, who is said to be the one that Christ referred to and one that the cardinal makes mention of is right up against the cardinal himself. The cardinal says that the church could not entertain error or heresy, and Peter says that they will bring in damnable heresies. Peter versus Cardinal Gibbons. Take your choice.

Heresies Introduced.

Now what were these heresies that came in? I want to read you one of the great heresies. "What renders this highly probable is that the most urgent necessity required it being done. For not long after Christ's ascension into heaven several histories of His life and doctrines full of pious fraud and fabulous wonders were written by persons whose intentions perhaps were not bad, but whose writing discovered the greatest superstition and ignorance. Nor was that all. Productions appeared which were imposed upon the world by fraudulent men as the writings of the Holy Apostles. These apochryphal and spurious writings must have produced a sad confusion and rendered both the history and the doctrine of Christ uncertain." Moshier, vol. 1, chapter 2, paragraph 17.

Now, I want to draw your attention to one of these spurious predictions. Come with me to the 6th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and

there you will read where several men had been ordained to the offices of deacons, or, as some would call it, bishops, and one of them was by name Nicholas. We find this man referred to in the second chapter of Revelations, 6th verse, where it says: "But this thou hast that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolantanes, which I also hate. So also thou hast them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes which thing I hate." 15 v. What was that doctrine? The doctrine of the Nicolaitanes was a community of wives. They believed in having their wives in promiscuous lewdness; they believed in promiscuous intercourse with women. (See Gardiner's Church Encyclopaedia, page 690; Buck's Theological Dictionary, page 408; and Barnes' notes on Revelations, 2 and 6.) These and other authorities convince me that this great man of the church introduced that awful system of polygamy, concubinage and other phases of lewdness that brought the church into disrepute. That was, I believe, the damnable heresy that Peter referred to here.

Now, all these false doctrines were gradually gaining sway. Of course, they came in as the apostles were killed, the church growing weaker and weaker and fraudulent and impious men came into the church and as a result we read: Rev. 2 and 2: "Thou hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars." Here you discover that after the true servants of God had been murdered in various ways, false men entered in assuming the position to which God had never called them, and the result was the church rapidly, and more and more rapidly went down into the meshes of superstition, priest-craft and idolatry.

John's Version of the Church.

And now I would draw your attention to the 12th chapter of the book of Revelations. I will not read this at length, but give you the salient points. John sees a woman clothed with the sun; the woman is the church. All Bible commentators, I think, without exception, will agree with that. Clothed with the sun, the gospel of Jesus Christ in all its glory. The moon under her feet, the old Mosaic law from which she had just passed. The crown upon her head and in that crown twelve stars, the royal priesthood and the first missionary quorum of the church—the twelve apostles. She brought forth a man child. And here we come to the parting of the ways. Many commentators say that the man child was Jesus. I don't believe that and I will just assign one reason. The church did not bring forth Jesus. Jesus brought forth the church. He said Himself: "You have not chosen me. I have chosen you and ordained you." What was this man child? The priesthood. And this man child was to rule all nations with the rod of iron. What was the rod of iron? The word of God. The picture continues as soon as the child was born it was caught up to God and to His throne and the woman fled into the wilderness. Ezekiel describing the wilderness, calls it the wilderness of the people. Now, turning to the 17th chapter, we see the woman again, but, oh, how changed. He sees the woman in the wilderness just where the 12th chapter said she was going sitting upon a scarlet beast, full of names and blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns, and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet, decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abomination and filthiness of her fornication and upon her forehead was a name written, "Mystery, Babylon, the Great. Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs, and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration. Further down it says: "And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains upon which the woman sits." Draw the line

of demarcation between the woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet and upon her head the crown with twelve stars, and then see her in later years sitting upon a scarlet colored beast. Every Bible commentator will agree with me that the beast here represents political power. Here was an ecclesiastical political force at work, church and state joined together.

What city is here referred to? Rome was built on seven hills and was known as "The Seven Hill City." (Barnes' Notes on the New Testament, page 239, 346, 437); Gibbons' Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, volume 1, page 536; Smith's Bible Dictionary, article Rome, page 588, and so I might go on for half an hour quoting authorities sayings that had reference to Rome. What about this scarlet colored beast? That is the color of the cardinal's dress; the hat, the cloak, the stockings; the entire body of the cardinal's carriage was scarlet and the trappings of the horses were of the same color. The inner color of the Pope's cloak is scarlet; the carpet on which he walks is scarlet; a large part of the dress of the Pope's body guard is scarlet. (Barnes on Revelations 17:4, page 430.)

"Having a golden cup in her hands." The papacy represents itself as a female extending an alluring cup to passersby. See engraving of Pope Leo XII. I have the picture of the engraving where the woman is sitting, extending the golden cup. (Barnes on Rev. 17:4). That this has reference to Rome, I think, will be admitted. Now, mark you, it is the same church, she claims to be the mother church. By the way, this refers to her as the mother of harlots. Who are the harlots? What else did she do? The woman was drunken with the blood of the saints. Has Rome filled that bill? Listen to the history: "Fifteen millions are said to have been sacrificed to the genius of Popery in about forty years. It has been computed that fifty millions of protestants have been the victims of persecutions of the papists and put to death for their religious opinions." (Buck's Theological Dictionary, article "Persecution," and Buck quotes from 14 different authors).

Christians Persecuted.

"From the first institution of the Jesuits to the year 1480, that is in little more than thirty years, nine hundred thousand Christians were slain in the Netherlands alone. The Duke of Alva boasted that within a few years he had despatched 36,000 souls, in the space of scarce thirty years. The inquisition killed 150,000 Christians." (Newton on the prophecies of Revelations 1:3-7, page 532). I want my audience to remember that I am not asking you to believe any particular statement that I make with regard to the Romanism of to-day. I may say personally that I have been as well treated by our Roman Catholic friends as I have by our Protestant friends, and while I do not hold them accountable for the dastardly deeds of their churches in former ages, yet I must submit to you that a church that was guilty of all this could not be the infallible, unalterable, unchangeable church of Jesus Christ. I want that considered.

The church went on growing weaker and weaker, until we reach the third century, when Constantine, the Roman Emperor was about to engage in a bloody battle outside the gates of Rome. (Oct. 3, 312 A. D.). He professed to have seen a cross in the heavens on which were written the words, "In hoc, signo vinces." Signifying, "By this sign thou shalt conquer." He immediately professed conversion to Christianity and by the vain imagination of his heart, thinking to promote the Christian religion, he not only repealed all the cruel edicts imposed on the Christians, but he heaped riches upon them and especially upon the clergy, until we find the bishops reigning upon thrones, wearing the mitre and having

their servants, and they became the most powerful potentates of the country. I might say that prior to the time of Constantine, during the great persecutions called the Ten Persecutions, the saints suffered everything. History says they were crucified, flailed, burned in houses, dipped in wax, tied to chariots, boiled in oil, held fire in their hands, scalded in hot baths, burned in lime kilns, flesh torn by hot pinchers, torn by wild beasts, scourged till the flesh fell off them, bound with hot chains; mothers just delivered, torn by wild beasts, rubbed with lime and afterwards flailed and burned on gridirons. (Buck's Theology; article "Persecutions" and Blanche's Book of Persecutions; pages 19, 40).

A Fatal Period.

But when Constantine was converted he repealed these edicts and persecution ceased, and the church had rest, but as John Wesley said: "I was a fatal period" because in place of the church being persecuted, she now had the sword of power placed in her hand. And now the scene is changed. It's a picture from life's other side, and the man and woman of any and every city that refused to bow to the church had to suffer. These wealthy and prominent bishops became frequently dictatorial and domineering and were continually fighting for position and place, until they gradually wore the thing down till they had four great leading bishops—the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople. They were the four great leading lights, but it did not stop there. Still the fuss went on. Who is going to be the greatest? and finally Rome overcame Alexandria and Antioch and they three formed the great church now represented by over 190,000,000 of people called Roman Catholics.

Constantinople revolted, and hence we have the Greek Church, with its 116,000,000 people. Hence the origin of the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand and the origin of the Greek Catholic on the other. They went on and on until the year 533, when Emperor Justinian declared papal power supreme; that the bishop, pope, papa or father of Rome was the daddy of them all. This did not exactly suit them all, and there was more or less stir until the year 606, when the Emperor Proclus declared the Pontiff the universal bishop. Now, I submit to you that the histories are not very explicit upon this point. They run all the way from those two dates, 533 to 606. Now, let us just take the middle point between those two dates—that is the year 570. I am not going to be able to make much of an argument to-night on dates, but I want you to remember this: That that year 570 is a wonderful, peculiar and interesting date. If I had the time I could read to you history that shows that around the year 570 rests the beginning of that period referred to in so many places in the Bible, where the Spirit left the church in its entirety and was to remain away for 1260 years, when by the hand of an angel the priesthood would be again restored in the latter days. Those of you who wish to continue with me in these lectures will see how this will be brought about.

I submit to you in Revelation 11:2; also 13:5 you read of a period called forty and two months. In Rev. 12:14; also Daniel 7:25; 12:7, you read of a period called: A time times and a half a time. In Revelations 12:6; also 11:3, you read of a thousand, two hundred and three score days. Num. 14:34; Ezekiel 4:6, you read that day in prophecy stands for a year. Now these forty-two months at thirty days to a month, bring you 1260 days. Now, it says one time, two times and then half a time. First in the singular, and then in the plural, making three times, and a half a time meant a year, which brings the number of days 1260. Again, one thousand two hundred and three score days is 1260 days. Now, in prophecy a day stands for a year, so that from the time of papal su-

premacny to the restoration by angel hands in the latter days will be just 1260 years. If the date 570 is the correct time, this will bring you to 1830, and on the 6th day of April, 1830, this church was organized! That is all I have time to say about the matter to-night. For proof that "time, times, and the dividing of time" "Forty-two months." "A thousand two hundred and three score days" means twelve hundred and sixty years, please read Newton, on Prophecy, page 211; Barnes, On Rev. 12, page 356; Nelson, On Infidelity, page 218.

History on Apostasy.

I want now to read you the history on the apostacy. This history will prove that the prophecies I have already quoted to you from the Scriptures have been literally fulfilled, and that the church established by Jesus Christ did go into apostacy. "The apostles being dead, everything came to pass as they had foretold. The whole Christian system underwent a miserable change. Christianity was maintained though under gradual decay during the first three centuries." (Buck's Theological Dictionary, page 475; Philadelphia edition, published 1830.)

In the very first society at Rome there were devisions and offences, but how early and how powerful did the mystery of iniquity work in the church at Corinth. Not only schisms, heresies, animosities, fierce, bitter contentions, but actual open sin. We meet with abundant proof that in all the churches the tares grew up with the wheat, and that the mystery of iniquity did everywhere work in a thousand forms. That grand pest of Christianity, a faith without works (let me say in parenthesis that the Methodist discipline in saying that "faith alone is a wholesome doctrine" here runs right up against John Wesley, who declares that the faith without works system is the grand pest of Christianity), that grand pest of Christianity a faith without works was spread far and wide when James wrote his epistle; the tares had produced a plentiful harvest. See chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5. There was strife, confusion, and every evil work. We easily see what was the state of the church in general from those seven churches in Asia. eW have been apt to imagine that the primitive church was all excellence and perfection, and such without doubt it was on the day of Pentecost, but how soon did the fine gold become dim; how soon was the wine mixed with water; how little time before the Christians were scarcely to be distinguished from the heathen. And if so bad in the first century, we cannot suppose it to have been any better in the second. Undoubtedly it grew worse and worse.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, in the third century, gives an account of his time. He says: "The converts practiced all kinds of abominations, exactly as they did before conversion." A Christian nation, a Christian city (according to the ancient pattern), was no longer to be found. Has the case altered since the Reformation? (John Wesley; sermon 66, Subject, Mystery of Iniquity).

"This was the real cause why the gifts of the Holy Spirit were no longer to be found in the Christian Church, because the Christians were turned heathens again and had only a dead form left." (John Wesley, Sermon 94). "The Christian Church was scarcely formed when in different places there started up certain pretended reformers, who, not satisfied with the simplicity of that religion which was taught by the apostles, meditated changes of doctrine and worship, and set up a new religion drawn from their own licentious imagination." (Mosheims' Church History; page 106). "By the middle of the second century the counsels and synods had changed the whole phase of the church and given it a new name." (Mosheims' Church History. Chapter 2, page 145). "These

councils changed nearly the whole form of the church, for by them in the first place the ancient rights and privileges of the people were very much abridged, and on the other hand the influence and authority of the bishops were not a little augmented." (Mosheim, chapter 2, page 3). "There is no institution so pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of man will not in time alter for the worse and load with conditions foreign to its nature and original design. Such in a particular manner was the fate of Christianity in this century. Many unnecessary rites and ceremonies were added to the Christian worship, the introduction of which was extremely offensive to wise and good men." "At the close of this century there remained no more than a mere shadow of the ancient government of the church." (Mosheim; chapter 2, verse 2.) "The Christian religion or worship was now (sixth century) become no less idolatrous than that of the Gentiles, who therefore chose to retain their own, there being no material difference between one and the other; between worshipping the ancient heroes or the modern saints." (History of the Pope, by Bowers).

I must give you this one and we will close this part of the subject. "The Christian bishops introduced with but slight alteration into the Christian worship those rites and institutions by which formerly the Greeks, Romans and other nations had manifested their piety and reverence towards their imaginary dieties, supposing that the people would more readily embrace Christianity if they saw the rites handed down to them from their fathers still existed unchanged among the Christians, and perceived that Christ and the martyrs were worshipped in the same manner as formerly their gods were. There was little difference in these times of the public worship of the Christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both alike there were splendid robes, mitres, wax tapers, processions, lustrations, images, gold and silver vases and numberless other things. Thus in this particular, the true religion evidently copied after superstition." (Mosheim; chapter 4, paragraphs 1 and 2).

Catholic Church Has Changed.

Now, with all this from the Bible, and with all this from the history, are we justified in declaring there was an apostacy. Now, the Roman Catholic Church makes the boast that she never changes. Now, if she were the true church that would be the right thing to say for the Church of Christ will never deviate the thousandth part of an inch from that which He established. To make any alterations is to fling an insult in the face of divinity. Nothing can be added to it; nothing can be taken from it. Whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever, and so if the church, making this claim, told the truth about it, I would go into her, no matter if I lost every friend I had in this world. But in making that statement, she is very far from the truth, and now to the history to prove it.

I will give you just a few changes that have been made by the church that claims to be changeless. Prayers first offered for the dead, A. D. 200; celibacy of the clergy recommended, 325; Infant baptism introduced, 254; Mary called the Mother of God, 431; the priests begin to wear distinctive dress, 500; prayers addressed to the Virgin Mary, 593; Pope's supremacy, somewhere between 533, by Justinian's decree and Proclus' decree in 606; holy water introduced, 682; kissing Pope's toe, 708.

(I remember an old gentleman, now dead, who lived in the City of London and became converted to Catholicism, and in a burst of enthusiasm said to me one night: "Oh, Elder Evans, what glory would fill my soul if I could only go to Rome and kiss the Pope's toe. Now," he said, "Richard, what would you do about that?" "Oh," I said, "I would want the mis-

sionaries to go there a long time before my arrival and get him thoroughly converted to the doctrine of feet washing.”)

Cardinals created, 817; canonisation of saints, introduced by John XIV., 933; celibacy of priests made obligatory, 1000; prayers for souls in purgatory introduced, 1000; sacrifices of the mass, 1100; tran-substantiation introduced, 1000; transubstantiation made a church dogma, 1215; auricular confession imposed, 1215; cup withheld from the laity, 1263. Now, I would not like that. When the bread is handed me I regard it as a symbol of the broken body of our Lord, and when the cup is handed me it symbolizes for me the blood shed for the remission of sins. What right has any man to say: “You take the bread and I will take the cup.” That would not please me. No man or no council has the right to do it. That is a law the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is one of the most sacred ordinances of the church, and no Pope or priest has the right to withhold half of it from the people. Jesus said: “Drink ye all of it.” What right has the priest to get all the wine for himself and give you the cracker?

Sprinkling is legalized as baptism by the council of Ravenna, 1311; papal infallibility confirmed, 1870. Now, I could read on and on and show you how the true apostles were murdered and the apostolic office done away with and the Pope introduced. Is not that a change? No prophet, but a Pope; no apostles, but cardinals, and so we might go on.

Now, I have had nothing to say to-night on the succession from Peter to Leo 10th. I have not time to enter into it, but suffice it to say, I challenge the production of any history that proves the unbroken chain of priesthood and that pure, true God-appointed men have occupied the pontificate chair from Peter to Leo 10th. I can show where there were several Popes at one time, each breathing out curses against the other, and if I have to do it, I will, but I just cite these in passing. That is their claim—and unbroken succession. I have not time to examine to-night. I just deny it.

As to the private lives of our Catholic friends I have nothing to say. I can only give my opinion, and if that is worth anything, I may freely say to you that for zeal, faithfulness, diligence to church service, respect for the sacred edifices, they outshine Protestantism in a thousand ways. I say it to their lasting credit. They have many marks of goodness that I admire, but with all that, in the face of all the Bible prophecies—and I have not handed out one hundredth part of them, in the face of all the histories—and I have not spoken of a thousandth part of them—in the face of the conflict and false doctrine—of which I have not cited one thousandth part, I am compelled to believe that the church as established by Jesus Christ gradually dwindled into sin and iniquity till she was rejected of God and the power of the priesthood was to remain away from the earth for 1260 years, when it is to be restored.

Now, I ask you that you follow these lectures. I cannot tell you everything in one. I thank you.

The Reformation

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 14th chapter of the Book of Job and the fourth verse, where you will read these words: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." In previous lectures I have shown from the Bible that in order to be the true church of Jesus Christ, God must establish it, and He must select its ministers whom He calls, Priesthood. The Roman Catholic Church admits that where there is no priesthood there is no true church. I followed the history and I cited the Bible, showing that the priesthood was to be taken away; showing that the church was to go into an apostacy. To-night it shall be my effort, so far as I can, to dovetail this subject into the one of last Sunday night, making a continuation of the story.

Priesthood Fell Into Sin.

I shall give you proof from history that the priesthood went into all manner of sins; that the church was rejected, and that all that the reformers hoped to do was to reform the church, and in their effort to reform the church, the church excommunicated them, leaving them without any priesthood authority. Even if Rome had the priesthood, she took it from them. If Rome had power to bind on earth, she had power to loose on earth. If the reformers had true priesthood, then the Romanish church was the Church of Christ; if the Roman Catholic Church was not the true church, they had no priesthood. I want you to note this carefully. If Rome was the true church, then the reformers were heretics when they denounced it. If, on the other hand, she was not the true church, then they had no priesthood, and consequently the Reformation was not, in any of its divisions, the Church of Christ, organized according to the Bible, and acknowledged of God as the Bride, the Lamb's wife.

This places me between two fires. I am taking the position that Rome is in apostacy, and therefore not the true church, and the Reformation had no priesthood, and so far as being the Church of Christ is concerned, was no more the Church of Christ than the Oddfellow's lodge, the Masonic fraternity, or any other order that has been established in which good has been accomplished. I freely grant you that there were honorable men and women in the Roman Catholic Church, perhaps in every generation, and that there have been quite as honorable men and women in every denomination of the Protestant organization, but honesty is one thing, and to have Divine authority to act in the name of Jesus Christ and in the ordinances of the Church of Christ is quite another thing. Remember that honesty and sincerity never have made a truth out of an error.

Toddlng Back to Rome.

Before I get through to-night I expect to prove from the Reformers themselves that as far as reforming the church is concerned, the Reformation has been a blank failure, and to-day it is gradually creeping its way back to Roman Catholicism, and in many parts of the world, Toronto not excepted, is becoming the laughing stock of the world. To-day many of the Protestant churches are toddling back to Rome. If I do not prove that to-night from the Toronto press, it will be because you go out before I do.

The Reformation "denotes the great spiritual and ecclesiastical movement which took place in Europe in the sixteenth century, as the result of which the national church of Britain, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Holland and many parts of Germany and Switzerland became separated from the Church of Rome. In the countries, such as Hungary and France, the same movement detached large portions of the population from the Roman Catholic Church, yet without leading to a national disruption with the papacy. The Church of Rome from the sixth century, or time of Gregory the Great, extended not merely its influence, but its direct control and government over all the countries of Western Europe."—(Chamber's Encyclo., Art., Reformation).

Again, "Reformation: The important religious movement in Western Christendom beginning in the early part of the sixteenth century, which resulted in the formation of the various Protestant churches. The rising spirit of individualism and nationality, in opposition to the centralized control of the church by the papacy, marked the Reformation also as a political revolt. The movement was in some measure prepared by early reformers, such as Wycliffe, in England, others in Bohemia, France, and immediately by Erasmus. These leaders were: Luther, in Germany; Calvin, in Switzerland; Cranmer, in England; and Knox in Scotland."—(Webster's Dictionary, Art. Reformation.)

All Acknowledged Pope.

"For the first three hundred years there was no pope at Rome, but for twelve hundred years there has been; and during that time all the nations of Europe had become Christianized, and all acknowledged the Pope as their head in religious matters, and, in short, there was no other Christian church known in the world. England never had known any Christian religion other than that at the head of which was the Pope."—(Cobbett's History of the Reformation, in his Introduction, page 7.)

I have given these three authorities to puncture the idea suggested by some that there had always been a remnant of the true church somewhere, which recognized God as their head, but nobody has been able to find it. The fact is, as I shall prove, not only by these historical statements, but by others to-night, that the Church of Rome was for hundreds of years the only church that claimed to be the Christian Church, and that the reformers—every soul of them—came out from Rome with the hope in their hearts of reforming Rome. And please note this thought: They only called it the "Reformation"; they never claimed a restoration; they only tried to tinker up and reform that which they knew had gone into apostacy, and they failed ignominiously, as the records will show.

Romish Authorities Admitted Apostasy.

My next point will be to show from the highest Roman Catholic authority that the church not only needed a reformation, but Romish authority itself declared that the church was going to ruin, and sought to bring about a reformation anterior to the efforts of either Luther, Calvin or Knox. "A reformation of ecclesiastical discipline had been desired several ages since—"Who will grant me, says St. Bernard, before I die to see the Church of God such as she had been in the primitive times." If this holy man had anything to regret at his death, it was that he had not witnessed so happy a change. During the whole of his life he bewailed the evils of the church; he never ceased to admonish the people, the clergy, the bishops and the Popes themselves of them." Cardinal Julian said: "These disorders incited the hatred of the people against the whole ecclesiastical order, and should they not be corrected, it is to be feared lest the laity should rise against the clergy as they loudly threaten

us." When they shall no longer have any hopes of our amendment then will they fall upon us." But he afterwards spoke more emphatically. "I see," said he, "the axe is at the root of the tree; the tree begins to bend, and instead of propping it up whilst in our power we accelerate its fall." "The great Catholic doctor, Gerson, in a sermon made before Alexander V., introduces the church, demanding reformation and the re-establishing of the Kingdom of Israel." Cardinal Peter D'Ally also duly sighed for a reformation." This is taken from the history of the variations of the Protestant churches, by Bishop Bossuet, pages 19-20-21—here is a bishop of the Catholic Church acknowledging that the church was corrupt. From the Pope down there was a demand for a reformation.

And Need For Reformation.

I now want to show you the reason for this reformation. Here are some fearful things performed by the early church under its apostate falling condition. "The Pope, who represents on earth, not mere man, but the true God, has a heavenly power and therefore changes the nature of things; nor is there any one that can say unto him: 'Why doest thou so?' for he can dispense law, he can make justice unjust by altering and amending laws, and he has a fullness of power."—Innocent III., Clos.

"Massonius, who wrote the life of Pope John IV., tells us that a bishop of Rome, namely the Pope, cannot even commit sin without praise." Father Hogan, page 25. Cardinal Bellarmine says: "If the Pope should err by enjoining vices or forbidding virtues, the church would be obliged to believe vices to be good and virtues bad, unless it would sin against its own conscience."—De Pontiff; 4th chapter 5, V. Rev. Strong, in "Our Country," page 52.

"Priests are Gods. The priesthood and the Godhead are in some respects to be parallel, and are almost of equal greatness, since they have equal power. Seeing that the priesthood walketh hand in hand with the God-head, and that priests are gods, it goes far beyond the kingly power, and priests are kings. Incredible thing, but yet true, that heaven depends upon them. Joshua stopped but the sun, but the priests stay Christ being in heaven in the mist of an altar. The creature obeyed the first, but the Creator obeys the last—the sun to the one, and God to the other, as often as they pronounce the sacred words (*Hog-est-enim-corporis-meum*). Whatever God is in heaven, the priest is the same on earth; Christ is incarnate and made flesh in the hands of the priests as in the Virgin's womb, and priests do create their creator, and have power over the body of Christ." (From "The Royal Priesthood," by Father Debssi; ch 2 and 3. Trial of Anti-Christ, pages 87, 88 and 89.)

Shocking Conditions of Church.

Now, when I read the next two or three articles, I read them to show you the awful condition of the church in those early days, for which the learned bishop himself acknowledged the need of a reformation. I am not speaking of the moral conditions of to-day. "In the third century celibacy was not enjoined upon the clergy by any decree. However, it is said that many of the sacred order in Africa adopted the practice of keeping certain women as concubines, who had made vows of perpetual chastity, but were permitted to participate in the bed of the priests under the most solemn declaration that nothing should pass in this commerce contrary to the rules of chastity and virtue." (Mosheim, vol. 1, page 85). "The body of the Latin clergy were chargeable with two great vices deplored by most of the writers of those times—the tenth century—namely, concubinage and simony; in the first place very general. They connected

themselves with women, some, indeed, in a lawful, but other in an unlawful manner, and upon these wives and concubines and the children born of them, they squandered the property of the church.”—(Mosheim’s “History of the Church.” 10th Century, chapter 2, page 336).

“On the ascension of King Edward the Fourth in 1462, he obtained the support of the clergy by granting them a charter of immunity whereby all civil magistrates were forbidden to take any notice of treasons, murders, robberies, rape or other crimes committed by archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, or any persons in holy orders.”—Wilkins, Con.

“All magistrates who interpose against priests in any criminal case, whether it be for murder or high treason, let them be accursed.” (Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III.). I make mention of these atrocious crimes to show you the awful condition in the church of those times, and again I present to you my text: “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?”

I now want to introduce a few items with regard to the Popes themselves. The council of Schaffhausen prohibited the clergy from dancing in public except at weddings; from carrying two kinds of weapons, and decreed that a priest that should be found in a house of ill-fame should be striped of his ecclesiastical habit. In several places the priest paid to the bishop a regular tax for the women with whom he lived, and for every child he had by her. A German bishop who was present at a grand entertainment publicly declared that in one year eleven thousand priests had presented themselves to him for that purpose.” It is Erasmus who records this. I find it in the History of the Reformation by D’Aubigne, page 12 and 13. I could read to you all night about the conditions of these men in those days, but I pass them over.

Doctrine of Indulgence.

I want to read to you now of the conditions that brought about the Reformation. The main spring of the Reformation was the doctrine of indulgence. To show that the commission of crime was encouraged, we submit the following: John Tetzel, in 1507, gained in two days at Freyburg, two thousand florins addressing audiences. In order to move them to purchase his pardons, he delivered the following: “Indulgences are the most precious and sublime of God’s gifts. This cross—(pointing to the red cross)—has as much efficacy as the cross of Jesus Christ. Draw near and I will give you letters, duly sealed, by which, even the sins which you hereafter desire to commit, shall be forgiven you. There is no sin so great, that the indulgence cannot remit it, and even if any one should (which is doubtless impossible) ravish the Holy Virgin, Mother of God, let him pay. Let him only pay largely and it shall be forgiven him. The very moment that the money chinks against the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory, and flies away to heaven.” Hist. of Reformation, by D’Aubigne; page 68.

Speaking of the above, Father Hogan, at one time a leading Romish priest, says: “There is not a Roman Catholic Church, chapel or house of worship in any Catholic country where indulgences are not sold.” Hogan’s Work, page 172. Succession of the Popes. The boasted succession of the Popes, or head of the church from the time of Peter down to the present incumbent has not been smooth running. There was schisms in the succession of the Popes; the greatest one being the western schism of 1378 to 1417, when three Popes were fighting for the Holy See. During seventy years some Popes resided at Avignon, in France, while the candidate of the opposition party held possession of Rome. In several cases one faction elected an opposition candidate, who, upon accession would excommunicate and depose opponent with the assistance of his constituents. At other

times an Ecumenical council had to declare the election of one candidate invalid, and to remove him by force, to make room for another. Thus the Council of Pisa, 1409, deposed Gregory XII., and Benedict XIII. and then elected Alexander V. While the Council of Constance, 1414 to 1418, deposed John XIII., who had succeeded Alexander V., but the deposed Benedict XIII. continued to claim authority until he died in 1424. In spite of the council, which elected Martin V., 1417, there were two and three Popes at one and the same time exercising papal authority, and under such circumstances it is doubtful which of them was the successor of the apostles." Dr. Hefele, quoted by Prof. Rudolph; ex-priest, patriot, American. Oct. 22, 1892.

I could show the papal seat was sold to the highest bidder, and at other times that children were placed in the chair; at others the wickedest men occupied it. One of the Popes, having a fuss with his cardinal, mixed a dish for him to eat. The cardinal being in good touch with the waiters, had the plates changed, and the Pope himself ate the mess he had prepared for the cardinal, and dropped dead. D'Aubigne; His. Ref., pages 12-13-14. I could go on all night showing that the church had been rejected of God. Now, in the falling condition the morning star of the Reformation illumined England. I refer to John Wycliffe, born 1324, and who died 1384. He was a Romish priest, rector of Lutterworth. He it was that first translated the Bible into English. He was a conscientious man, accomplished and good, but don't forget, in your examination, that he was ordained a Catholic priest. He never received any divine call from God to reorganize the church, but he attempted to reform it, and they cursed him. He even died a Romish priest. In the summer of 1903 I visited Lutterworth Church. I stood in Wycliffe's pulpit; sat by the table on which he translated the Bible into English; stood on the stone floor, 'neath which his body rested for years, till, by order of a Roman council, it was taken up and burned and the ashes thrown into the River Swift.

Martin Luther.

The next great reformer was Luther, born November 10, 1483. His early days were spent in misery and poverty, and I could read you of his unhappy school days, and the way his father used to whip him; of how he sang in the streets and begged for bread and finally secured an education. When he was eighteen years of age, he entered the university to study law. When looking over some books in a library, he saw for the first time in his life a Bible. In 1505 he was master of arts. In that year he was out in a severe storm which knocked the angel off the steeple of a church, the lightning struck the ground at his feet, and in terror he there resolved to give himself to the Virgin, to become a monk of the Augustinian order, being admitted to a monastery at Erfurt, August 17, 1505. He was presented with a Bible, the first he ever owned. He was finally ordained as a priest of the Romanish Church, May 2, 1507. In 1510-11 he went to Rome on church business, and there became disgusted with the scenes of wickedness that he witnessed; but still he believed that Divine authority was vested in the Pope. Speaking of his faith in Romanism, he says: "I wish you to know that when I began the affairs of indulgences I was a monk and a most mad papist. So intoxicated was I and drenched in papal dogmas that I would have been most ready at all times to murder or assist others in murdering any person that would have uttered a syllable against the duty of obedience to the Pope." Letters on Ecclesiastical History, page 56.

The Augustine Friars, of which Luther was a member, believed in indulgences, and Goldsmith's History of England, Cobbett's History of

the Reformation, and many others, show that Luther believed in indulgences. But when this Tetzel, who had been sent out by Pope Gregory to preach and sell these indulgences and give the ministers this power—when this man Tetzel went to such horrid extremes about it, Luther began to oppose him, still having full faith in the Pope and in the church, and when the sale of them was transferred from the Augustine Friars to the Dominican Monks, Luther began to resent the transfer, and finally to oppose Tetzel. He went on in his denunciation, but still believed in indulgences. He wrote: “Whosoever denies the truth of the indulgences of the Pope, let him be accursed.” Bishop Bossuet; Var. Prot. Ch; page 23. Although he was denouncing these indulgences he still remained a member of the Church of Rome, and believed in them, but not in the extreme methods used by Tetzel. “Accursed be he whomsoever speaks against the Pope’s indulgences, but blessed is he who opposeth the foolish and reckless speeches of the preacher of indulgences.” This is taken from D’Aubigne History on the Reformation; page 77-78, showing that Luther never dreamed of leaving the Catholic Church, but believed the Pope the vice-regent of God.

Breaks His Oath.

In 1530 the Pope signed the bill that excommunicated Luther from the Roman Catholic Church. On June 25, 1525, Luther broke his oath of celibacy, and married an ex-nun, Catherene Bora. He tells us himself that he had offered her hand in marriage to two different men, but one didn’t want her, and the other she didn’t want. What Luther’s idea was of marriage I can hardly tell you. This girl, seemingly, was on his hands; Luther tried to get one fellow to marry her, but he wouldn’t have her, and she wouldn’t have the other, so Luther married her himself. D’Aubigne, 329. It was real kind of him, I think. Now, Luther’s idea of marriage was very crude. We hear a great deal nowadays about Brigham Young, Mormonism and polygamy—a thing I hope to be able to denounce as long as I live with all the power that God will impart to me; but don’t forget that Luther sanctioned the practice of polygamy in the case of the Langrave of Hesse. Luther certainly had very poor ideas on the chastity of marriage, and if you want to find out about this, I cite you the following authorities: Cobbett’s History of the Reformation, page 45, and Bishop Bossuet, Var. Prot. Ch., 205-214, where the complete history of his nasty, deceptive work on polygamy is recorded, and let us remember that Protestant works tell this story and published his work on polygamy and marriage, which all true men will say is a standing disgrace to Luther.

Just before his death, he said: “I have spent my strength for naught. Those who are called by my name, are, it is true, reformed in opinions and modes of worship, but their hearts and lives, in their temper and practice, they are not a jot better than the papists.” John Wesley, Ser. 70.

Luther died Feb. 18, 1546, and all the ordination he ever had was under Romish Church authority. Again I remark: If Rome was the true church, he was a heretic when he left it. If she was not the true church, he never had any priesthood authority, and so the Lutheran Church is a human institution, born and bred in a fuss.

Calvin’s Spite.

John Calvin is the next reformer, born July 10, 1609, in France. He, too, was a Romish priest; a most prolific writer, and one of the best educated men of his time, but what a bitter, spiteful, cruel wretch he was. He was practically the ruler of Geneva, and when Servetus wrote that which Calvin did not believe, he had Servetus brought back to Geneva, tied to the stake, fagots piled around him, and Calvin, the reformer, the

head of Presbyterianism, gave consent to his being burned at the stake. Blanchard's *His. Ref.*; page 497-498. Calvin's followers destroyed twenty thousand churches in three reigns and in one province they killed fifty-six priests and a hundred monks. (Father Nothen; page 84.) That Calvin carried on a spiteful, murderous fight against Rome can never be refuted. It was a case of the mother thrashing her children, and the children getting big enough to slap back. It was a family fuss between the mother and her daughters—Rome and the Reformers.

John Knox, the friend and champion of Calvin, did most of his work in Scotland. He was born in Scotland, 1505; ordained a Romish priest 1530. "The voice of Knox struck through the land like an electric shock; throughout all Scotland images were broken, altars shivered, mass books were torn, priestly vestments torn in shreds. He afterwards boldly denounced the celebration of the mass in Holyrood Chapel." *Collier's Hist. of England*; page 189. Knox denounced the evils of Rome, but was guilty of many of them himself; but yet to-day we have Knox churches all over. Christ's Church is good enough for me.

Anglican Churches Papal.

We now come to Henry VIII. and the Church of England. The Church of England, known in history as the second daughter of Rome, was born about the year 1535, while Henry XIII. was born 1491, and began to reign in 1509. This king was a strong papist. He wrote a book in Latin defending the seven sacraments of the church, and sent a copy of it to the Pope, who showed his appreciation by giving him the title of Defender of the Faith, which title our present King owns, as you will see by examining some of our coins. After nearly twenty years of married life, the king pretended to have doubts about the legality of his marriage with Queen Catherine. The truth seems to be that Henry was tired of her, and had taken a violent fancy to one of her maids of honor. Ann Boleyn. A divorce, then, became the great object of Henry's life. He defied the Pope (Clement the VII.) for refusing to sanction the divorce and the second marriage. He resolved to deny the supremacy of the Pope and to make himself the head of the English Church. And now the chain which had so long bound England to Rome was breaking link by link.

The parliament of 1531 owned Henry as head of the church. The parliament of 1532 forbade the payment of the first fruits, by which the Pope had received the first year's income of vacant bishopries. The parliament of 1533 forbade appeals to Rome. In the same year Ann Boleyn was declared Queen. Catherine formerly divorced. When these things were heard at Rome the Pope laid Henry under a terrible curse unless Queen Catherine was restored. But no curse could bend the stubborn King of England. The dispute when the divorce was thus settled, centered in the question, "Who was to be the head of the Church of England—the King or the Pope?" The point was decided by the parliament of 1534, confirming the title, with privileges, on Henry. Henceforth the Church of England had a separate existence. Paul III., now Pope, hurled the thunders of excommunication at Henry, but the English king cared not." *Collier's History of England*; page 160.

History shows that Henry the VIII., head of the Church of England, took one wife after another (sometimes the day after he had one wife killed, he would be married to another), and so this holy head of the Church of England continued to kill or divorce and marry till he had six wives. The members of the Church of England need not gnash their teeth and threaten to do me violence for telling these things, for it is common history, those who wish to read up on the Church of England and Henry,

read Edward's or Thompson's History of England, or, in fact, a number of others, and they all agree. The combined historical facts show that the Church of England was conceived in sin, born in lust, lived in polygamy and idolatry and that she is now dying in formality and pride. Before leaving the Church of England, we must make short references to Archbishop Cranmer of Romish Church? The world has never produced a more vile hypocrite than this leading parson of the Church of England. History shows he took the oath of celibacy, yet had two wives. He performed the marriage ceremony for the King and then he divorces him. He sent many to be burned to the stake. Three thousand two hundred and nineteen religious houses were destroyed. He wrote part of the prayer book. He was finally burned to death. Bishop Bosseut, Cobbett's History and Goldsmith's History of England; Collier's History of England.

In closing this part of my discourse, I refer you to the Toronto papers wherein one of the most brilliant barristers of the Dominion, and a member of the Church of England, is citing proof that that church is going back to Rome, and that societies are formed in the church for that very purpose. See The Toronto Telegram for March 2, 1911—Returning Home to Their Mother.

A Man-Made Church.

Now, to the Baptist Church. "John Smyth organized the first Baptist Church in England in 1608. He acknowledged that the true apostolic succession had been lost, and that the only way to recover it was to begin a church anew on the apostolic model. Accordingly, having first baptized himself, he baptized Thomas Helwys and thirty-six others and so constituted the church." (Short's History of the Baptist Church, by Professor Vedder; page 137). Now, mark this thought: He confessed its human origin, and declared that the only way to have the true church was to get it under the original apostolic plan.

"Roger Williams was a Church of England clergyman who landed in Boston, 1631. In March 1639, Williams baptized Ezekiel Holliman and thereupon Holliman baptized Williams and eleven others, and thus the first Baptist Church on American soil was formed. A few months later Williams came to the conclusion that this baptism by one who had not been himself baptized in an orderly manner was not valid baptism. He therefore withdrew himself from the church, and for the rest of his life was not connected with any religious body." (Hist. of the Baptist Church, by Professor Vender; page 195). Knowle's History of the Baptist Church practically says the same thing. Now, I want you to notice this: The man that organized the Baptist Church of America declared he had no authority from God to do it, and remained aloof from it till the day of his death, declaring that the only way to have the true church upon the earth was by God raising up a new apostolic church. What would you do? what would the churches do? what would the parsons do, if they could prove that when this church was organized that those who were instruments in the hands of God in organizing it had confessed that the thing was of human origin, and denouncing it had left it. You would never forget to ring that in my ears; so pardon me for hinting at yours for once.

The Methodist Church.

Now to the Methodist Church. John and Charles Wesley were the sons of a Church of England preacher. The father and mother had a row over some political matter, separated, and lived apart for a long time. John was ordained a priest of the Church of England in 1728. Charles was also a priest of the Church of England. The two brothers came to America in 1735, and did some preaching here, but they had a great deal

of trouble. John fell in love with some girl here, who would not have him, and as a consequence he said something against her, and finally thirteen indictments were urged against him, and they left the country between two days, and reached England in 1738. Hales' History of the United States, and almost every authentic history written by Methodists acknowledge that themselves. John married a widow, who became jealous of him, and eventually they separated and lived apart for many years till death gave them both relief. My brethren, if you could find anything like that on Joseph Smith, how quick the world would publish it. John and Charles disagreed and separated. Charles, it is said, by these very historians, "was not so much admired as endured." Charles foretold the fall of the Methodist Society, and refused to be buried where he knew his brother was to rest. John and Charles Wesley both died members of the Church of England, and the Methodist history shows that.—Dr. Daniels' History of Methodism.

Wesley Thought Reformation Failure.

I will now give you the proof that John Wesley thought the Reformation had failed to reform the church: "We may easily infer what was the state of the church in general from the state of the seven churches in Asia. But all the rest were corrupted more or less, insomuch that several of them were not a jot better than the present race of Christians. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 3rd Century, has left letters, in which he gives a large and particular account of the state of religion in his time. In reading this, one would be apt to imagine he was reading an account of the present century, so totally void of the true religion were the generality, both of the laity and clergy. So immersed in ambition, envy, covetousness, luxury and all other vices, that the Christians of Africa were then exactly the same as the Christians of England now. Historians tell us of nations in every century who were converted to Christianity, but still their converts practiced all kinds of abominations exactly as they did before. Such has been the deplorable state of a Christian nation, a Christian city and the Christian Church from the time of Constantine till the Reformation. (According to the Scriptural mode) there was nowhere to be found. Has the case been altered since the Reformation? They (the reformed churches) are as full of heathenism or worse than heathenish abominations as ever they were before. Were either their tempers or lives reformed? Not at all. Now, let any one survey the state of Christianity in the reformed parts of Switzerland, Germany, France, Sweden, Denmark, Holland or in Great Britain and Ireland? How little are any of these reformed Christians better than heathen nations? Have they more communion with God (although there is no Christianity without it); Have they any more justice, mercy or truth than the inhabitants of China or Hindostan?

Oh, no, we must acknowledge with sorrow and shame that we are far beneath them; I doubt whether you ever knew a Christian in your life. These are Christians in Savannah. No; they are not, but are not these Christians in Canterbury, in London, in Westminster? No; no more than they are angels, why, if these only are angels, said an eminent wit. "I never saw a Christian yet." I believe it. You never did, and perhaps you never will, though they are called Christians. The name does not imply the thing. They are as far from this as hell from heaven."—John Wesley; Sermon 66; Mystery of Iniquity. Charles Wesley, in a letter dated April 28, 1785, the following words occur: "What are your poor Methodists now—only a new sect of Presbyterians, and after my brother's death, which is now so near, what will be their end: They will lose all their influence and

importance; they will turn aside to vain janglings; they will settle again upon their lees, and, like other sects of dessenters, come to nothing." History of Methodist Church, by Daniels, page 71.

When you read the trouble between leading Methodist divines as given in the City of Toronto papers the last year, you will see that Wesley was not far out. In its not being the true Christian church.

In proof that Wesley was right, as to their being no Christian church holding communion with God on the earth, I submit the following: "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, of all ages, sects and degrees of men, women and children of whole Chrisendom (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more."—Book of Homilies; pages 253.

Roman Catholic Church Often Condemned.

The reader of history will freely admit that every society known in the Reformation, have from their pulpits and press, expended their time, energy and money to inform the world that the Roman Catholic Church is about everything that is bad. She is regarded as "The mother of harlots," "the scarlet colored woman," "the abomination of the earth." In the Pope, they profess to see the "man of sin." If this be true, then, in the language of my text: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." I have shown by the histories, and most of the Protestant histories, that the chief reformers were priests of Rome. All the priesthood authority they ever professed to have, came from Rome.

Jesus said: "Neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Matt. 7:18. He clearly states: "Men can not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles," Matt. 7:16. If Rome is the thorn, the thistle, the corrupt tree, the mother of harlots; no wonder Wesley spoke as he did of the Reformation.

Has Rome True Spirit?

In closing permit us to, from another standpoint, measure the fruit of the Reformation. Jesus said: "Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; pray for them that despitefully use you." Matt. 5:38-46. Paul said: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him. If he thirst, give him drink." Rom. 12:20. Again: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor." Rom. 13:10. Again: "The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness," Gal. 5:22. How history proves that Rome and her daughters have not the spirit that is here referred to; each in their turn, as they had the power, hated, murdered, in the most cruel manner, their hundreds of thousands. Just read of the thumb-screw, the rack, the fagots, the riping up, the burning, the inhuman tortures that Catholics and Protestant churches treated each other with, and you will see at a glance that the spirit of Christ left the church and it became a place of murder, of hatred, of envy, of lust, of polygamy, of idolatry. Death and torture were written on her brow, wither you gaze upon the mother or her daughters. It was kill your enemies; till the Union Jack and Stars and Stripes have said: "You must no longer kill your enemies, and the churches now can only gnaw their teeth, but they are not permitted to bite and devour. Only last Sunday night I was threatened, "I would shoot him right now if I had a gun."

Paul said to the true church: 'Ye are the body of Christ, 1 Cor. 12:27, and James said: "The body without the spirit is dead. James 2:26.

I have shown the body has gone into apostasy. She has lost the spirit, and is, therefore, dead.

In my next sermon it will be my pleasure to show you that God promised in the latter days to restore the priesthood and reorganize the true church and prepare the people for the coming of the King. There must be a grand restoration of the ancient church. The Reformation has been weighed in the balance and found wanting? How could the Reformation proceed from the very thing to be reformed? How could the wound find in itself the elements of its cure? So asked one who felt the need of a restoration, from God.

Now, I close by saying that while I have shown from history and Bible the facts as to the apostasy and the Reformation, yet I admit there are splendid men and women that are seeking the Light in every church, and the cry for light is on many lips. Oh, "let there be light." Now, in closing, may I ask, with Paul: "Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" May God bless you one and all, is my prayer.

The Restoration

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 13th Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 40th and 41st verses, where you will read these words: "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish, for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in nowise believe, though a man declares it unto you."

It would seem from this statement that God some time in the future would perform a work through human instrumentality that the children of men would wonder at; they would ridicule it; they would despise it and finally would perish because they rejected it. In my first lecture on priesthood here I showed that Christ organized a church, and that the ministry or priesthood of His church was not selected by man but called of God by revelation. In my lecture on the apostacy of the church I showed that the open sins of the church and the false doctrine taught, led the church into darkness and shame till God withdrew His spirit from the church. In my lecture on the Reformation I showed that the reformers were acting under the order of priestcraft, and that while the Reformation did much good—and I wish to be understood aright, that I thank God for much that was said and done by the reformers, God blessed every honest effort to break the chain of priestcraft, superstition and idolatry—yet the reformers acted under ordinations had from Rome which were spurious, and they did not restore the church as we find it in the New Testament history either in doctrine, church organization or spiritual power; but they largely (as might in all charity be expected that they would) followed in the wake of their mother, the Roman Church, acting frequently just like she acted when she had the power. It was a case of first the mother inhumanly treating her children and then the children getting big enough to strike back until the crimson river has flowed down through Romanism, and the Reformation, and the doctrine of retaliation, spite, hatred and murder has stained and scarred the history at almost every step. Because of these things we discover that the spirit of God left the church, and she became dead, and is to-day in all her parts a human organization without the Divine authority. And the best proof of that is in the conglomerated confusion that she presents before the world and the clashing contention that she is suffering from internally.

God Promised a Restoration.

I promised to show you so far as I have time tonight, that according to the promises God would restore the church in the latter days in the hour of God's judgment just before the end of the world, that in its restoration it would come in the power and spirit that actuated it during the first century, bringing men and women back from the thralldom of priestcraft, idolatry and superstition into the sunny path of righteousness and peace. To this task I betake myself to-night.

The word restoration means a renewal, restitution, re-establishment, the restoration of a thing or institution to its original state or form.

“Webster.” We take the position that Christ under the command of His Father, organized a church and gave to us a system or divine plan of religion which He called the gospel, which was to be the power by which God would save them that obeyed and we strenuously contend that no council, syndicate, conference or individual has any right to make any alterations or emendations to that church organization or gospel plan. To insinuate a change in any regard is to fling an insult into the face of the Master of men, who declared: “I will build my church,” and “except the Lord build the church, they labor in vain that build it.” And so if the church is to be restored in the latter days we must find it just such a church as He organized in the dear dead years of the silent past.

And Reformers Foretold It.

I shall now show you that while the reformers acknowledged that the Reformation failed to reform the church and bring it back to its original splendor and power, many of them at least foretold the coming of the Latter Day Saint Church; they looked for it; they prayed for it. They saw in the dimming twilight the approach of the day that was to baptize the world beneath the halo of its glory, and bring back a system that would enable us to develop a character that would reflect Christ in us, the hope of glory, that when He came we might be like Him and be accepted of Him.

Martin Luther said: “I know not what to say of myself. Perhaps I am a precursor or forerunner of Phillip Melancthon, and like Elias, am preparing the way for Him in spirit and in power, and it is He who will one day trouble Israel and the house of Ahab. “D’Aubgin.” Great Reformation, page 157. Here you will discover that Luther had no definite mission; he was unsettled in mind as to what God really wanted him to do. He was fighting Rome, but he says: “Perhaps I am a forerunner of some great individual. It may be Phillip Melancthon.” But it was not Phillip Melancthon. It was some one later than him that I will introduce to you tonight. I just bring this up here to show you that the spirit within the man foretold the coming of the latter day glory. Luther further said: “The ancient and primitive church of the apostles must on the one hand be restored in opposition to the papacy by which it had been so long oppressed.” (D’Aubgin’s History of the Reformation; vol. 3, p. 80.) Don’t forget this point; he predicts the restoration of the true church.

The Time Is at Hand.

John and Charles Wesley both in story, sermon and song foretold the latter day glory. Listen to them: “What could God have done which He hath not done to convince you that the day is coming, that the time is at hand, when He will fulfill His glorious promise and will arise to maintain His own cause and set up His kingdom.” (John Wesley; sermon 71; vol. 2.) Again, I trust this is only the beginning of a far greater work, the dawn of the latter day glory. (John Wesley, Sermon 65). Again: “The time, which we have reason to believe is at hand, is what many pious men have termed the time of the latter day glory, meaning the time when God would display His power.” (John Wesley, sermon 68.) He calls it the latter day glory. He says that he among other men have foretold the LATTER DAY GLORY. No wonder when it came it was called the latter day glory, and the subjects of it were called Latter Day Saints. Charles Wesley, his brother, the great poet, composed these verses on the coming of the prophet and the organization of the church with apostles selected by the divine call from heaven:

Previous to the dreadful day,
Which shall thy foes consume,
Jesus Christ prepared thy way,
Let the lost prophet come.

Wesley knew that in the restoration of the gospel a prophet would be selected through whom God would speak, declaring His mind and will, prior to the coming of Jesus Christ. But listen. Again he says:

Almighty God of Love,
Set up the attracting sign,
And summon whom Thou dost approve
For messengers divine.
From Abraham's seed.
The new apostles choose,
In isles and continents to spread
The soul-reviving news.

When reading those hymns on one occasion, a Methodist clergyman said to me: "Yes, Wesley did write those verses, but we have not got them in our hymn book any more. We don't need them now." "Sure thing," I said, "God has answered Wesley's prayer; the prophet has come; the new apostles have been chosen. You don't need to ask for that which has come." "Oh, says one, 'it says 'from favored Abraham's seed' the new apostles choose.' Well, that would be of the Israelites." "Yes, but who are the Israelites?" As many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ and become Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise; so that from those who would hear the tocsin of alarm and render perfect obedience to the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God, from them would be selected the apostles as the chief missionaries of the restored church of the nations of the world.

"The primitive gospel in its effulgence and power has yet to shine out in its original splendor to regenerate the world." (Alexander Campbell in History of the Disciples' Church by Haydn; p. 36.) Here is the founder of the Disciples' Church declaring that the gospel has yet to shine out with its original splendor. He further continues: "The practical result of all creeds, reformations and improvements and the expectations and longings of society warrant the conclusion that some new revelation or some new development of the revelations of God must be made before the hopes and expectations of all true Christians can be realized or Christianity can save and reform the nations of this world." Now what is going to produce that? He says that the world is longing for it, expecting it and is wanting some new revelation. What is going to bring that about? He answers: "We want the old gospel back and sustained by the ancient order of things." (Alexander Campbell, Christ's System; p. 234.)

New Testament Church System.

God had a prophet in his church; God had twelve apostles in the church; God called His ministry by direct revelation. He had not one man going over to his corner and getting an education and learning to be a Catholic priest, and another learning to be a Church of England parson, and another learning to be a Presbyterian, and another a Methodist minister, and so on, with the Shakers and Quakers and Baptists, and all the rest of them that make up an ecclesiastical hotchpotch with each man contradicting the other; each man denouncing the other; each man in

open rebellion against the other; with all of them claiming that God sent them to carry on this contradiction that has made the reformation the laughing stock of the Roman Catholic world and infidelity at large.

To restore the ancient order of things, we must have the original organization of the church with a prophet through whom God would speak, and all the other officers mentioned in the New Testament, such as apostles, bishops, elders, priests, teachers and deacons (referred to in my lecture on Priesthood), called by direct revelation and by having in the same spirit they will all speak the same thing. As the Bible says: "See that you all speak the same thing, that there be no division among you. One Lord, one faith, one baptism." That is what the world is longing for. God grant that the efforts we are making here may redound to God's glory and your salvation, and that you will believe and obey the truth, that you may be made free is my prayer.

With Apostolic Gifts.

"The preaching that is to bring America into the fellowship of the apostolic church must be accompanied by a revival of apostolic gifts, and I believe it will be." (Rev. T. Watson in the Pulpit of the Cross). You will remember a few nights ago I read from Cardinal Gibbon's work showing that the church formerly had these spiritual gifts to which the Rev. Mr. Watson refers, but he says: "They are no longer needed." (Faith of Our Fathers, page 322). Great God! Can it be possible that the world is so good, know so much, that they have reached such a complete unity of faith that we do not require the gifts of the Holy Ghost that will take the things of the Father and reveal them unto us? That is what the world needs; that is what we are suffering for, and when the learned cardinal admits that they are not in the church and whimpers out that miserable statement that "we do not need them now," he portrays the awful condition into which churchianity has led the people.

"And should the apostolic church finally be reproduced, thereby bringing Christ to the earth again, in personal power and rest-giving influence, what a precept that would be for us. The full realization of this splendid ideal is what the world is waiting for, and until it is realized we must continue to trust, and pray, labor and hope and patiently wait." (W. T. Moore in The Christian Evangelist, Dec. 18, 1890).

"We must restore the gifts of Christ (apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers) R. C. to their proper places and power if we would have His peace rest upon us and be once more in him." (H. H. Hawley in Christian Evangelist) July 17, 1890. You remember last Sunday night I referred to Roger Williams, the founder of the Baptist Church. I told you that he organized the first Baptist Church in America; that he discovered that he had not been sent of God, nor had he seen a man that had been divinely commissioned to baptize according to the Scriptures, and that he left the church. Listen to what he says on its restoration. "In the poor, small span of my life I have desired to be a diligent and constant observer and have been myself in many ways engaged in city, in country, in court, in schools, in universities and churches in old and New England, and yet can not in the holy presence of God bring in the results of a satisfactory discovery that either the begetting ministry of apostles or messengers to the nations, or the feeding or nourishing ministry of pastors and teachers according to the first institution of our Lord Jesus is yet restored and extant. These imperfections in the church in its revived condition could be removed by a new apostolic ministry alone." (Hireling Ministry, by Roger Williams). One of the writers of the Baptist Church says: "He

(Roger Williams) conceived that the apostasy of Anti-Christ hath so far corrupted all, that there can be no recovery out of the apostasy till Christ should send forth new apostles to plant the church anew." (Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty; page 239; and Knowles' History of the Baptist Church; page 172).

Founder Admitted Baptist Church "Man-Made."

If there is a Baptist among my friends tonight, let this burn into your hearts, that the Baptist Church is a human institution, organized without the command of God, and the man that organized it declared that it was a human institution. He left it and for years had nothing to do with it, and declared that the imperfections could only be removed by God speaking from heaven and restoring the new apostles and organizing a church as in the first century. I could keep you here all night on these matters, but I will hurriedly cite you this one statement.

"The Waldenses, Wycliffites, Hussites and the Mennonites, perceiving that such a church as they had formed an idea of would never be established by human means, indulged the hope that God Himself would in His own time erect for Himself a new church free from every blemish and impurity and that He would raise up certain persons and fill them with heavenly light for the accomplishment of this great object." (Mosheim; book 4, page 201).

Now, friends, I have given you the largest, the best and the most honorable churches of the Reformation, and last Sunday night of Romanism itself, all declaring that the churches of today are in apostacy, and that nothing could heal the wound but God Himself by a restoration of original Christianity as described in the New Testament. It is with great pleasure that I go to a task that my former sermons and my duty toward you and my commission from God enable me to present: The restoration in these latter days of the church according to the New Testament pattern by divine authority.

Joseph Smith.

It is not to be expected that tonight I can clear up every objection and present all the facts, but if I have the health and strength, and you the patience and the inclination, we will continue till everything will be perfectly clear to your mind, and you will see that the church has been restored, but don't denounce before you examine. Remember the text: "Behold ye despisers and wonder and perish; for I work a work in your day; a work which you shall in no wise believe, though a man declared it unto you."

Joseph Smith was born December 23, 1805, in Sharon, Windsor County, State of Vermont. His parents were law-abiding citizens. When he was about fourteen years of age a great revival commenced in their neighborhood, and several of the Smith family professed conversion. The mother, one sister and two brothers, joined the Presbyterian Church. Joseph was visibly affected, but before he got the consent of his mind as to which of the churches to join the revivals came to a close, and then to use an Irishism, "And thin the row began." It began in this way. While the ministers professed a lovely unity on the platform, they were wire-pulling for converts to their churches until there was considerable feeling and discussion. Joseph said to himself, "Can they all be right when they all differ?" and finally decided: "I will join none of them, but I will search God's word and do the best I can walking in the light reflected from that word." While reading the epistolary address of James 1: 5, he

came across these words: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." In his history, as he wrote it years afterwards, he declares that that passage of scripture loomed up before him as a golden, glittering promise direct from God to man; that upon the earnest prayer on the part of humanity, divinity would make reply.

Poor little Joseph! He believed that God told the truth about it; that he really was invited by the Almighty to ask Him, and that He, independent of any parson or priest would reply to it. And so he betakes himself to a sequestered spot in the rear of his father's farm, amid a clump of wood. I have a number of times bowed neath the selfsame tree just out from Palmyra in the State of New York. This was in the year 1820, and I want you to keep these dates in mind, because I am going to use them. Now I cannot tell you all about the visions he received, tonight, but suffice it to say he received his first great visitation from the eternal world. Two glorious personages appeared to him, and both addressed him. and among other things one of them said to him: "The creeds are an abomination before me." And he was commanded not to join any of the churches then existing. He received another communication in 1823, and still another in 1827. In fact from 1820 till 1830 he declared that God the Father, Christ the Son, John the Baptist, Peter, James, John, Moroni and Michael all appeared to him from time to time and gave him instruction, so that on the 6th day of April, 1830, the Church of Jesus Christ was organized.

There are No Angels Now!

When I was relating these facts in a discussion up here in Hillsburg a few years ago during a debate with Rev. Mr. Kelley, of the Baptist Church, I came to the place where an angel ordained Joseph Smith. I will tell you more about it later on in this discourse. The reverend gentleman came before the audience and he said: "Ladies and gentlemen, we are asked to believe that an angel appeared to old Joe Smith. Why, ladies and gentlemen, the idea is simply preposterous; it is bordering on blasphemy. There are no angels now." Well, if he told the truth, then Latter Day Saintism is a delusion and a snare. There is no doubt about that. But the first thing that caused me to think he was perambulating around the suburbs of veracity and economising the truth was when he referred to Joseph Smith as "Old Joe Smith." You will remember that in 1820 Joseph Smith was only fifteen years old, and so it was not quite fair to speak of him as Old Joe Smith. When I had my discussion with T. L. Wilkinson in 1888, he trotted out the words "Old Joe Smith" so continually that I thought I would teach him a lesson. In my next speech I had occasion to refer to John Wesley, and I said "Old Jackie Wesley." He almost fainted and said: "That shows the bringing up you have had, sir." It seems perfectly respectable to say Old Joe Smith when Joseph was only fifteen years old, but when you stop to think you will see that R. C. was just right when he spoke of John Wesley as "Old Jackie Wesley," for in the "History of Methodism," by Daniels, we see that John Wesley lived to be a very old man and so could be spoken of or addressed as an old man, and his mother, when referring to John, always called him "Jackie" or "Jack." So if I was only doing what his mamma did, I was not so bad after all; and besides, I did it to teach the great debater a lesson.

What's Become of Them, Then?

Now let us examine this statement: "There are no angels now." That audience was expected to believe that my story about the angel appearing

to Joseph Smith was false, and the proof that it was false is found in these words: There are no angels now. Well, maybe that is true. Let us see. Jesus Christ will be accepted by this audience as a reliable witness. Matthew 26: 53: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." Twelve legions! A legion is 6,000, "Gardner's Christian Encyclopaedia and Smith's Bible Dictionary, page 605." Twelve times six is seventy-two. Here then if Jesus is good evidence there were alive and well 72,000 angels at that time. Second Kings 6:17: "And the prophet's eyes were opened and he looked upon the mountain and he saw the mountain full of angels." I don't know how many there were there. In Daniel, 7: 10, we are told ten thousand times ten thousand angels. Revelations 5: 11, shows that there were millions of angels, and Paul in Hebrews, 1st chapter, declares that angels are ministering spirits sent forth to minister unto those who are heirs of salvation. Heb. 12:22 says there are an innumerable company of angels. Now, just look. Take the parson's words: "There are no angels now," and think that the business, the occupation of an angel is to minister unto those who are heirs of salvation. Are there any heirs of salvation in this generation? If so, if they believe the conditions prescribed by the Almighty, they have as much right to angelic administration as any other man or woman had in the past, for God is no respecter of persons. Did you ever hear tell of the death of an angel? Millions of them were well and ready for action a few short years ago, according to John the Revelator, and the churches say that God has not revealed anything since the Bible. So the last advices we have from heaven are to the effect that millions of angels were well and about their business when last heard of.

I have heard that prejudice and hatred would slander the north star out of the heavens, but I tell you that prejudice and hatred and malice and priestcraft have grown so big that they would sooner believe and sooner teach that millions of angels have died rather than admit the bare possibility that one of them was still alive and well, and might appear to Joseph Smith.

That is what that preacher wanted those people to believe rather than believe that an angel would appear to Joseph Smith, and he would have them believe that every angel that ever lived had been annihilated. "There are no angels now!"

Angels Have Appeared Before.

Now why should it be incredible that an angel should appear now? Angels appeared in the days of Adam, Enosh, Abraham, Jacob, Daniel, Zachariah, Joseph, Peter, Paul, John, and let me say that whenever God's true church was upon the earth and men and women were worthy of the vocation wherewith they were called angels appeared to them. But they would have no angels appear now because the church has taken the place of Christianity, and the creed has taken the place of the Bible, priestcraft has taken the place of priesthood, and the world has said: "We will run our own affairs. We do not want, nor do we need that heaven should interfere."

Ladies and gentlemen, if ever there was a time in the history of the world that we need the divine interposition, the divine communication, it is now. If ever there was a time when the silence of ages should be broken and God should come out and perform the marvellous work and wonders that He promised to do, it is now.

Joseph Smith testifies that on the 15th day of May, 1829, an angel

came down from heaven, laid his hands upon him and his associate, Oliver Cowdery, and ordained them to the Aaronic priesthood, and that he came in the spirit and power of Elias, and that the church was to be restored as found in the prophecy of Malachi. More of this vision later.

Now, to prove to you that John the Baptist was to come back to earth, I subpoena Jesus Christ and the apostles as witnesses. Matthew, 17th chapter, 10th and 13th verses inclusive: "And his disciples asked Him saying: Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come and restore all things, but I say unto you that Elias is come already and they knew him not, but they have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of Man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spoke unto them of John the Baptist." Not only has John already come, but Jesus predicts his second coming. "Shall,"—that is in the future. That was fulfilled when he came and restored the priesthood to Joseph Smith. "Well," says one, "the funny part of all this is, did anybody else see the angels besides Joseph Smith? If you can produce evidence along that line, then I will believe." "Oh, would you? Don't forget my text: "Ye shall in no wise believe though a man declare it unto you."

Let me show you now that you may be prejudiced and not know it. Angels appeared to Daniel when he was all alone. You would take Daniel's evidence. Angels appeared to Abraham. You would take Abraham's statement, or at least Moses' statement of it. Angels appeared to John, to Joseph and to Mary, to Peter and Paul. Did anyone else see the angel at these particular times? You never saw the angel nor anybody else that saw anybody else that did see the angel except the one to whom the vision occurred. But you believe it. Why do you want more evidence from Joseph Smith than you want from some man who lived six thousand years ago?

And to Worse Men.

Well, Joseph Smith tells the story that while he was praying in the woods a light shone about him, and the heavenly messengers came down and testified to certain things. "All that is incredible." Yes? Let me tell you another story. A long time before Joseph Smith was born, there was a boy born under very peculiar circumstances, and they hid him in the bulrushes, and he was found under very peculiar circumstances. He was raised as a kind of adopted son, and by and by he saw two men having a little fuss on the roadside. And the Bible (Exodus 2: 11-12) says he looked this way and then that way, and when he saw there was no one watching him, he recognized that blood was thicker than water, for one of these men was his own brother, and he hurried up and gave the Egyptian a solar plexus and killed him on the spot; then hid him in the sand. Now you cannot say he did it in passion. You cannot say I am slandering him because he tells the story himself. You cannot say that it was not premeditated for he looked this way and that way before he put his thought into action. Now when he had done his worst did he go to the man's widow and offer to provide for her? Did he say, "Don't fret, I will see your children are well educated." No, he skipped the country and hired himself to a man to watch sheep, and eventually married the man's daughter. He tells that one day he was watching the sheep when he looked towards a bush. He says it was all in a blaze, and he walked over to it, and the first thing someone said: "Moses, take off thy shoes for the ground upon which thou standest is holy ground." Every Bible believer takes that down surely. Now here was a young man escaped

after committing a crime. There is not a single sentence in all the Bible that says he was sorry for it. There is not a single sentence in all the Bible that says he ever asked forgiveness for doing it. There is not a sentence in all the Bible to show that he ever offered a prayer until that time, but you believe an angel could appear in the woods, a great big light shine around, and that an angel appeared to that man. "But," says one, "there is a difference between Moses and Joseph Smith." Yes, there is, but in whose favor does the difference lie?

In the one case an angel appears to a man who had committed a murder and skipped the country, and as to whom there is no evidence that he ever prayed up to that time. On the other hand we have a boy attending a revival meeting; we have him reading the Bible; we have him searching for light; we have him reading the promises of God. He believed them to be as invulnerable as the God that made them, taking God at His word and living in the golden, glittering promise that God Himself has made: "Ask and ye shall receive. Seek and ye shall find. Knock and it shall be opened." He went to a sequestered place where none but God might hear him. There, 'neath the leafy bowers in nature's temple, he prays, and God keeps His promise, and the answer comes. There is a difference, but it is all in favor of the stripling, and any unbiased jury would say I have that case no matter what your religious prejudices say concerning it.

The Doubting Thomas.

"Well," says one, "that looks pretty good, but is there anything in the Bible that shows an angel was to appear in the latter days?" Suppose I was to say that I know nothing to that effect. Is that any proof that there was none to come? Just try that out and find me the place where it says an angel was to appear to Moses, or Abraham, or to Peter or Paul or James. Oh, you believe that without putting on these restrictions, but you want to put up a barrier so you won't have to believe it about Joseph Smith. Does not that show you are prejudiced? The Bible does show that the gospel is to be restored in the latter days, and that the authority will be conferred by the hand of an angel. Jesus in Matthew 24 says: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness, and then the end shall come," showing that just prior to the end the gospel shall be restored, for I have already shown you from His own lips that the church was to suffer violence, and the violence would take it by force., (Matthew 11), but that it was to be restored. And how was it to be restored?

How Would It Be Restored?

Go with me to the 14th chapter of Revelations, and the 6th and 7th verses, where you will read these words: "And I saw another angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, saying with a loud voice: Fear God and give glory to him for the hour of the judgment is come, and worship him that made the heavens and the earth and the sea and the fountains of water." John is here speaking of that which is to come to pass in the latter days. You remember what the vision opens with. He is told to "come up and I will show you what is to come to pass hereafter," showing that after John's time, an angel would restore the gospel. He declares he sees an angel coming from heaven with power, with the right and authority to preach the everlasting gospel who is to confer the authority upon humanity, that his work may result by reason of this message.

The Creeds Are an Abomination.

I have just got started on this sermon, but I will take time to answer one objection before closing; that is, the messenger from heaven is reported to have said to Joseph Smith that the creeds are all wrong, and were an abomination in the sight of God. "Ah, says one, "that is so uncharitable." Oh, is it now? Well, there is one thing you must admire in Joseph Smith, and that is he did not try to go as a sheep in wolf's clothing, professing to endorse creeds and churches in order to ingratiate himself in their good graces. He told them they were wrong right from the start to the close.

Now I will show you that the creeds are wrong, and I will prove it by the best churchman of the 19th century. An Indianapolis paper for February 23, 1890, speaking of the Methodist creeds, says: "The following paper was read by Rev. T. A. Goodwin at the meeting of the Methodist ministers. (This comes from the preacher himself). For more than seventeen hundred years the church has been tinkering at her creeds, now adding, now subtracting, and then revising until the creeds of today are theological hotchpotch rather than the faith of the church." Dr. Thrall, in the New York Sun of October 11, 1874, said: "The different sects are looking away from the creeds or catechisms to the absolute sufficiency of the Bible and are learning that church government, as described in the Bible, does not exist upon the earth." The St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 3, 1890, containing a sermon of Rev. T. DeWitt Talmage entitled "Why a New Creed is Needed," and represents him as saying: "The unfortunate thing now is that so many Christians are only half liberated. Many have been bound hand and foot by religious creeds. Now, that the old creeds have been put under public scrutiny something radical must be done. Some would split them up; some would carve them; some would abbreviate them. At the present moment and in the present shape they are a hinderance. If you want one glorious church, free and unencumbered, take off the encumbrances of old ecclesiastical vocabulary, loose her and let her go."

And do you know that the creeds are changing almost as rapidly as your yearly almanacs? Every synod and conference is making something new, introducing some changes, until your most brilliant preachers are telling you that this Bible is not what our fathers believed it to be—the word of God. Many of them have denounced the story of creation and the story of Adam and Eve; the story of Abraham; and one of your city preachers has been bold enough to say that when Christ referred to those mystical personages and to those stories, narratives and legendary affairs, it was because He was limited in knowledge, and that if He stands up for that which science denounces, so much the worse for Him. Surely it is time we had an authoritative priesthood. It is time we had a church brought back to the original conditions.

Now this question is so big I cannot finish it tonight. In my following lectures I shall continue to bring out the evidence touching the organization and the time of the organization of the Church of Christ, that it was to be in 1830, and the work shall proceed just as fast as I can make it plain to you. I thank you.

The Angel's Message

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 5th chapter of Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians, and the 21st verse, where you will read these words: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Last Sunday night I gave you a brief account of the first visitation of the heavenly messengers to Joseph Smith, which took place in the year 1820. The next visitation occurred in 1823, when the angel Moroni appeared to him in his bedroom, just a short distance from the Village of Palmyra in the State of New York. Among many things revealed to him that night he was told that America was inhabited many centuries ago by a people led here under the guiding hand of divinity; that they had become a mighty and a numerous people; that Christ had visited them here; that through their prophets God had spoken to them and had revealed His will to them and that those revelations and the history of those people had been written upon plates of gold; and that those plates had been deposited by one of the prophets in a certain hill called "The Hill, Cumorah," situated some two or three miles from his father's residence near Palmyra in the State of New York. He was told that the time was near when God would establish His church again upon the earth; that this record was not to take the place of the Bible but was confirmatory of the Bible; it was a second or another witness that Jesus was the Christ and that the gospel was the power of God unto salvation; that it presented the same God, the same Christ, the same gospel as we read of in the Bible, called the old and new testaments; and that if he were faithful he would be an instrument in the hands of God in bringing this work forth, translating it from the language in which it was written and setting it before the people.

He continued to receive instruction from the Lord until September 22, 1827, when the angel delivered the plates into his hands, and in the winter of 1829-30 the Book of Mormon was translated and finally printed. I have a copy of the first edition. I may give you a short description of the hill where the plates were discovered as found in a little work called the "Visions of Joseph, the Seer," p. 11. As you pass on the mail road from Palmyra, Wayne County, New York, before arriving at a little village called Manchester, about three or four miles from Palmyra, you pass a large hill on the east side of the road. Why I say "large" is because it is as large perhaps as any in that country. It was on that hillside the plates were deposited, and, centuries after, were discovered by Joseph, the Seer.

The Plates.

The plates perhaps may be described to you. "These records were engraven on plates which had the appearance of gold. Each plate was not far from seven by eight inches in width and length, being not quite as thick as common tin. They were filled on both sides with engravings in Egyptian characters and bound together in a volume as the leaves of a book and fastened at one edge with three rings running through the

whole. The volume was nearly six inches in thickness, a part of which was sealed. It was said by those who profess to know, that the entire volume weighed in the neighborhood of sixty pounds.

Seen By Four People.

The testimony of Joseph Smith from 1820 till he fell a martyr to the cause at the hands of an infuriated mob in 1844, stands out unimpeached. From boyhood till he stood in the gate of death he continued to testify that the angel appeared to him and that the Book of Mormon was of divine authenticity. He was not alone in this testimony, for shortly after he received the plates they were shown to three witnesses: Oliver Cowdery, the brilliant school teacher, and afterwards a famous lawyer; David Whitmer, who was the soul of honor; and Martin Harris. These three men, from 1829 until each of them laid down the weapons of their warfare on this mundane sphere, continued to testify that an angel from God came down from Heaven, turned over the leaves of this book and that the voice of God from the Heavens spake to them commanding them to testify to the divine authenticity of this work.

The last words of Oliver Cowdery in 1850 testified to the divine origin of this book. The last words of David Whitmer in 1886 were in testimony of this work. The last words of Martin Harris in 1875 were also in testimony of its divine origin. They endured persecution all through life and when the lilies of eighty-four winters were upon the brow of David Whitmer he went down to death stating with his last breath, "I heard the voice of God: I conversed with the angel: I handled the plates."

Strong Testimony.

When it is remembered that these three men differed from Joseph Smith in some things and at times the difference was so great that they were estranged from him, yet their testimony regarding his divine calling and the divine authenticity of this book continued to fall from their lips until they went down to the silence of the tomb. Their testimony is found recorded in the fly-leaf of the Book of Mormon. I shall not read it because in these sermons I have to be brief. Eight other witnesses testified in that same book that they saw the places and bore testimony throughout their lives to that effect and not one of them ever denied it.

Now here is the testimony of twelve men, from boyhood, youth to manhood, and on until their death, some of them living for eighty years, all testifying that they saw, they heard, they felt. If you can get the testimony of twelve men that cannot be impeached on any other matter, the jurisprudence of civilization would say that that testimony continuing for so long, agreeing, uncontradicted, must stand.

Book of Mormon.

A brief history of the work perhaps may be necessary at this juncture. The book claims to contain the history of three colonies of people, having been led by God to this continent. The first company was called the Jaredites. They lived on this land about 1600 years and became a great people and built many cities. They finally fell into wickedness, and about 600 years before Christ they were all destroyed save two men. One of their prophets named Ether wrote their history on gold plates and buried them in the ground. They were twenty-four plates in number, and later on were discovered and form a part of the Book of Mormon.

The second colony came from Jerusalem in the first year of the reign of Zedekiah—King Judah. They were called the Nephites.

The third colony came from Jerusalem in the eleventh year of the

reign of the same king, Zedekiah, and were discovered by the second colony about 400 years later, when they were amalgamated.

The first company landed in Yucatan; the second colony landed on the west coast of South America, now called Chili, and the third company landed on the west coast of Central America. The Book of Mormon gives the history of these people; their worship; their wars; their religion; their habits and customs; it tells of the great cities they built and how the Saviour visited them; and later that the Spirit was poured out among them; and it gives a very good account of the early inhabitants of this country. It tells how God rebuked them from time to time for their wickedness and finally how they were cursed; becoming a filthy and a loathsome people, and were discovered by Columbus on his arrival on this great continent and are known as the American Indians.

A History of America.

I shall not attempt to-night to go into the internal history of the book. That shall be my pleasure, the Lord willing, next Sunday night, when I shall show you the teaching of the book and shall go into the archaeological researches of America and show you that there are hundreds of cities, the remains of which have been discovered since the Book of Mormon was in print that tell the story of the splendid and mighty colonies and of the great nations that dotted this country from one end to the other. But I just here state that if it be logical for us to delve into the ruins of Egypt and Palestine and that great eastern country to prove the divine authenticity of the Bible, then that same logic should accept the evidence of cities that I shall show you have been called by name; temples and palaces that have been minutely described in the Book of Mormon and have been discovered and described forty, fifty and sixty years after the Book of Mormon was in print and have been found to tally with the descriptions in the book. I shall show you, if your patience will last long enough, that it is one of the most interesting books and the greatest history of the American nation that has ever been written. And had there not been a vision connected with it the nations would have hailed it with gladness, for it is the only authentic history of the American Indians. You can produce a hundred volumes, but I challenge the production of one that tells you definitely about where the American Indians came from. This Book of Mormon is the only book in existence that describes the inhabitants of those wonderful cities. I just give you this little pointer to-night so that you will be interested and come out next Sunday night and hear what we have to say in regard to the book.

Its Object—Jesus Is the Christ.

The book comes to us in a way that demands an investigation. It does not claim to come from some irregular source; it claims to come from the same source as the Bible—God. It claims to contain a proper message—the gospel of Jesus Christ, the history of God's dealings with the people of ancient America, as the Bible contains the history of God's dealings with the ancient people of the eastern world. The object of the book is to convince the Jew and the Gentile that Jesus is the Christ. You may read the object plainly stated in the flyleaf of the book and also on the 490th page.

Now let me say, right here, that if upon investigation it is discovered that the object of the book is to convince the Jew and the Gentile that Jesus is the Christ, why should any man or woman that loves the immaculate Son of Mary be found fighting against a work that extols His name and invite men to worship Him as the Christ. It seems to me, no matter

where it originated, no matter who wrote it, if that is the basic claim every lover of the Master of men would have it in his library and use it for the laudable purpose for which it was intended; to convince both Jew and Gentile that Jesus is the Christ. More of that when we come to the book itself. The rest of this evening will be spent in answering certain objections made against the book for I want to clear the weeds away in order that I may the better and more effectually plant the good seed.

A Challenge—Who Picks It Up?

From the pulpit and the press, the parsons of this world, the clergy of churchianity have taught the people that the Book of Mormon is the foundation for the practice of polygamy. I challenge any clergyman in this city to produce a book now in print that denounces polygamy as emphatically, as tersely, as unmistakably as does the Book of Mormon. And when I challenge him to produce a book I will permit him to include the Bible itself. I unhesitatingly say that I have never read a book that denounces polygamy as plainly as does the Book of Mormon. In support of my statement, I shall read from the book itself. I might read you a dozen of passages, but this one reflects the sentiment of the book throughout.

An Enemy of Polygamy.

In the Second Book of Jacob we read that Jacob is commanded to go up before the Lord in the temple to-morrow and to declare to the people what the Lord will impart to him. He goes up on the morrow and then speaks to the people as follows: "And were it not that I must speak unto you concerning a grosser crime my heart would rejoice exceedingly because of you; but the word of God burdens me because of your grosser crimes." (He had just been speaking of the crime of pride and is telling us now of another crime worse than pride.) "For behold, thus saith the Lord. This people shall begin to wax in iniquity. They understand not the Scriptures for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms because of the things which were written concerning David and Solomon his son." (That is the David and Solomon of the Bible.) "Behold David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord. Wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have lead this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem by the power of mine arm that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruits of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me and hearken to the word of the Lord, for there shall not any man among you have any save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none, for I, the Lord, delighteth in the chastity of women, and whoredoms are an abomination before me. Thus saith the Lord of Hosts."

Nine times in that one paragraph God denounces the practice of the plurality of wives, and all through that book can be found the same sentiment whenever the marriage relation is referred to. Now, in closing upon this point, the first great objection urged against the book, falls. What are you going to do with this army of false teachers who wilfully and maliciously lie about the contents of that book? If it is a bad book can't the preachers meet it without misrepresenting it? And I want to say right here that when there are hundreds of thousands of these books circulated and you can buy them as cheap as 50 cents, there is no excuse for a public man to be ignorant as to its contents and no preacher should make statements derogatory to anybody or any book until he knows the facts about it.

The Spaulding Romance.

Now I want to answer another popular objection to the book and that is "The Spaulding Romance." I cannot give you all this story tonight. You will find it in many of your family Bibles. You will find it in most every book that has been written against the church, and I want to say here that it is the most self-contradictory, silly, bungled bunch of falsehoods and misrepresentations ever concocted by the mind of man. If there is a man in this audience that has believed that story I fancy that when I get through with it he will want to jump off the bridge and say, "Here goes nothing." I have taken pains to get all these dates so that if you bring your encyclopaedias or your parson's books against me I am ready to meet them all. But as the parsons have made such a beautiful story of this, I think it proper to let them tell it in their own language. The Rev. Samuel D. Green, in *The Christian Cynosure*, Dec. 20, 1877, in an article entitled, "Joseph Smith, the Mormon," says: "There was living in Bethany a Rev. M. Spaulding. He had written some chronicles on the ruins of Central America and some Bible truths mixed up together. . . . Joe Smith and Cochran got some knowledge and borrowed it and from the help of Spaulding's manuscripts made the Mormon Bible. Rev. Mr. Spaulding called and sent for it a great many times, and his wife came for it, but Smith would not let them have it. Smith told Spaulding, and I heard him, (No hearsay about that. You can't excuse the parson, he is a living witness) that he had made a Mormon Bible of it and the Lord had taken it into the wilderness and he, Joe Smith, prophesied where it was deposited in Palmyra Woods about twelve miles east of Rochester, N. Y." Another letter written by Mr. Green to I. N. White, says: "I saw Rev. Mr. Spaulding as late as 1827, and I have a letter from William Jenkins, (now dead), that he saw Spaulding in Attica in 1829, and he wanted to preach there." Before I examine this statement I submit another sure testimony from a reverend doctor of divinity. In *The Congregationalist* of Oct. 24, 1877, the Rev. Tyron Edwards, D. D., of Philadelphia, says: "The Book of Mormon was in substance written by Rev. Solomon Spaulding, who was a graduate of Dartmouth College, and a Presbyterian minister once settled in Cherry Valley, N. Y., and afterwards living in New Salem, Ohio. Beginning in 1809 and writing in intervals as he did, he often read parts of the work to his neighbors, and among the listeners was Joseph Smith, who not only attended the readings but borrowed the manuscripts, as he said, to read to his family at home. In 1812 the completed manuscript was placed in the hands of a printer in Pittsburg, Pa., by the name of Patterson, with a view to its publication. While the printing was delayed, Mr. Spaulding left Pittsburg for Washington County, Pa., where he died in 1816. While the manuscript was in the hands of Patterson, Sydney Rigdon was working for him as a journeyman printer, and it is supposed that he, having copied the manuscript, with Smith concocted the idea of the new religion."

Joseph Smith a Father of Three !!!

Now permit me to examine the statements of these two parsons which contradict each other, for they form the basis of the great Spaulding romance. Every encyclopaedia in the world, every history written on this subject, all agree that Joseph Smith was born Dec. 23, 1805, according to the doctor of divinity. Joseph Smith, somewhere between the years 1809 and 1812 was a bar-room loafer, and a neighbor of Spaulding's. He borrowed the manuscript to read to his family at home. Joseph Smith would be about three years old in 1809. He would be about six

years old in 1812. Now, I submit to you that Joseph must have developed much quicker than most boys. Just think, somewhere between three and six years of age he is a bar-room loafer—a neighbor of the reverent tavern keepers—and the dear little fellow had a family. Not many boys have a family at the age of three years. “He borrowed the manuscript to read to his family at home.” No wonder they accuse him of having several wives and a number of families in later years. See the good start he had. But worse and more of it; Spaulding and his wife went a number of times for the manuscript and Smith refused to give them the precious roll. Surely he was a big fellow early in life, and now he turns prophet, and prophesies that the Lord had taken it and was going to make a Mormon Bible out of it.

Contradictory Evidence.

But notice—one parson says he would not give it back. The other parson shows that if he had it he did give it back, for he relates that Spaulding gave the manuscript to a printer and then left Pittsburg and died in 1816. Next, Rigdon is supposed to have been a printer in the office, and is supposed to have got in league with Smith and copied it. But Rigdon says that he never was a printer in that office or any other. History shows Rigdon was a Baptist minister, and then became a Disciple minister, and that he never saw the Book of Mormon till it was in print in 1830. That he opposed the elders that came to his town preaching, had a debate with them and, seeing the light, was baptized and brought with him many of his church. All true history is contradicted by the doctor of divinity’s “It is Supposed.”

One of the parsons, a man of many years of experience, when writing a book on the subject says: “It is generally believed that Sidney Rigdon was the chief abettor of Joseph Smith in concocting the Mormon scheme. The usual debate undertakes to trace the Book of Mormon to the Spaulding romance through Sidney Rigdon. Nothing can be more erroneous, and it will lead to almost certain defeat. . . . The facts are all opposed to this view.” (Doctrines and Dogmas of Mormonism by Bays; p. 22.)

Again Rev. Green is told his story by Rev. Spaulding in 1827. Brother Jenkins talks with Spaulding in 1829. But listen—Rev. Edwards says Spaulding died in 1816. Spaulding’s widow and daughter says Rev. Spaulding died in 1816. In the graveyard at Amity, Pa., still stands the tombstone on which is engraved: “Solomon Spaulding, died 1816.” Yet to convict Joseph Smith the parsons tells us of getting evidence from Spaulding. One eleven years after his death, the other thirteen years after his death. Now any of you that wish to believe that silly story in order to find Joseph Smith guilty may do so, but the honest person will not believe such self-contradictory yarns.

I will submit for the benefit of those that wish them, a few dates that may be of interest to you. Spaulding wrote his story between 1809 and 1812; gave it to the printer in 1812; left Pittsburg in 1814, and died in 1816. Putting it at the furthest limit then, Joseph Smith would be only ten years old when Solomon Spaulding died. The manuscript was returned by the printer to Mr. Spaulding’s widow, who placed it in a trunk, where it remained till 1834. The Book of Mormon was printed and thousands of copies in circulation all over the world in 1830. D. P. Hurlburt was excommunicated from the Latter Day Saints Church for bad conduct, and swore vengeance. E. D. Howes’ wife joined the church of the Latter Day Saints and he was mad about it. Howe was an infidel, and wrote a book against the Bible. Now these two men, full of spite and unbelief, wrote a book against the Latter Day Saints Church. Hul-

burt went to Spaulding's widow and procured the manuscript from her and promised to return it. He gave it to Howe and then to spite Joseph Smith and make money from the sale of their book they stated that the manuscript was similar to the Book of Mormon and contained the same names, etc. Howe filled his book with these false statements. Hence we have "Mormonism Unveiled," by E. D. Howe. The manuscript was not returned to Spaulding's widow. Howe doubtless thought he burned it, for Mrs. Spaulding was informed that the manuscript had accidentally been destroyed by fire, but it must have been some other manuscript, as the sequel will show. He put it among other manuscripts in his printing office, he forgot where, and then tells Mrs. Spaulding that the manuscript was burned.

The Manuscript Found.

Between 1839-40 he sells his printing office to L. L. Rice. The transfer of the printing department was accompanied by a collection of old manuscripts. Years passed away. L. L. Rice removes to Honolulu, Sandwich Islands. In 1884-5 President Fairchild, of Oberlin College, Ohio, visited Mr. Rice. Looking over some old manuscripts they discovered "the long-lost manuscipe," found Smith had not borrowed it; Smith never refused to give it back because he never had it; Howe did not burn it, though he may have thought he did. It was sold with the other truck of the office and lays for all those years and they discover it. It had been in Mr. Rice's possession for forty years. It is now in the Oberlin College, in the State of Ohio, with the following endorsement on the manuscript: "Writings of Solomon Spaulding, proven by Aaron Wright, Oliver Smith, John Miller and others." The testimony of the above named gentlemen are now in my possession. Signed, D. P. Hulburt.

Thank God. The manuscript is found. It is discovered and the preachers who have maligned the character of Joseph Smith and misrepresented the Book of Mormon now stand aghast at the unimpeachable testimony for the book is a relic in the library of Oberlin College, in the State of Ohio, notwithstanding what your encycyopedias have had to say and notwithstanding what your family Bibles have had to say about it.

It is well called "The Manuscript Found."

They testify that the Book of Mormon and the Spaulding Romance are very much alike. One preacher just a few weeks ago was silly enough to say in a sermon in London that there twenty-three perfect identifications in the Book of Mormon and the Spaulding Romance. Some of you have perhaps read my letter asking the gentleman to come to the platform and prove it, but he doesn't like to and I don't blame him. Now are there any identification marks, any similarities? Let us see. Joseph Smith, the president of this church and the son of the original Joseph Smith, received a letter from L. L. Rice, who writes that the manuscript is in the possession of President Fairchild and here is one paragraph written by L. L. Rice to President Joseph Smith from Honolulu, Sandwich Islands. May 14, 1885: "Two things are true concerning this manuscript in my possession. First, it is a genuine writing of Solomon Spaulding; and, secondly, it is not the original of the Book of Mormon." Upon investigation there is not a name in the whole book like a single name in the Book of Mormon. The testimonies as to similarity were written up by fellows who thought they had destroyed it and anybody can prove they were lying about it, but murder will out, so that the greatest argument ever urged against the Book of Mormon, known as the Spaulding Romance, falls to the ground. So much for that objection.

Is Book of Mormon Necessary?

I want to present another objection. In a discussion with a revered clergyman a little while ago he said to me, "Mr. Evans, I think if you will answer me one question we can close this debate." I said, "I will answer it if I can, sir." Question: "Is there sufficient in the New Testament to save a man?" I answered: "Yes, sir. If a man is privileged to obey the gospel as taught by Jesus Christ and the apostles in the New Testament he will undoubtedly be saved." "Ah," said he, "that settles it; if there is enough in the Bible to save a man, then we don't want any Book of Mormon." "Well," remarked one of my audience, "that is a clincher, alright." But I said, "Now don't close the debate yet. I want to ask a question. Is there sufficient in the Old Testament to save a man?" Now, sir, you have told me that I am a lawyer from Salt Lake who hypnotizes people and makes them believe what I want them to believe. I don't want to hypnotize you, nor get you in a corner. I want to warn and help you if I can. Remember, sir, you make the claim that there are only two places, heaven and hell, salvation and damnation. Now, before you answer my question, think. (It hurts some people to think.) If you say there is not sufficient in the Old Testament to save a man, then all who are not saved are damned according to your faith, and you have Adam, Eve, Isaiah, Jacob, David, Solomon, and all the good people of the Old Testament times and further you have Mary, Elizabeth, John, Peter, James, Paul and all the people of the first and second century condemned for all eternity for the New Testament was not compiled for hundreds of years after Christ ascended. Now, sir, answer me. Is there sufficient in the Old Testament to save a man." "Well," he says. "Why, him, I—er—cannot say that all the holy worthies of the past are damned. Why, why, yes sir, yes sir, there is sufficient in the Old Testament to save a man." "Oh, then if there is sufficient in the Old Testament to save a man what do you want the New Testament for?" The very logic that will throw out the Book of Mormon will throw out the New Testament and it an axiom that that which proves too much does not prove anything. I showed you the other night that prejudice had murdered all the angels rather than admit that one was well and living and visited Joseph Smith. Now I am showing you that the arguments that will "down" the Book of Mormon will also down the New Testament, so that objection must go down.

The facts are, God revealed Himself to the people of the Old Testament times and God revealed Himself to the people of this continent in Book of Mormon times, and whenever God speaks it is true; and if it be recorded, whether in Asia or America, whether in the Old Testament or in the New Testament, the Book of Mormon or any other book that contains what God says, is the word of God."

Another Silly Objection Quashed.

Another objection is found in the 22nd chapter of Revelation, the last chapter of the Bible, which I shall read to you. I quote verses 18 and 19: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophesy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the Holy City, and from the things which are written in this book."

The parson piously approaches and says: "I denounce the Book of Mormon because it claims to be a revelation from God. It is adding to the Bible." Terrible, isn't it? That man is either unpardonably ignorant, or is presuming upon the gullibility of his audience. That is a big charge to make, isn't it? I am happy in believing you will listen to my proof. The

Bible does not say that God will never speak again; it never hints at any such thing. It only says this, in effect; that God meant what He said, and said what He meant; that no man was to alter this by adding to, or taking from it. But if that means that God was to close His mouth and never speak again after the Book of Revelation, then again I say that which proves too much proves nothing at all.

And to be brief, I draw your attention to the 4th chapter, second verse, of Deuteronomy, and also the 12-32, when the same thought as to adding to, or diminishing from, the words that I this day have given to thee, is expressed; and if that means that God is never going to speak again, then the same argument that brings the curse on Joseph Smith for adding the Book of Mormon, will bring the curse on Moses; for he wrote from the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy to the 30th after that declaration. It will not only take in Moses, but every writer of the Old and of the New Testament; and again, that which proves too much proves nothing. In order to get Joseph Smith under that curse you have to curse every man of Old Testament times. But it does not mean that all. It means what God says at anytime, in any book or any age; man should not seek to abbreviate it.

Church of England Tinkering.

For instance, the Church of England, now think that God said too much in the Ten Commandments, and they are seeking to get them cut down. There is a curse due there, and they'll get it. They say that God ought never to have said so much in the Ten Commandments. The Toronto papers only a few days ago tell how some preachers are trying to abridge the Ten Commandments, while other parsons write, "It is blasphemous."

I spoke of gullibility and unpardonable ignorance. That very chapter, the last in the Bible, contains twenty words in italics that have been added by the translators, but the preacher would have you believe that as the Book of Revelation is the last in order in the bound Bible, that that was the last revelation given. Now, I say that when they take that position, they are either unpardonably ignorant or wilfully presuming upon the gullibility of the people because the Book of Revelation, as every man ought to know, was not the last book given. For proof of that I submit the following: "The reference here—Rev. 22—18, 19—is to the Book of Revelation only, for at that time the books that constitute what we call the Bible were not collected into a single volume. This passage, therefore, should not be adduced as referring to the whole of the sacred scriptures." (Barnes' Commentary on Revelation: 22-18, page 516). Every person knows that the Bible in its present form was not compiled for hundreds of years after Christ's ascension, and the putting of Revelation at the last of the book, is the work of man and not of God. Every preacher knows this, and when he makes that argument he is presuming upon your gullibility.

The Revelation Not the Last Book Written.

"Olhausen and Guerike insist that the Apocalypse was written twenty years before the gospel or the Epistles of John, So also Commentators of the sixth century make quotations from the book in such a manner as to show that they suppose it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem." (Barnes' Commentary, page 22 and 30). "The Book of Revelation, though placed last among the books of the Bible, is supposed to have been the first of John's writings in point of time." (Gardener's Christian Encyclopaedia, page 574.) "The Book of Revelations was written after John had been confined in Patmos. . . for he afterwards wrote the gospel," Lardner, volume 5, page 216.

"The Revelation appears to us to have been written long before the

gospels. It carries us into a period very little remote from the persecution under Nero." De'Plessense, *Early Years of Christianity*, page 427. "We may, perhaps, be content with the arrangement which places the Book of Revelation as the last of the book of Holy Writ, but the whole weight of evidence now tends to prove it is not the last book in chronological order, but that it was written nearer the beginning than the end of John's period of apostolic activity amid the churches of Asia, that the last accents of revelation which fall upon our ears are not those of a treatise which, though it ends in such perfect music, contains so many terrible visions of blood and fire, but are rather those of the gospel which tells us that "The word was made flesh" and of the Epistles, which first formulated the most blessed truth which was ever uttered to human hearts, the truth that "God is love." *Early days of Christianity*, by Canon Farrah, page 404-5. A full quarter of a century elapsed between the ripe manhood when John wrote the Apocalypse and the old age in which he wrote the gospel and the epistles," *Ibid*, page 491. "How then," it may be asked, "can the evangelist and the seer of Patmos be one and the same, person. They are one and the same, but divided from each other by nearly a quarter of a century. By more than twenty years of divine education and broadening light, the Apocalypse was written amid the great throbbing agonies of a Jewish war, and after the blood-stained horrors of the Neronian persecution. The gospel and epistles, on the other hand, were written after long residence among the Gentiles. After the fall of Jerusalem." *Ibid*, page 493. Apart from its own beauty and importance, the Epistle of St. John derives a special interest from the fact that it is the latest utterance of apostolic inspiration," *Ibid*, page 504.

"The Sunday School Journal and Bible Students' Magazine for October, 1901, is as follows: 'John's revelation was written about 68, A. D.; John's Gospel was written about 90, A. D.; and his three epistles were written about 95, A. D.'"

Those Contradictory Preachers!

Now, all those quotations prove that the Book of Revelation was not the last one written, and that if you interpreted this passage to mean that God was not going to speak any more, you have to denounce the gospel as written by John, and the three epistolary addresses delivered by him; and again I say that which proves too much proves nothing.

One thought more, and I will close for to-night. The funniest thing about it is this: In one breath the preacher will say: "Don't you read the Book of Mormon; it is vile; it is obscene; it is disgusting; everything that is bad in Utah Mormonism is born and bred in the Book of Mormon." In the next breath he says: "The Book of Mormon was stolen from the Bible; why, page after page of it is taken from the Bible, and is just like it. It is written in the same style as the Bible, and anybody can see that it is copied largely from the sacred book itself." Ladies and gentlemen, I leave this with you. Answer this question, if it is everything that is bad, and vile, and obscene, and disgusting, and just like the Bible, taken from the Bible; what is your Bible worth? Those two stories won't agree. I thank you.

The Book of Mormon

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 85th Psalm, 10th, 11th and 12th verses, where you will read these words: "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other; truth shall spring out of the earth and righteousness shall look down from heaven. Yea, the Lord shall give that which is good and our land shall yield her increase."

Last Sunday night I took pleasure in introducing to you the subject of the Book of Mormon and removing many objections that have been urged against it, exposing the false stories that have been circulated from the pulpit and the press. To-night, I betake myself to the task of showing that God led a people from the eastern world to America. They came in three different colonies at different times; became a mighty and numerous people; built great cities upon this continent and worshipped the Lord who raised up prophets among them and revealed His will to them. Jesus, after the crucifixion, appeared to them; after many years they became a wicked people. Their last prophet took the records that contained their history, placed them in a stone box and deposited them in the earth whence they were brought forth by the power of God in these latter days to form another witness with the Bible that God really exists and that Jesus is the Saviour of the world.

New Testament Doesn't Convince the Jew.

I stated last Sunday night that the object of the book was to convince the Jew and the Gentile that Jesus is the Christ. I remarked that if that is the true object of the book, everyone that loves Jesus should hail the coming of that book with gladness. But as an offset to this we are told that the New Testament accomplishes this work. I deny it. While I believe God revealed Himself through Jesus Christ and the apostles and that the record of that revelation is to be found in the New Testament, yet I deny that the New Testament has convinced the Jew that Jesus is the Christ. You present the claims of Jesus Christ as made in the New Testament to the Jew and he laughs at you, he pities your ignorance and he says, "Jesus was a Jew, one of our family. Permit us to know as much about our family as you folk who are outside of the pale of relationship. Jesus lived and died. He was accused of many things. Your own Testament says that he was accused of being a wine bibber and a gluttonous man." "Oh," we say to the Jew, "Isaac, you're mistaken. Your people crucified Him, but He was the Son of God and that great fact was demonstrated because He rose from the dead." And again, he laughs at you. "Rose from the dead. Who told you He rose from the dead?" And you reply, "Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter and James." "Yes," and he laughs again and says, "Those are the very fellows that were accused of stealing His dead body from the tomb." Matt. 28: 13. And we try to reason with him thus, but he rejects the witnesses that we attempt to prove our case by; and so the New Testament has not convinced the Jew that Jesus is the Christ, and it has not done a great deal toward convincing

the Gentile that Jesus is the Christ. We have any amount of churchianity, but a very small amount of Christianity, as we find it in the New Testament, and the plainest doctrines of Jesus Christ are denied by the great majority of the Gentile world to-day, and even your Christian Churches (some of them), and your leading preachers in Toronto (some of them), are denying much that He taught and believed; until the church today is a laughing-stock to infidelity. So that we hail with gladness any book that will be of assistance—in co-operation, shall I say—with the New Testament and the Old, bringing conviction to the Jew and the Gentile regarding the divinity of Christ, and the doctrine that He taught and the Church that He organized.

How Will the Book of Mormon Do It.

You may ask, how is the Book of Mormon to do this, and I shall try to make that answer plain to-night, in that I will show by the Old Testament writings of such men as Moses, the great Jewish lawgiver; and Isaiah, the golden-tongued prophet; and other prophets that are recognized as the representatives of God by the Jew; I will show them by their own witnesses that the Book of Mormon was to come forth. By their own prophecies, by their own histories, I am going to take those people from the eastern world and follow them to America, and to show that they had a book, and that the book was to be buried in the ground, and was to come forth when these prophecies are presented to them; they will believe them when they accept the book; they must accept Jesus with it, because His wonderful Messiahship runs through every page of it. Thus they will be convinced in God's time that Jesus is the Christ.

God No Respector of Persons.

Now, the Jews make the same mistake as the Gentiles along a certain line. We have all concluded that God selected one little tribe through whom He would reveal His mind and will to the sons of men. They thought that you had to be a Jew; that you had to live somewhere over in that eastern country before God would speak to you; but I turn to the Bible. Acts 10:34-35, reads: "I perceive that God is no respector of persons, but in every nation ne that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him." This thought is supplemented in the 17th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and reads as follows: "And God hath made of one blood all nations of men, and has appointed the bounds of their habitation that they might seek after Him and find Him; though He be not far off from anyone of them." Whatever your preconceived ideas might have been regarding these two passages of scripture, I submit this thought: that God is no respector of persons; that He knows where every individual of humanity is located. He has appointed the bounds of their habitation, and if they will seek Him they may find Him, and He will reveal Himself to them. That being true, it follows that if discovery brings to light people numbering millions on the continent of America, that it will be but reasonable as well as scriptural to suppose that God will reveal Himself to them; and if it were recorded, that revelation would then be the Word of God, though it be not found in the volume known to us as the Bible.

If God spoke to the people of America in the dear, dead years of the past, it would be just as much God's words as if He spoke to the people in Palestine; and He promises in these texts to deal impartially with all men everywhere, with the object that they might find Him and serve Him. Jesus takes up this thought, and in the 10th of John He says: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." That is to say: Jerusa-

lem or Palestine was not the only place where Israel's posterity would be found serving God; and that they would hear Christ's voice.

Taking up the Book of Mormon, page 451, I read this strange language that is coinciding with this prophecy of Jesus Christ: "And behold this is the land of your inheritance, and the Father hath given it unto you and not at any time hath the Father given me commandment that I should tell it to your brethren at Jerusalem. Neither at any time hath the Father given me commandment that I should tell unto them concerning the other tribes of the house of Israel, of whom the Father hath led away out of the land. This much did the Father command me, that I should tell unto them; that other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

God's true Israel were ever called His sheep, and so we might find them outside of Palestine. In support of this I submit Ezekiel 34: 6, where He says: "My sheep wandered through all the mountains and upon every high hill."

Joseph's Posterity Came to America.

Now, I cannot follow all the tribes of Israel, but I am going to follow the posterity of Joseph, and I will follow them to America. "Ah," says one, "you always pick on the Joseph, don't you?" Yes, it seems that was a favorite name with the Almighty. When God wanted to save the civilized world from starvation he picked the boy from the pit, made him a ruler in Egypt and thus saved the people from death. When God wanted to place the infant baby Jesus under proper influences and make provision for the Hebrew girl mother, he selected a man by the name of Joseph. When God wanted someone to take care of the body of Jesus Christ as it lay between death and the resurrection, Joseph of Arimithea was selected and when God desired to raise up a prophet in the latter days through whom this wonderful work, this marvellous work was to be presented to the world, and the church reorganized for the last time, to prepare the people for the coming of the King, again He selected Joseph. Now I am going to follow the posterity of Joseph.

Go with me to the 48th chapter of Genesis, 9-20 verses. The story is a long one but I will abbreviate as much as possible. Israel, or Jacob, is now an old man. He requests Joseph, his son, to bring his two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, to their grandfather that he might lay his hands upon them and bless them. Joseph takes the two lads and brings them to the grandfather, who is blind, putting Manasseh under the right hand and Ephraim under the left, he being the youngest. But the old man puts his hands "wittingly," the Bible says, crosswise and places his right hand on Ephraim, and Joseph says, "Not so my father. Put thy right hand upon Manasseh, he is the elder." "I know it, my son, I know it. He too shall be great, but his brother shall be greater and he shall grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth. Now get your geography and find where the midst of the earth is and where the posterity of this boy Ephraim is to grow into a multitude of people. In the 49th chapter, Joseph is receiving his own blessing from his father, Jacob. "And Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well." You will notice the metaphor here is drawn from the vineyard. It speaks of vines, branches and boughs, meaning the posterity of the original tree. "Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well, whose branches run over the wall." (I shall show you that the wall there means the sea, for at that time the sea was considered a wall because no one was known to have crossed it.) "The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the bless-

ing of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills; they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren." "The blessing of thy father hath prevailed above the blessing of progenitors." Who were they? Abraham and Isaac. What was their blessing?

Abraham's Blessing.

The country east and south of the Mediterranean, from the River of Egypt to the Euphrates, including the whole of Canaan. For proof of this see Genesis 12: 7; Genesis 15: 7; Genesis 15, 17-18; Genesis 26: 24; Genesis 28: 24, and Genesis 48: 4. The utmost bounds of the everlasting hills. That means the country furthest off. The utmost land from Goshen, where Jacob blesses his boy in Egypt, is America. The promised land: from south to north it extends from Arabia to Mount Lebanon, and from the great River Euphrates on the east to the Mediterranean on the west, including all the interior of that area. (Bible History, page 168.)

Joseph's Family to Have a Land.

It was about 185 miles long, and generally speaking, about 45 miles broad. That was the land given to Abraham and Isaac; but remember, this promise shows that Joseph's posterity is to get a land to the utmost hills, beyond the rivers of Ethiopia. "Now, you are trying to give Joseph a land of his own, aren't you?" Oh, no! I am going to read you the Bible where it says Joseph's posterity will have that land; and I will prove to you, if evidence will produce conviction, that it is America. Deuteronomy 33: 13-17, where you read, "And of Joseph, He said, Blessed of the Lord be his land." (You see, he is going to have a land.) Why is that land blessed? "For the precious thing of heaven" (and the most precious thing that heaven has sent to us is the word of God, and that word is to be found in this land) "for the dew that coucheth beneath, and for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun; and for the precious things put forth by the moon; and for the chief things of the ancient mountains; and for the precious things of the lasting hills; and for the precious things of the earth and the fullness thereof.

And for the goodwill of him that dwelt in the bush; let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and on the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren.

Where Is That Land.

I submit a little history, now, to show you that America fills the description here. "When America was discovered there were but sixty millions of gold in Europe; California and the territories around her have produced one thousand million dollars in gold in twenty-one years. Sixty-one million dollars was the largest annual yield ever made in Australia. California has several times produced ninety million dollars in gold in one year." (Old World and New, page 384). * * Silver: The Comstock mine of Nevada yielded seventy million dollars in seven years. In 1889 the silver harvest was over sixty million dollars. Iron: A mountain of solid iron in the State of Missouri contains enough ore above the surface to give an annual supply for two hundred years of one million tons. It is thought every foot beneath the surface will yield three million tons of ore. The artesian auger was still penetrating solid ore at a depth of 150 feet. (Year Book, page 645.) "In 1892 over sixteen million tons of iron ore were mined in the United States. Iron mountains in Missouri cover five hundred acres of land, and are sixty per cent. good iron." (Autumn Leaves, November, 1903.) Copper: United States produces twice as

much copper as any nation. Lead: In a single year she produced one hundred and ninety-three thousand tons of lead; the area of workable coal fields in all the world, outside of the United States, is estimated at 25,000 square miles; that of the United States, not including Alaska, is estimated at over 200,000 square miles, or eight times as large as the available coal area as all the rest of the world." (Year Book, 1869, page 655.) Cotton: The Southern States for six years have produced 75 per cent of the world's output of cotton. The crop in 1898 amounted to 11,274,840 bales. Wheat: In 1891 the United States produced 611,780,000 bushels of wheat. Fruits: The fruits of any and every land will grow in America and some of them better than in their native haunts. Two years in succession California shipped 14,000 carloads of oranges. In 1894 she shipped 108,000,000 pounds of raisins. Fisheries: The Newfoundland cod fisheries are the greatest in the world. The salmon fisheries of the Pacific Slope are unequalled anywhere. Their product goes to all parts of the civilized world and brings a yearly income of \$3,700,000. New Bedford whaling vessels annually brought in cargoes worth \$21,000,000. The principal mineral outputs for one year are as follows: Coal, \$210,263,953; iron, \$111,858,254; gold, \$64,000,000; copper, \$64,244,326; silver, \$37,321,356; lead, \$16,410,261; zinc, \$10,267,397; coke, \$31,920,000; petroleum, \$49,277,000. The total production for the year was \$810,050,023. (St. Louis Republic for 1898.)

"The wealth of the United States equals the combined valuation of Italy, Spain, India, Portugal, South America, Turkey, Egypt, Sweden, Norway, Canada, Denmark and Australia. It exceeds the wealth of Germany and Russia combined. It is equal to the wealth of Great Britain, Canada and Australia." (Facts for the Times, page 110.)

They Start Out.

Now, I have given you a few points indicating that the prophecy describing Joseph's land fits America as it fits no other place on the globe. Now we will start them on their journey right from the Bible. Go with me to Isaiah 16: 8: "For the fields of Heahbon languish, and the vine of Sibmah; the lords of the heathen have broken down the principal plants thereof, they are come even unto Jazer, they wandered through the wilderness; her branches are stretched out, they are gone over the sea." Here is the same idea of branches or boughs going over the wall, and now it says plainly "over the sea." Turn to 48th Jeremiah and we read another statement regarding these people going over the sea: "O vine of Sibmah. I will weep for thee with the weeping of Jazer." The country of Jazer is on the east of the Mediterranean. Pass over the sea from there and you come to the land of America.

Wander Through the Wilderness

Now it says they wandered through the wilderness. I pick up the Book of Mormon, and I read on page 36, "And we did sojourn for the space of many years, yea, even eight years in the wilderness, and we did come to the land which we called 'bountiful' because of its much fruit, and all these things were prepared of the Lord that we might not perish; and we beheld the sea, which we called Irreantum, which being interpreted is 'many waters.'" Bountiful was on the southeastern shore of Arabia, on the Gulf of Oman. They went east. The direction would keep them south of the Persian Gulf. Now the Bible says they were to travel through the wilderness and come to the sea. The Book of Mormon gives the history of how they travelled through the wilderness eight years and came to the sea, and gives a description as to how they came.

I want to go a little further with this and draw your attention to the 49th chapter of Jeremiah, where it says, "Flee, get you far off, dwell deep." (that is unobserved.) Oh ye inhabitants of Hazaor, saith the Lord; for Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, hath taken counsel against you and hath conceived a purpose against you. Arise, get you up into the wealthy nation that dwelleth without care, saith the Lord, which have neither gates nor bars, which dwell alone. And their camels shall be a booty, and the multitude of their cattle a spoil." A strange language used here. It was given through the prophets 600 years before Christ, as you will see in the margin here, they were told to go to a wealthy nation that dwelleth without care. Turn to the 43rd page of the Book of Mormon and we read, "And it came to pass that I, Nephi, did guide the ship that we sailed again towards the promised land, and it came to pass that after we had sailed for the space of many days we did arrive to the promised land, and we went forth upon the land and did pitch our tents, and we did call it the promised land. And it came to pass that we did find upon the land of promise as we journeyed in the wilderness that there were beasts in the forests of every kind; both the cow, the horse and the ox and the goat and all manner of wild animals which were for the use of men. And we did find all manner of ore, both gold and silver and of copper." "They landed on the west shore of South America on the coast of Chili, not far from the 13th degree south latitude."

Now, who were these people who had preceded them? They were to find a wealthy nation that dwelt without care. I draw your attention to the history of the first colony that came. Turn to Genesis 11: 19, and you will there find that at the time Nimrod had inspired the people in rebellion to go and build a tower that they might reach heaven and thus be able to speak defiance in the face of the Almighty in the case of another flood, and God came down, the record says, and confounded their language and they were driven to every part of the earth.

Josephus (Westor's edition, page 97, says): "They were scattered over all the earth and some of them took ship and crossed sea." I want to give you some of the history of this country from "The Mounmental Evidences of America." Claverigo says: "The Chiapanese have been the first people of the new world. They say that Votan, the grandson of that old man that built the ark to save himself and family from the deluge, and one of those who undertook the building of that lofty edifice which was to reach up to heaven, went by the express command of God to people that land. Votan came from the east, from across the sea by the Divine command. He brought with him seven families." (This is taken from John T. Short. North American Antiquities, page 202-4. Mark you, John T. Short who wrote in 1882, while the Book of Mormon was published to the world in the winter of 1829-30. Now, the history of that first colony called the Jaredites, that came from the Tower of Babel, shows that their language was confounded. The Book of Mormon from page 510 to page 533 gives the history of that first colony as it was written on twenty-four gold plates that were afterwards discovered by those who came six hundred years before Christ.

History and Book of Mormon.

Now, I want to read you from Baldwin's Ancient America, published in 1872, regarding the confirmatory statements of this Book of Mormon. I have prepared this in such a way that you can gather it as briefly as possible. Baldwin, page 264, says that there were over a thousand years between the two colonies; that is the Jaredites and the Nephites. The Book of Mormon says that there were 1600 years between them. Bald-

win; page 271: "They were not one people." Book of Mormon; page 157: "There were the people of Jared which came from the Tower of Babel and the people of Nephi, who came from Jerusalem six hundred years before Christ." Baldwin declares: "They were of different speech." The Book of Mormon, page 137, shows how the people of Nephi came and found the sons of Mosiah and educated them in their own language, and both people merged into one great body.

Baldwin, page 264—Speaking of Peruvian History, says: "It was originated by a people led by four brothers, who settled in the Valley of Cuzco, and developed civilization there in a very human way. The youngest of these brothers assumed supreme authority, and became the first of a long line of sovereigns."

The Book of Mormon, page 3-4, tells who these four boys were and who was the youngest of them. His name was Nephi, and the great nation was called after him "The Nephites." The names of the other three boys were Laman, Lemuel and Sam. Friends, can you not see the wonderful agreement between the Book of Mormon and the monumental history of this people?

I could read all night from the antiquarians in demonstration of the fact that the discoverers of America have in a thousand ways proven the divine authenticity of the Book of Mormon, and notice the dates of these books. John T. Short's was published in 1882; Baldwin's Ancient America in 1872; the Book of Mormon copyrighted in August 1829, in possession of Joseph Smith in 1827. He saw the plates first in 1823. These were given to the world in print and known as the Book of Mormon in the winter of 1829, before these cities were discovered at all.

Cities Described in Book of Mormon Afterwards Discovered.

Now, I wish to read some history regarding the finding of many ancient cities, discovered since the Book of Mormon was printed, many of them are named and located by the Book of Mormon.

Bancroft says of Stephens and other explorers: "Since 1830, the veil has been lifted from the principal ruins of ancient Maya works by the researches of Zavala (1834); Waldeck (1835); Norman (1834); Stephens, Catherwood (1841, 1843, 1844); Frederichsthal (1841); and Charnay (1863, 1884, 1887). "Stephens and Catherwood boldly left the beaten track and brought to the knowledge of the world, about forty ruined cities, whose very existence had been previously unknown, even to the residents of the larger cities of the very state in whose territory they lie," Native Races; vol. 4; page 144-146. "Waldeck was the first stranger who visited the ruins of Uxmal, and he brought them to the notice of the public." Ibid, page 4; vol. 145-150. "For what is known of Copan, the world is indebted almost entirely to the work of Stephens and Catherwood. . . . This is considered to be the oldest city on the American continent." Ibid, vol. 4; 81-82.

D. S. Banks, in Leslie's Monthly, May, 1889; page 547: "There are between sixty and seventy ruined cities in Yucatan as far as discovered."

"A dead Nation." Remarkable discoveries made in the State of Chippas, Mexico. Recently returned explorers from the State of Chippas, confirm and add to the remarkable reports concerning important archaeological discoveries. A fine broad, paved road, built by prehistoric inhabitants, has been traced from Tonalá down into Guatemala, and thence in a curve up into Mexico, terminating at Palenque. All along the road are still to be seen the remains of ruined cities, and a careful estimate of the population of these places is about thirty million. On that part of the road near Palenque the ruins are of great magnitude. Houses four, and often five

stories high, have been found in the depth of the forest. Many of these houses are pyramidal in form, and so covered are some of them with vegetable mould that large trees are growing from the roofs. * * * The architecture indicates a high degree of scientific attainments."—London Advertiser.

"William Niven, a mineralogist of New York, in July 1898, discovered a prehistoric city in Mexico. The city covers an area of one thousand acres. He found the ruins of twenty temples, and he photographed them all." San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 26, 1898. "A prehistoric city was discovered in July, 1901, on the Navajo Indian reservation, between Durango, Colorado and Farmington, New Mexico. A palace of prehistoric age, containing, it is said, about one thousand separate apartments. Another stone castle, contained one hundred separate apartments * * * It is believed to antedate the time of Actecs occupation of the country ages ago." Kansas City Journal, July 22, 1901.

Mr. P. C. Truman, in a paper read before Columbia University, September 7, 1876, said: "Before Columbus ever saw these shores, America contained great cities and mighty empires." I could, if I had the time, show the pictures I have in the different books here, but it would take too long.

A Temple Discovered.

I will give you a description of one of the temples recently discovered and one of the palaces: "The interior of the temple was most worthy of admiration. It was literally a mine of gold. On the western wall was emblazoned a representation of the Deity, consisting of a human countenance looking forth from amidst innumerable rays of light which emanated from it in every direction. In the same manner as the sun is often personified with us. The figure was engraven on a massive plate of gold of enormous dimensions thickly studded with emeralds and precious stones. It was so situated in front of the great eastern portal that the rays of the morning sun falling directly upon it lighted up the temple with an effulgency which seemed more than natural and which was reflected back from the golden ornaments with which the walls and ceilings were everywhere encrusted. All the plates and utensils of every description were of gold and silver. Twelve immense vases, the pipes which brought the water to the fount from the subterranean channels; even the agricultural implements used in the gardens of the temple were all of the same rich materials; that is gold and silver, and sparkled with flowers of gold and silver." (Prestcott's Conquest of Peru, vol. 1., chap. 3).

"The great temple was literally covered with plates of gold. They beheld the royal mummies seated each in his gold embossed chair. The number of plates they tore from the temple was 700. A cornice of pure gold encircled the edifice." (Prestcott's Conquest of Peru, vol. 1, Book 3, chapter 6.)

Now, if you will read in the Book of Mormon, the book of Mosiah, chapter 7, verses 1-4, page 164, you will read a description of this temple that I am now about to describe to you from Baldwin's Ancient America. "The largest known building at Palenque is called The Palace. It stands near the river on a terraced pyramidal foundation forty feet high, 310 feet long, by 260 feet broad at the base. The edifice itself is 228 feet long, 180 feet wide and 25 feet high. It faces the east and has 14 doorways on each side with 11 at the ends. It was built entirely of hewn stone. A corridor nine feet wide and roofed by a pointed arch went around the building on the outside and this was separated from another of equal width. The palace has four interior courts, the largest being 70 by 80 feet in

extent. These are surrounded by corridors and the architectural work facing them is richly decorated. Within the building were many rooms. From the north side rises a high tower." (Balwin's Ancient American, page 105 to 106. I could read to you for a week about the great cities that have accommodated the teeming millions which have lived upon this continent before Columbus discovered it and the Book of Mormon gives the history of those days.

Mormon Prophecies Fulfilled.

I will give you the names of fifteen cities, named in the Book of Mormon, which have been discovered by antiquarians in recent years:

Book of Mormon, page 528, Akish, now called Ake. Baldwin's Ancient America, page 144.

Book of Mormon, page 439, Gilgal, now called Galal. Baldwin's Ancient America, page 146.

Book of Mormon, page 511, Kib, now called Kibah. Baldwin's Ancient America, page 155.

Book of Mormon, page 251, Ishmael, now called Izamal. Baldwin's Ancient America, page 144.

Book of Mormon, Page 64, Nephites, now called Neophites. Bancroft Native Races, vol. I., page 450.

Book of Mormon, page 440, Laman, now called Laman. Universal Geography, E., Reclus, vol. 3, page 283.

Book of Mormon, page 356, Manti, now called Manti. American Antiquarian. Rev. S. D. Peet, March, 1900, page 128.

Book of Mormon, page 367, Moroni, now called Moroni. Any map S. A. div. French and Dutch Guiana.

Book of Mormon, page 356, Cument, now called Cuemani. Any atlas map of Colombia.

Book of Mormon, page 483, David, now called David. Columbian Atlas World, S. A. Colombia, N. W.

Book of Mormon, page 55, Sam, now called Sami. United States Bur, Eth, vol. 19, page 605, 625, 628.

Book of Mormon, page 394, Mulek, now called Muluc. North American Antiquity, J. T. Short, page 438.

Book of Mormon, page 501, Moron, now called Moron. Bradley's Atlas, Argentine Republic, J. 19.

Book of Mormon, page 267, Desolation, now called Desaldo. Any good Atlas. Cape, West Nicaragua.

These pages are from Book of Mormon edition of 1902, published, Lamoni, Iowa.

Now I ask, is it incredible to you that God should reveal Himself to these people?; and further, that they should write what God revealed to them; and that those writings by the prophets should be protected, and that that record should come forth in the latter days to convince the people that Jesus is the Christ. Especially when you read that God is no respecter of persons; but out of every nation those who fear Him and work righteousness before Him will be accepted of Him.

God's Promise.

Now, it shall be my pleasure to prove from the Bible that God would reveal Himself to the posterity of Joseph, and that their book would be hid in the ground and come forth in the latter days. Hosea, 8:12: "I have written to him (Ephraim) great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing." You have already concluded that I am putting up some strong argument in favor of God having in America people you never heard about. It is a strange thing, you say. Now, He declares

He has written the strange things of His law. He brought Ephraim from the eastern country to America. Turn to the 37th chapter of Ezekiel, and you there will read from the 15th to the 20th verses that the prophet is to "take one stick and write upon it for Judah and for the children of Israel, his companions; and then take another stick and write upon it for Joseph, the stick of Ephraim and for all the house of Israel, his companions; and join them one to another into one stick, and they shall become one in thy hand. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee saying, 'Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these?' Say unto them, thus saith the Lord God: 'Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel, his fellows, and will put them with him; even with the sticks of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in my hand.'"

That, you see, is the result of the two sticks being together. Now, what does He mean by these sticks? If any of you have even been to a Jewish synagogue you will notice that the sacred record of Judah is not bound in a book like this I have in my hand, but is fastened on two sticks rolled up like a map. Now, we all know that the stick of Judah is the Old Testament; but the stick which is in the hands of Joseph, that is to be another book. And I have taken Joseph's posterity to America, and it is declared that these two sticks, the stick of Judah (the Old Testament), and the stick of Ephraim (the Book of Mormon) will come together in the latter days. Then God will begin to restore Israel to their promised land, and thus their conversion will be brought about. Now, for a little bit of history on this word "stick." "The use of these sticks was a frequent practice among primitive nations." (Clintock's and Strong's Encyclopaedia, Article Stick.) "A book in ancient times consisted of a single long strip of paper or parchment, usually kept rolled up on a stick, which was unrolled when a person wished to read it." (Smith's Bible Dictionary, Article "Roll.") "The king being impatient to know the contents, the scribe begins to read immediately, and as the books of the times were written upon long scrolls and rolled upon a stick, the latter part of Deuteronomy would come first in course." J Kitto, page 403. The stick here has reference to the Book of Judah; that is, the Bible; and the stick of Joseph is the Book of Mormon. The two sticks are to come together in the latter days. But, says one, you said they were coming out of the ground. My text says "Truth shall spring out of the earth." "Jesus, what is truth?" In the 17th chapter of John, he answers: "Thy word is truth." So God's word is to spring out of the ground, out of the earth. Now turn to the 29th Isaiah and if I cannot show you that this book is to come out of the ground it will be because evidence won't convince you. "Woe to Ariel, the city where David dwelt (that is Jerusalem), add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices. Yet I will distress Ariel, and there shall be heaviness and sorrow; and it shall be unto me as Ariel." Here are some people going to be to God just like Jerusalem, and what was the result? Read the next verse: "And thou shalt be brought down and shalt speak out of the ground and thy speech shall be low out of the dust and thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust." Four times in that one verse we are told that this people is to speak out of the ground? How will the people ever speak out of the ground? Why, only by their records. Men speak after they are dead by their records. As long as "The Cotter's Saturday Night" lives, Robert Burns will speak. As long as "Romeo and Juliet" shall be enacted upon the stage, Shakespeare will live; so these people, by their records, will speak out of the ground. "Yes, it looks like that but it does not say a book."

“Yes it does.” Read the 11th verse: “And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned saying, Read this, I pray thee, and he saith: I cannot, for it is sealed. And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee; and he saith, I am not learned.”

Joseph Smith received the book as I told you last Sunday night. He transcribed some of the hieroglyphics from the golden plates onto a piece of paper. Martin Harriss, in 1829, took the words of the book to Professor Anthon of the City of New York. Anthon examined the scroll and said: “I discover thereon Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyriac and Arabic characters, but it is a sealed language; I cannot read it.” Notice, ladies and gentlemen, more than three thousand years ago God said through Isaiah that the words of the book were to be shown to the learned man and he was to say: “I cannot read it,” but the book was then to be delivered to one that was not learned, and he, in his modesty, says: “I am not learned.” Now, notice, the Lord said: “Wherefore, thus saith the Lord, ‘Forasmuch as this people (living in the day in which this book shall come forth) draw near me with their lips, and their fear toward Me is taught by the precepts of man (if we are not living in that day, now, I don’t know anything), therefore will I proceed to do a marvellous work and a wonder. The understanding of their prudent men shall be hid.”

That is true of to-day. The wisdom of your wise men has turned you away from Jesus Christ. You know that some of your most eloquent preachers are on the rack of heresy to-day.

We are told from the pulpit and their productions from the press: “We must revise the faith of our childhood concerning our Hebrew Scriptures.” That the story of creation of Adam and Eve, as recorded in the Bible, is untrue; that Moses did not write the Pentateuch; that it cannot be proved that David wrote a single psalm; that Job is a dramatic poem; that Jonah is a parable; that Genesis is largely a myth; that Isaiah did not write all the prophecies contained in the book that bears his name; that the stories of the patriarchal period do not hang by a single thread; that not one whit of proof for personal existence of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob or Joseph can be produced and with an air of pity for the common ignorance, we are informed that it is hardly less than cruel to allow young men and women to grow up in the belief that these chapters are literal history and afterwards to send them to a University.

When the learned University parson is told that Jesus believed and taught regarding the creation; Adam and Eve story; the flood; Jonah; the fish story; Abraham and other matters now looked upon as myths, we are gravely informed that Jesus was wrong, and that it was part of His humanity to think on such questions as others in His situation naturally thought.

“Verily, the wisdom of your wise men has turned the people away from this book, but God is to do a marvellous work and wonderful in the latter days, and is to raise up one that is not learned; that no flesh could glory in His presence; and the Church of Christ will be re-established again in the latter days; and that He would prepare the people for the coming of Jesus Christ; a thing that your learned men are rapidly teaching the people to deny. This chapter continues to say: “Is it not a very little while (after the coming forth of this book), and Lemanon (Palestine) shall be turned into a fruitful field; and in that day shall the dead hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity; the meek shall increase their joy in the Lord; and those that murmur shall learn doctrine.”

Curse on Palestine Being Removed.

That is just what we are doing now. The meek are increasing their joy; those that have been murmuring at churchianity are beginning to learn the doctrine of Christ and obey it. I have baptized a great number this month already. Roman Catholics, Protestants, and people of almost every denomination have come to me in Toronto this winter, and I have baptized them into the Church of Christ. Lebanon is to be turned into a fruitful field. I shall not take time to give you the history on that to-night, but very briefly. "Eighteen centuries of war, ruin and neglect have passed over Palestine. Its valleys have been crossed for ages without the least attempt at fertilization. Its terraced walls have been allowed to crumble, and its soil has been washed down its ravine, leaving the hill-sides rocky and sterile. Its trees have been cut down and never replaced. Its fields have been desolate. Its structures pillaged and all its improvements ruthlessly destroyed. A land of ruins, without man or beast. Everywhere on plain or mountain, in rocky desert, or on beetling cliff, the spoiler's hand has rested." McClintock and Strong's Ency., Article Palestine.

"I know not whether you are aware of the fact, but it is one that is fully authenticated, that the latter rain returned last year to Mount Zion. A rain that had been withheld so far as our information goes, ever since the dispersion of the people, and He who has brought back the latter rain in its season, will also give the former rain in its season, and these returning showers of earthly blessings are the harbingers of returning showers of spiritual benedictions from on high." Rev. Hugh Stowell, in *Scottish Presbyterian Magazine*, 1853.

Now a Land of Fruitfulness.

"I arrived in Indiana a few days since from the eastern continent. I stopped at Joppa nearly the whole winter, and was well pleased with the country. It is a land of wonderful fruitfulness with a delightful climate, with two to three crops a year. Never was a country in Europe or America known to compare with Palestine. Its fruitfulness is uncommon, its climate is delightful even in winter and most of vegetables grow in perfection. It is a fact that the rain and dew is restored. Recently, in 1853, the former and latter rains were restored to the astonishment of the natives." —Louis Van Buren, Sen., Nov. 14th, 1867.

I could read all night showing that the curse that was on Palestine for seventeen hundred years was to be removed. A little while after the book came out of the ground. The book came out of the ground in 1827. The former and latter day rains were returned to Palestine in 1853. The land that was desolate for seventeen hundred years now bears three crops a year. The curse is removed from her, and God is moving upon the nations; and at the close of the Crimean war, England, France, Sardinia and other nations signed a treaty removing the disability of the Jews, thus allowing them to return to their promised land. Now Jerusalem is being built up; Palestine is becoming civilized; the Jew is waking up. He was the hiss and the by-word of the world; but shortly after this book came forth, Lord Beaconsfield, the butcher boy, rose to be prime minister of England, known to all as Disraeli. If the Rothschilds like to foreclose a mortgage which they hold, they would own the whole of Palestine to-day. To-day Isaac is selling bottles and rags and bones, and to-morrow he is no longer carrying a bag on his shoulders, he has got a horse and wagon. The next day he has a second-hand store on the back street, and the next day one on the front street, and the next day he becomes a banker, and to-day he is the money-lender of the world. There is where the influences are being brought to bear on him. When he sees that God has removed the curse; when he sees all the prophecies literally fulfilled, his eyes will be opened, and the Jew will be convinced that Jesus is the Christ.

Polygamy

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 18th chapter of the Book of Proverbs, where you will read these words: "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is a folly and a shame unto him." The subject to-night is "The Origin of American Polygamy." The popular claim made by the pulpit and the press for many years is that the Book of Mormon is the foundation for the practice of polygamy, and that Joseph Smith who, under God, was inspired to organize this church, both taught, practiced, and sanctioned polygamy. It is my pleasure to-night to let the history of the church as you find it in the authorized books of the church speak upon this matter; and also the history of the church regarding the life and character of Joseph Smith.

Obedience to the Law Essential.

My first presentation is from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, one of the standard books of the church, containing the revelations said to have been given by the Lord through Joseph Smith. Section 17, paragraph 1, of this work reads as follows: "The rise of the Church of Christ in these last days, being 1830 years since the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the flesh, it being regularly organized and established agreeably to the laws of our country." I read this to show that the church organized by Joseph Smith was organized according to the law of the country, and that as such it would not teach or practice polygamy. I draw your attention now to the 42nd section of this book, 21st and 22nd paragraphs; and again: "Every person who belongeth to this church of Christ shall observe to keep all the commandments and covenants of the church." We are told in this section that if any member of the church shall murder, steal, rob or commit adultery, he or she shall be delivered over to the laws of the land for trial and conviction. Sec. 58, Par. 5 is very clear upon this point, and reads as follows: "Let no man break the laws of the land, for he that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to break the laws of the land. Wherefore be subject to the powers that be." I may just say in passing, here you will see that the true Latter Day Saint Church starts out in keeping with the laws of the land, which were ever opposed to polygamy.

Utah Mormonism Defies Law.

In contradiction to that, Utah Mormonism has always been in direct rebellion to the laws of the land. Joseph F. Smith, their president and prophet, has had six wives and they have borne to him 43 children. He is now living in open rebellion to both the law of God and the laws of the United States, and living with five wives. And even after promising the United States to abandon the practice of polygamy, each of those five wives have bore him children since the church made that promise and thirteen children have been born to him since the manifesto by which the church professed that they would abandon polygamy. I just touch that thought now to show you that the Utah Mormon Church is absolutely separate and distinct from the Latter Day Saint Church, and that we differ

from them on this question of polygamy wider than does the Lutheran, the Methodist, the Presbyterian, or Baptist Church, and several others.

Now, I notice that there is a little stir in this audience, but if you don't get tired before I do, I shall prove that this Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is more antagonistic to Utah Mormonism on the question of polygamy than the churches I have named. You know, this thing has been rubbed into me for about thirty-six years, and I am prepared to speak for myself in defence of the church that I have the honor to be a credentialed representative of, and I shall show by the history of those churches that they themselves have had something to do with polygamy, and I defy them, one and all, to show that this church has ever had anything to do with it.

Strongly Condemns Polygamy.

I now draw your attention again to the 42nd section, par. 7, and I shall produce from this section a commandment that for plainness, terseness, and unmistakable denunciation of polygamy cannot be equalled in any Catholic catechism, Church of England Prayer Book, Presbyterian Confession of Faith, or Methodist Discipline in the world. If you can produce its equal in any of these works, I shall make an apology for this statement; and now I will read it: "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else; and he that looketh upon a woman to lust after her shall deny the faith and shall not have the Spirit, and if he repents not, he shall be cast out." If you can find anything more emphatic in favor of the one-wife system in any other religious work in this world than that, you will surprise me. In Sec. 49, Par. 3, I read: Whoso forbiddeth to marry is not ordained of God, for marriage is ordained of God unto man. Wherefore it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh; and all this that the earth might answer the end of its creation, and that it might be filled with the measure of man according to his creation before the world was made."

Marriage Ceremony.

I now draw your attention to the 111th Sec. Par. 2, where the formula for the ceremony of marriage is declared. If you can find a more solemn covenant than this in the Roman Catholic Church or any Protestant Church, I should like you to produce it. "You both mutually agree to be each other's companion; husband and wife, observing the legal rights belonging to this condition; that is, keeping yourselves wholly for each other, and from all others during your lives." Could there be a more sacred covenant made between man and woman upon the marriage question? In that same section, paragraph 4, we read the following: "All legal contracts of marriage made before a person is baptized into this church should be held sacred, and fulfilled, inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again." Now, that is the Book of Covenants, the rule and guide of the Latter Day Saints' Church on the marriage relationship. This book was published in 1835 by conference resolution, and in 1845, 1852, 1854, 1869 and 1876 by the Utah Mormons themselves. This shows the vile hypocrisy existing in that system, for while they were presenting that book, presenting those laws, those revelations to the world, from 1852, they were secretly practicing the doctrine of polygamy at home. There can be no excuse for this contemptible, matchless hypocrisy. If they had learned, or become convinced that they had even been in error regarding the marriage question, and that it was the privilege

for a man to have two or a dozen wives, why not preach it before the world, in place of getting hundreds and thousands into the church under the name of Latter Day Saintism, only to take them out to Utah and introduce to them this system by which hearts were broken, homes were ruined, lives were lost, and people sent broken hearted to premature graves?

Book of Mormon Equally Emphatic.

I leave the Book of Covenants, and now go to the Book of Mormon. I shall not have much to say about the question of polygamy from the Book of Mormon to-night, for the reason that I showed you last Sunday night from its pages that it emphatically denounces the doctrine of polygamy, declaring every time it speaks on the marriage question that polygamy is a crime before God, and that man should have but one wife, and that God delighted in the chastity of women. I shall content myself by just giving you the pages where polygamy is denounced in the Book of Mormon. Lamoni Edition, Pub. 1902; page 113, paragraph 4; page 115, paragraph 3; page 116, paragraph 6; page 117, paragraph 9; page 143, paragraph 6; page 164, paragraph 1; page 184, paragraph 25; page 458, paragraph 1; page 519, paragraph 5.

I might continue on this, but I just wish to say in this discourse that having studied this matter closely for more than a quarter of a century, in the presence of God, I solemnly declare to you to-night, I have never read a book that denounced the practice of polygamy as emphatically, as unmistakably as does the Book of Mormon. Now, in the face of that, my friends, what are you going to do with these pious ministers who impose upon the credulity of the people, and try to get you to believe that the Book of Mormon is the foundation for polygamy. What excuse can you make for these men, who are publicly and privately making that claim. I leave them to a discerning public and to a just God.

David Was to Blame.

Joseph Smith was inspired to give to us a translation of the Scriptures. You know the Bible has been translated a great many times. Even those who revised it in 1881, declared the imperfection of their work in the fly-leaf of the book itself, and acknowledged that nothing but the Divine help could restore to us a perfect Bible. Joseph Smith made no claim to education, but by the Spirit of God he claimed to translate the Bible, and I am going to read you one or two points on the marriage question where the regular Bible (King James' translation), would seem to infer that polygamy was not condemned by the Almighty. I am going to show you that when Joseph Smith reached those places, that under the inspiration of God, he made it so plain, that no one reading it can deny that he took the last stone out of the foundation that would seem, I say, to support polygamy.

I draw your attention to the 1st Book of Kings, 3rd chapter, 14th verse. God, speaking to Solomon, said: "And if thou wilt walk in My ways to keep My statutes and My commandments, as thy father, David, did walk, then I will lengthen thy days." "There you are," says the polygamist. "God is endorsing the life and conduct of David, who had many wives." Now, let me read this same passage from the inspired translation by Joseph Smith: "And if thou wilt walk in My ways to keep My statutes and My commandments, then I will lengthen thy days, and thou shalt not walk in unrighteousness as did they father, David."

Without further comment, I draw your attention to the 11th chapter, 4, 1st Kings: "For it came to pass when Solomon was old that his wives turned away his heart after other gods and his heart was not perfect with

the Lord, his God as was the heart of David, his father." Here David is again commended, and the advocates of polygamy to-day will tell you that David did not commit sin in having many wives; that his great sin was in going out of the tribes of Israel and getting wives from strange nations and in committing the horrid murder to get Bethsheba, Uriah's wife. And so they patch it up and make it appear quite feasible to the uninitiated. But let me read the same verse from the inspired translation by Joseph Smith: "For it came to pass when Solomon was old, his wives turned away his heart after other gods, and his heart was not perfect with the Lord, his God, and it became as the heart of David, his father." Sixth verse: "And Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord as David, his father, and went not fully after the Lord." Whatever your pre-conceived ideas may have been with regard to Joseph Smith's conduct, I have shown you from the Book of Covenants that professed to come through him, a clear and concise case in favor of the one-wife system and the strongest denunciation of Polygamy. I have taken the Book of Mormon and showed from the 116th page that these very two men referred to, David and Solomon, in Bible times, sought to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms. "David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines which thing was abominable before Me, saith the Lord, and there shall not any man among you have save one wife and concubines he shall have none, for I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women." I have shown you that in the translation of the Bible, Joseph Smith makes God denounce polygamy in more unmistakable terms than does the King James' Bible.

Wolf in Every Fold.

I shall now betake myself to the task of showing from the witnesses in the church and out, that polygamy was never acknowledged nor taught nor practiced during the lifetime of Joseph Smith, by his consent, nor by the consent of the church, and if it was done secretly or practiced privately by some individual of the church, then the church should not be held responsible for that, any more than the church is held responsible to-day when some of its members commit murder or rob a bank. You would not think of reflecting upon the church because the Farmers' Bank went down under professors of religion.

I desire to present thirty-one witnesses to prove that there was no polygamy sanctioned in the church during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. This was published by the church in 1842, less than two years before Joseph Smith's death. We deem this sufficient to show where Joseph and Hyrum Smith stood on the question of polygamy. "We, the undersigned members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and residents of the City of Nauvoo, persons of families, do hereby certify and declare that we know of no other rule or system of marriage than the one published from the Book of Covenants" (that is the one I read in your hearing.) This is signed by a number of the leading men of the church; some of those leading men, who afterwards followed Brigham Young, of Utah, and went into polygamy. A similar document is signed by Emma Smith, wife of Joseph, and by a number of leading women of the church, thirty-one witnesses in all.

Now, I submit for your consideration a statement made by Joseph Smith and his brother, Hyrum, just a few months prior to their assassination. It was in reference to a man who had been teaching polygamy, and they said: "As we have been lately credibly informed that a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints by the name of Hiram Brown has been teaching polygamy, and other false and corrupt doctrines, in the County of Lapeer, in the State of Michigan, this is to notify him

and the church in general, that he has been cut off from the church for his iniquities.”

(Signed)

JOSEPH SMITH.
HYRUM SMITH.

Presidents of the Church.

This was in February, 1844. Joseph Smith was killed four months after that, and, mark you, he here declares that polygamy is an iniquity and a corrupt doctrine.

I now submit the testimony of George Q. Cannon, one of the first presidents of the Utah Mormon Church, and the father of Senator Frank Cannon, who is now writing in opposition to Utah Mormonism in “Everybody’s.” “A prevalent idea has been that this prejudice against us owes its origin and continuation to our belief in a plurality of wives. Joseph and Hyrum Smith were slain in Carthage goal, and hundreds of persons were persecuted to death previous to the church having any knowledge of this doctrine.” (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 14; page 165-6). This shows that Joseph and Hyrum Smith and the church during their lifetime had absolutely nothing to do with polygamy. Let me strengthen this by another statement by H. B. Clauson, a son-in-law of Brigham Young: “Polygamy at that time (that is, at the time of Joseph Smith’s death) was not known among those of the Mormon faith. The doctrine of polygamy was not promulgated until they got to Salt Lake; not, in fact, until some little time after they arrived there.” (Salt Lake Herald, 1882.)

Polygamy Began at Salt Lake.

Now, Joseph Smith was killed in 1844. They arrived in Salt Lake July 24, 1847, and it was some little time after they arrived there before polygamy was promulgated, on the 29th day of August, 1852; eight years and two months after the assassination of Joseph Smith; that is Utah testimony itself. Will you condemn a man for something that was introduced between eight and nine years after he is lying in the grave? Now, we have Brigham Young saying in an interview with Senator Trumbull in 1869: “It (polygamy) was adopted by us as a necessity after we came here.” Ah! there never was a truer word spoken in the world. It was adopted as a necessity. The real facts are, some of those men were in crime after the death of Joseph Smith, and on their way across the plains they took advantage of human weakness, poverty, suffering and trial, and after their arrival in Salt Lake, a thousand miles from civilization, a revelation on polygamy was introduced, hearts were broken, and souls were blighted.

Not Practiced in Joseph Smith’s Time.

But we pass on. Ephraim Jensen, another leading Utah Mormon, says: “Polygamy was not practiced by the Mormons prior to, and at the time of, the execution of Joseph Smith, who was executed at Nauvoo, Ill.” (This is a mistake. Joseph Smith was executed at Carthage, Ill., the 27th of June, 1844). Again, only three per cent. of the Mormon men practice polygamy. A proof in itself that it was not essential to the creed.” “The Yeoman’s Shield.”

Elder Whitaker: “Go back to the founding of our church, April 6, 1830. There was no polygamy practiced or taught in Mormon literature until five years after that band of persecuted saints reached Utah.” (New York Herald, Jan. 8, 1900.)

What Does Brigham Young Say?

Now, let me show you Brigham Young’s own confession as to who had the revelation on polygamy, whether it was Joseph Smith or some one else. He says: “While we, were in England in 1839 and 1840, I think, the

Lord manifested to me by vision and His Spirit things that I did not understand. I never opened my mouth to anyone concerning them until I returned to Nauvoo." Now, notice. "Joseph had never mentioned this; there had never been a thought of it in the church that I ever knew anything about at that time, but I had this for myself and kept it to myself." (Messenger, volume 1, page 29). There, you see, Brigham Young, not Joseph Smith, had the revelation on polygamy! I now wish to give you several statements from the book entitled, "Tell It All," by Fanny Stenhouse. Her husband was a Utah Mormon. He married her in England, and they suffered everything, for they honestly believed that the church was the continuation of the original church under Joseph Smith. And when they found out the awful conditions they abandoned the church and exposed it. She says: "Polygamy was unheard of among the (English) saints in 1849." (Pages 45 and 47). Then, again she says: "In June, 1850, I heard the first whisper of polygamy." (Page 98-9). "In January, 1853, I first saw the revelation on polygamy, published in The Millenium Star," (Page 132). Out of 30,000 Saints in England in 1853, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-six had been excommunicated for apostacy through polygamy. The president of the conference was cut off. (Page 160). Speaking regarding polygamy, she says: "They know that the only source of their revelation is the man Brigham Young. (Page 190.) Again: "Brigham has outraged decency and riven asunder the most sacred ties by his shameless introduction of polygamy (273). There have been many apostates from the teachings of Joseph Smith in early days but of all apostates Brother Brigham is the chief." (Page 614.) It is reported by Fanny Stenhouse and many others, that Joseph Smith said: "If ever the church has the misfortune to be led by Brother Brigham he will lead it to hell." (Page 268). Now, you may say that I am quoting from the works of an enemy of that church. I am quoting from the works of a broken-hearted victim. After suffering untold agonies, she wrote a book giving the facts.

I want to submit this statement that Joseph Smith had heard certain rumors just before his death regarding this awful crime, being either secretly taught or both taught and practiced. In proof of this, I submit a conversation he had with Elder William Marks, who was president of the stake of Nauvoo. President Marks said: "A few days after this occurrence I met Brother Joseph, he said he wanted to converse with me on the affairs of the church and we retired by ourselves. I will give his words verbatim. They are indelibly stamped upon my mind. He said he had desired for a long time to have a talk with me on the subject of polygamy. He said it would eventually prove the overthrow of the church and we should soon be obliged to leave the United States, unless it could be speedily put down. He was satisfied that it was a cursed doctrine and that there must be every exertion made to put it down. He said that he would go before the congregation and proclaim against it and I must go into the high council and he would prefer charges against those in transgression, and I must sever them from the church unless they made ample satisfaction. There was much more said, but this was the substance. The mob commenced to gather about Carthage in a few days after, therefore there was nothing done concerning it." (Saints' Herald; vol. 1; page 22-23).

Speaking of the revelations on polygamy, Marks said: "I never heard of it during Joseph's life. It was evidently gotten up by Brigham Young and some of the twelve after Joseph's death." Brigg's Autobiography; Herald, 1901.

The Revelation on Polygamy.

I will now present to you the history of the introduction of the so-called revelation on polygamy. Brigham Young, in Salt Lake City, did present to his Apostate Church, a document which he called a revelation on the subject of polygamy. He presented it on the 29th day of August, 1852. He told his poor, deluded followers that Joseph Smith received it July 12, 1843, but that he had kept it under a patent lock all these years, and now the time had come to present it. We ask, where is the original of this revelation? and he whimpers out, "The original was given to Emma Smith, Joseph's wife, and she burned it; I have only a copy." We are requested to believe that God gave it in 1843, but wisdom declared that it should not be presented till 1852.

Just think, we are asked to believe that God gave the revelation, but after He gave it, He found He had spoken too quickly on the matter and Brigham kept it under lock and key from 1843 till 1852.

Emma Smith's Testimony.

Now, what does Emma Smith say about this revelation? I have an account of an interview between Emma Smith and Jason W. Briggs in April, 1867. J. W. Briggs, speaking to Mrs. Smith, asked: "Have you seen the revelation on polygamy published by Orson Pratt in *The Seer*, in 1852? A.—I have. Q.—Have you read it? A.—I have read it and heard it read. Q.—Did you ever see that document in manuscript previous to its publication by Pratt? A.—I never did. Q.—Did you ever see any document of that kind purporting to be a revelation to authorize polygamy? A.—No, I never did. Q.—Did Joseph Smith ever teach you the principles of polygamy as being revealed to him or as a correct and righteous principle? A.—He never did. Q.—What about that statement of Brigham Young that you burnt the original manuscript of that revelation? A.—It is false in all its parts, made out of whole cloth, without foundation in truth." *The basis of Brighamite Polygamy*, p. 7.

Well, says one, the whole thing resolves itself into this: Joseph Smith in all his revelations denounces polygamy; in his revelation called the *Book of Mormon*, he denounces polygamy; in the great revelation called the inspired translation of the Scriptures, he denounces polygamy more tersely than the King James' translation of the Bible. That would seem to indicate that Joseph Smith was absolutely innocent of the charge preferred against him by Brigham Young.

Which Would You Believe?

Is it not really funny that the preachers will believe Brigham Young when he tells stories against Joseph Smith, and they would not believe him on his oath on any other thing in the world. They will tell you that Brigham Young's name is a synonym for all that is vile and criminal. Everybody knows that he taught, practiced, and sanctioned polygamy from 1852 till the day of his death. Yet they will take his testimony against Joseph Smith's who can only speak by the records printed during his lifetime. Would you do that in any court of justice in this world? Then it becomes a question of veracity existing between Brigham Young and Emma Smith, the wife of Joseph Smith.

Let us compare the two. Emma Smith lived to be an old woman. When she died she was loved and honored by thousands. Her house was surrounded, her gardens were dotted with people, who came for miles to weep at her funeral. If every person for whom she had done good was to drop one tear upon her grave, it would be thoroughly immersed in the waters of sorrow. There is not a man or woman living on record outside

of Utah Mormonism but what will say she was a woman of the highest and noblest character.

On the other hand, you have the vile polygamist and criminal, Brigham Young. There is such a thing as gregariousness. In other words, "birds of a feather flock together." If you want to stand by Brigham Young as against Emma Smith, you can do it. I would not. And here's Brigham's own estimation of veracity, integrity and honesty as stated in one of his own sermons printed in his own works. He says: "I have many a time in this stand dared the world to produce as mean devils as we can. We can beat them at anything. We have the greatest and smoothest liars in the world; cunningest and most adroit thieves and any other shade of character that you can mention." That was in one of his boastful sermons. He went on to say that they could beat the world at any game. You may say that that was just a hasty utterance. Pardon me. Not so. That sermon was revised and published under his instructions in the (Journal of Discourses, vol. 4, page 77), and Desert News, volume 6, page 291.

Will you take the testimony of a man like that against that of Joseph Smith, and believe him in preference to Emma Smith? Will you just accept his statement regarding that abortive revelation, when it is in conflict with everything written during the lifetime of Joseph Smith? And I want to make this statement: There is not a sermon, book or pamphlet printed in the lifetime of Joseph Smith, under his instructions, that can be produced to show that he ever taught, practiced, or sanctioned polygamy.

Now then, suppose we say that he did teach, practice, or sanction polygamy privately, but the church did not know it. If he did, the church should not be to blame for that. Again, if Joseph Smith secretly taught or practiced polygamy, he did it contrary to all public revelations. He did it in direct conflict with the Book of Covenants, with the Book of Mormon and with the inspired translation of the Bible. If he was guilty, he was a criminal before the laws of his country, and before the law of God, and was a hypocrite to the church he organized and a traitor to the woman he professed to love.

Now, in the face of that, we refuse to believe that he was guilty, upon the contradictory statements of men and women that are steeped and dyed in the crime of polygamy.

Luther and Polygamy.

Now, I am obligated to make good my promise to you first, that I would show that the church, during the lifetime of Joseph Smith denounced polygamy first, last, and all the time; that they did it more tersely and emphatically than some of the churches that are busy misrepresenting this church and Joseph Smith. You will, I presume, hold me to the task to make good my statement, and so I will proceed to show you the attitude of those churches that have opposed and slandered us on that very question. First of all we will take Martin Luther. He won over to his cause Phillip, the Landgrave of Hesse, by a shameful inducement. Phillip desired to contract another marriage, although his first wife was still living, and he desired to obtain the acquiescence of the new reformer. He accordingly applied to Luther, who, having assembled the doctors of the new religion at Wittenberg, gave the Landgrave permission to have two wives at the same time. Father Nothen, Church History, p. 415. Bishop Bossuet, Variations of the Protestant Churches, p. 205-214; Cobett Protestant Ref., page 45.

So much for Luther.

Would Rule David Out of the Church.

The Presbyterian Church—what is their attitude? I will tell you a little story. I was called to meet a Presbyterian minister a few years ago in debate and he made a statement that the Latter Day Saints and Mormons were all one and the same, and that we would practice polygamy here in Canada if the law would allow us. Well, I went on and prescribed for him, and when I got through I said: "There is a kind of smell of polygamy round here. I have proven that it does not attach to the Latter Day Saints, I wonder if it exudes from the Presbyterians," and I reached for a book on the table. "Take your Mormon paws off that book," he said, and I replied: "Ladies and gentlemen, I have loaned this gentlemen three or four books already to-night, and I want to have a look at this pamphlet for five minutes." I had read the report of the General Presbyterian Conference and I recognized it among the books on the table. Finally he was shamed into giving it to me by the audience, and I read this: "Presbyterians recognize polygamy." Pittsburg, Penn., May 27: The last day's session of the Presbyterian General Assembly opened this morning with a crowded docket. An overture from the Synod of India asking for a reply to a memorial upon the subject of baptizing polygamous converts was considered. The Mohammedan was admitted to the church, and he was allowed to retain both wives and house. A memorial was presented asking the General Assembly that final power be given the Synod of India in such cases. Dr. Thompson, of the committee on church policy (no backwoods preacher, this) to whom it was referred, said that there was no concrete case before the assembly, and that the committee was indisposed to interfere until the judicial case involving polygamy was before it. Dr. Morrison, representing the synod trial cases, and special legislation, held that the recognition of polygamous marriages, by the church of India, was an absolute necessity. Any other rule, said he, would rule David out of the church. (Kansas City Mail; Fergus, Ont., New Record March 16, 1899). Gentlemen, here is your chief doctor of divinity in the Presbyterian Church telling you that you must admit polygamy in the Presbyterian Church. Any other rule would throw David out of the church. The Latter Day Saints, in the person of the Bishop, to-night says: "Let David sink to hell, before the Christian Church breaks the hearts of her millions of women by debasing them in the slimy pits of polygamy.

Methodist Church: N. J. Plumb presented a resolution asking that in countries which permitted a plurality of wives, the marriage tie need not be dissolved in order to enter the church." Referred. (London Advertiser, May 12, 1892. General Conference, May 11, 1892.) Now, let me say to the lasting honor of Methodism they would not grant it. (Applause from Methodists present.) When you get through clapping let me say to you that some of her leading ministers had strength enough and power enough to ask the conference to permit it! You see here is where I get back on this charge, "Oh, you Latter Day Saints would practice polygamy if the country would allow you. Anywhere the laws of the country would permit, you would practice it." That is not true of true Latter Day Saint Church. But the other churches, or at least some of them, have discussed polygamy in their conferences and some permitted their people to practice it.

"The Calcutta Missionary Conference, representing Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists and Congregationalists, consisting of the missionaries of the various societies which have missionaries in that vicinity, after frequent consultations and much consideration on the subject of polygamy, as it exists in India, were unanimous in the following conclusions." (You will notice, my friends, that it is not the work of a moment, not the work of one individual, but the result of mature consideration and a big time they

had over polygamy). And here's the conclusion: "If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and primitive Christian churches, he shall be permitted to keep them all, but such a person is not eligible to any office in the church." (India, Ancient and Modern; page 601.)

I am told by a letter from one of these leading gentlemen that there were 400 missionaries and 670 native preachers present at this conference, representing 12 denominations. (Allan's India, page 601-2). The charge against the Latter Day Saints that they would practice it if the laws of the country would permit it, is a base slander unfounded by a single fact. But I have shown to you where twelve Protestant denominations permit men who belong to their churches to still practice polygamy. They practice polygamy in these churches where the law of the land permitted. The very charge they have urged against me is false concerning the Latter Day Saints, but they in their general conferences admit that it is true concerning themselves.

Now, you say that is unkind. Oh, is it? The man or woman who says that is unkind is the one that is constantly sending in questions to the platform asking, "How many wives have you got." It is absolutely fair to slander Latter Day Saints, but when we read you your conference enactments that make your church occupy the place you would have ours in, then you think that is unfair and unkind.

Now, I believe that the chief body of the reformation represented in the many different Protestant churches and the Catholic Church do not approve of polygamy in Canada or the United States and many other countries. I believe that millions of their adherents would oppose it with their lives, but just the same, their conferences have discussed the advisability of permitting it and this poor preacher about whom I was telling you, said: "Oh, well that is in India." That does not help a jot. If the Presbyterian Church is the Church of Christ in Canada, it is the Church of Christ in India, and if Christ's Church permits it in India, it would permit it in Canada. The church that would permit it in India would be inconsistent if it did not permit it in Canada. You cannot get away from this logical conclusion: that where the law permits it, those churches permit it, and worse and more of it.

They say it was permitted "in the Primitive Christian Church." India, Ancient and Modern; page 601-602, and I deny it.

My Character Has Been Attacked.

If I have spoken emphatically upon this subject, it is because my moral integrity has been assailed. The only sister I ever had was a Latter Day Saint. The only daughter I ever had is a Latter Day Saint. My mother was a Latter Day Saint, and my wife is a Latter Day Saint. Thousands of my friends are Latter Day Saints, and to say that we teach and sanction polygamy or have anything to do with it in common with Utah Mormonism, that cesspit of iniquity in the west, is a slander that is both unkind and untrue and is descended to because they have no argument.

I hope that no soul in this audience will refuse hereafter to be my witness. Let your honor speak out in my defense and in the defence of Latter Day Saintism, that we have the law and the history and the books to prove that those who are opposing us in this matter are slandering us.

Next Sunday night I will show from the verdict of the law courts of the United States, and the report of the United States Congress, as also the most reliable history, that the Utah Mormon Church has departed from the faith and doctrine of the Latter Day Saint Church, and the true church is no more to blame for their fall than the Early Day Saint Church was for the apostasy into Romanism. I thank you.

Latter Day Apostasy

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 22nd chapter of the Gospel as written by St. Matthew and the 14th verse, where you will read these words: "For many are called but few are chosen." This seems to indicate what the Scriptures present in many other places: that God in His loving kindness has made provision for men to be workers together with Him for the evangelization of their fellows. He endows them with ability, bestows upon them splendid talent and calls them to labor, but upon them depend the results as to whether they shall be chosen or not. Only those who walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called, with all lowliness and meekness will finally be chosen to dwell with Him. This is further emphasized in the 13th chapter of the Gospel as recorded by St. Matthew, where we are told that the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a net cast into the sea. It gathers good and bad and when the net is drawn ashore the good is preserved and the bad destroyed.

So Jesus argues that by and by all those that will not develop character after having come into the church, will be gathered out and those that work iniquity and are deceptive and vile in character will be condemned. And so you discover that the tenor of the record called the Bible is to teach this fact; that the church or Kingdom of God is the place where both good and bad people come, and that by and by the chaff will be separated from the wheat.

The Church One in Doctrine.

I have tried to show to you in previous lectures that Joseph Smith organized the church according to the laws of the land and in direct fulfillment of the prophecies contained in the Bible, and that in doctrine, organization and blessing it was in complete harmony with the Church of Christ, as described in the New Testament. The church was organized April 6, 1830, and her ministry went forth in many parts of the United States, Canada, Europe, and the islands of the sea, till at the death of Joseph Smith, which occurred on the 27th June, 1844, the church is said to have numbered about 200,000 souls. Some writers place it at a much larger figure than that.

I wish to read to you from a decision made by Judge Phillips of the Circuit Court of the State of Missouri in 1894, page 20, as to the condition of the church from its organization to the death of Joseph Smith: "Beyond all cavil if human testimony is to place any matter for ever at rest, this church was one in doctrine, government and purpose from 1830 to June, 1844, when Joseph Smith, its founder, was killed. It had the same federal head, governing bodies and faith during this period; there was no schism, no secession, no parting of the ways in any matter fundamental or affecting its one-ness.

Joseph Smith's Successor.

The legal successor to Joseph Smith, according to the law of lineage as taught in the Bible, the Book of Covenants and the Book of Mormon, was his eldest son, Joseph Smith. The evidence is voluminous and uncontradictory that prior to the death of the prophet he had several times announced before large congregations that Joseph, his eldest son, was to be his successor in the prophetic chair. I shall read a statement

made by this successor in a letter written by him in October, 1868, relative to his father's setting him aside to that office under the Spirit of God. "In Liberty Jail the promise and blessing of a life of usefulness to the cause of truth was pronounced upon our head by lips tainted by dungeon damps, and by the spirit confirmed through attesting witnesses. This blessing has by some been called 'an ordination' from the usual predilections to confound names and terms. Subsequent to our baptism in 1843 upon two occasions was the same blessing confirmed by Joseph Smith; once in the council room in the brick store on the banks of the Mississippi, of which we have not a doubt there are witnesses who would confirm the present testimony, once, in the last interview Joseph Smith held with his family before he left Nauvoo, to his death. A public attestation of the same blessing was made from the stand in the grove in Nauvoo some time prior to the murder in Carthage." (Latter Day Saints' Herald, vol. 14, page 105.)

This is supported by the secretary of Joseph, the prophet, as he testified under oath in the law courts of the State of Missouri during the time of the trial. In the Temple Lot suit, Elder Whitehead, Plaintiff's Abstract, page 28.

It reads as follows: "I recollect a meeting was held in the winter of 1843 at Nauvoo, Illinois, prior to Joseph Smith's death, at which the appointment was made by him of his successor. His son, Joseph, was selected as his successor. There were present Joseph and Hyrum Smith, John Taylor, and some others, who also spoke on the subject. At that meeting Joseph Smith, the present presiding officer of the complainant's church, was selected by his father as his successor. He was ordained and anointed at that meeting. Hyrum Smith anointed him, and Joseph, his father, blessed and ordained him. Newell K. Whitney poured the oil on his head and he was set apart to be his father's successor in office, holding all the powers that his father held."

His Son Was to Succeed Him.

I read this to show that at the time of Joseph Smith's death and prior to his death the general claim was that not only by revelation and appointment and blessing and ordination but also by lineage little Joseph Smith was to succeed his father in the presidential chair.

Some time after the death of Joseph Smith the church was called together by some of the leading officers and Brigham Young, who was then a member of the church, with others not antagonizing this view at all suggested that he felt there was an over anxiety to hurry matters in regard to the placing of the president, and it was decided that the Twelve would be in control till God would reveal that the time had come for the placing of the president.

There was no motion to place little Joseph at the head of the church at this meeting. For it will be remembered that the boy was but twelve years of age, and because of his tender years it was not expected that at that time he was qualified to fill the prophet office and the presidential chair.

Some of the Twelve and many thousands of the membership refused to follow Brigham Young, and several leaders drew away disciples after them.

Apostacy From the True Church.

In 1845 under the oversight of Brigham Young and the Twelve, the church began rapidly to fall into sin and iniquity, until they were compelled to leave the State of Illinois and they started, February 4, 1846, on

the long march of one thousand miles from civilization, landing in Salt Lake City (at that time a barren wilderness) but known now as Salt Lake City. Brigham Young and his party arrived at Salt Lake City on July 24, 1847. It is said that from 4,000 to 10,000 out of the original 200,000 members of the church followed Brigham Young to Utah. And now commenced the formation of a new church.

Started With Brigham Young.

I shall try to show you that Utah Mormonism is no more the Latter Day Saint Church in doctrine, organization and teaching as left by Joseph Smith than the small nickle show in Toronto is the direct succession of the Church of Jesus Christ. Of course, every church has some things in common with all other churches, but to say that Brigham Young's church is the Latter Day Saint Church as organized by Joseph Smith is absolutely false.

I shall try to show you as carefully as I can by the dates collected from their own histories that they formed a new church.

In Direct Fulfilment of Prophecy.

On August 6, 1847, Brigham Young, under a new covenant, was rebaptized and reconfirmed by H. C. Kimball. Then Brigham rebaptized and reconfirmed and reordained the members of the Twelve who were present and on the 8th of August, all those who followed Brigham to Utah were rebaptized and reconfirmed under the new Covenant. For a complete account of this, read the "Life of Brigham Young," page 180-2. Thus you will see a new church was started with baptisms, confirmations and reordinations.

Isaiah, 24th chapter and 5th verse, declares that they would transgress the law and break the everlasting covenant, and they themselves acknowledged that they had sinned to such an extent from the death of Joseph Smith, in 1844, till their arrival in Utah in 1847 that they needed rebaptism, reconfirmation and reordination, thus acknowledging in the plainest and most emphatic manner possible their apostacy from the original church. They went further than this. Brigham Young, who had begged them not to be hasty in the formation of the first presidency—told them they were to wait till God had spoken and set a time—meets with a few of his followers in a private house, the home of Elder Hyde, on December 5, 1847. Brigham and six of the twelve apostles ordained under Joseph Smith and a few others were having a meeting at this house. Brigham expressed his views as to the reorganization of the church presidency, and there he was elected president of the new church in direct opposition to his own statements made in 1844. He then selected his two councillors and the funniest thing of all is that if he received the majority vote of the twelve as left by Joseph Smith, he must have voted for himself, as his election depended on his own vote. The fact is the church proper was driven to the winds and Brigham was busy organizing a new church under different laws as the history will show.

I have tried to be careful in presenting the history regarding the apostacy of the church in the latter days. I shall now show from the Bible that the very crimes marked out in the history of Brigham Young's church, are plainly presented in prophecy, even as to time, "The latter times" or "last days" place, "A salt land," "Polygamy," "Adam," "God," "Blood atonement" being described. First Tim. 4:1-3. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing Spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry."

Utah Mormonism Expressly Prophesied.

Permit me to give prominence to the several points presented here. First, "The Spirit speaketh expressly." Here is a direct revelation. Second the time is stated, "The latter times." Third, "seducing spirits." Seduction is just another name for polygamy. Read Webster's Dictionary. Fourth, "Doctrines of devils." Murder, under the name of "blood atonement." Fifth, "speaking lies in hypocrisy," and above all it is plainly stated that they were to "depart from the faith." That is, some would leave the true church, in the latter days would become guilty of all these conditions.

Brigham Young, and those that followed him departed from the faith, when he taught and practised polygamy, as the following will clearly show: Polygamy, Book of Mormon, page 116, states that people having lost the true Spirit, seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, they would practice polygamy under cover that David and Solomon did it. But the Lord here told them: "Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord. * * * Again, God said: "There shall not any man among you have save it be one wife and concubines he shall have none. For I the Lord God delighteth in the chastity of women."

The Revelation on Polygamy.

Now I read from the Revelation on Polygamy, which Brigham Young presented to his apostate church in Salt Lake City, August 29, 1852, on the point at issue, Doc. Cov., Section 132, 38, as follows: "David also received many wives and concubines, as also Solomon and Moses, my servants. . . . David's wives and concubines were given unto him, of me, by the hand of Nathan, my servant, and others of the prophets, who had the keys of this power, and in none of these things did he sin against me, save in the case of Uriah and his wife." All that I care to say on the point now is that a discerning public can see here the evidence of the awful apostacy and the fulfilment of the prophecy cited.

It may be stated here that Brigham Young and others may have secretly practiced polygamy after the death of Joseph Smith, and before he had presented the revelation in 1852, and to cover up his iniquity, he gave the filthy document called the Revelation, the history of which I gave in a previous lecture. It is said, however, that he had many wives, and his successor in office in the Utah Church. President Joseph Fielding Smith, has had six wives. Five of them are still living and have borne him forty-three children. Please remember that I have clearly shown, hitherto that this man is not the Joseph Smith, son of the original Joseph Smith that presides over the true Latter Day Saints' Church.

Speaking Lies in Hypocrisy.

But to the prophecy again: "Speaking lies in hypocrisy." Permit me to unfold to you the history of the most gigantic system of lying on record. It is in connection with the Utah Church. In 1882 Congress passed the Edmonds law, and in the enforcement of that law in Utah, it is said a thousand leading Brighamites went to prison. In 1887, Congress passed another law, by which the Utah Church was disincorporated, and all the church property confiscated. Please permit me to state in this connection that while the Congress passed laws by which the Utah Church was disenfranchised, and their property confiscated, and their ministers in crime imprisoned, yet at that time the church which I have the honor to be a credentialled representative of, was an incorporated church, recognized by the state. None of us were imprisoned and we were holding property in most every state in the Union. Now, what are you going to do

with those pious parsons who, in public and private, tell the people that the Utah Church and the Latter Day Saint Church is one and the same? There is no excuse for this wilful misrepresentation of the history. That those learned men are ignorant of what Congress has done and what the courts of Canada have performed regarding this matter, is hard to believe.

Woodruff Manifesto.

To resume, when the Utah Church realized that their leaders were imprisoned, their property confiscated, their people disfranchised by the action of the government, because of their crimes, it is said that on Sept. 25, 1890, Wilford Woodruff, the president of the Utah faction, professed to receive a revelation from God, which is known as the "Manifesto."

In the proceedings before the master in chancery, President Woodruff, Joseph Fielding Smith and other leading members of the hierarchy, were closely examined as to the meaning of the manifesto. They testified as follows: "Did you intend by that general statement of intention to make the application to existing conditions where the plural marriages already existed? A.—Yes, sir. Q.—As to living in the state of plural marriages? A.—Yes, sir; that is to the obeying of the law." These men were asking for mercy and the restoration of their property, and promising to leave their plural wives and never permit the practice of polygamy. (Read McClure's for January, 1911, page 256.)

That the manifesto was considered a revelation from God, and that it was intended to put a stop to the practice of polygamy, read President Woodruff's address, delivered in Logan Tabernacle, November 1, 1901.

Joseph Fielding Smith testified under oath before the senate committee in 1904, vol. 1, page 177, that there were no more polygamous marriages being performed; that he, as the president of the church, would not permit it, yet in "Everybody's" for March, 1911, Senator Frank Cannon, the son of George Q. Cannon, who was one of the presidency of the Utah Church, declares that, notwithstanding Smith swore before the committee that there were no polygamous marriages being performed and that he knew of no such marriage since the adoption of the manifesto in 1890, yet Cannon declares that Smith performed a polygamous marriage between Abraham Cannon and Lillian Hamlin, and gives the facts to prove it. This Abraham Cannon was the son of George Q. Cannon, and the brother of Senator Cannon, and thus both father and son are on record in proof that Smith lied before the senate committee. Thus you see that "speaking lies in hypocrisy," is drawing it mildly.

Polygamists Can Do No Wrong, They Say.

You may say, "Surely a person would not be guilty of downright lying under oath like this," but when you remember that the famous thing called a revelation from God states that the person who enters into the new and everlasting covenant (that is the polygamy revelation), may lie or commit almost any other crime, except the shedding of innocent blood, which meant the blood of a polygamist, he would be forgiven, you will see why they lie to defend the vile system. For proof of this read the Revelation, paragraph 26. But to the Bible statement again: "Forbidding to Marry." Surely that does not apply to the Church of Utah, you say, for they are marrying all the time. Ah, my friends, there is where you are deceived. What is marriage? It is a solemn covenant between one man and one woman, for this life. But that kind of a marriage will not give you a right to a celestian crown in the Utah Heaven. Their Revelation provides that the sealing is not for time only, but for eternity, and it must be done under the law called the New Covenant. (The poly-gamy revelation.) That revelation declares that the poor man with no

wife, or with only one wife, and she not bound, or sealed under the polygamy revelation, may become an angel in the next world, but can never become a god, but as an angel, will be the servant of the gods who have become gods by reason of the practice of polygamy. This blasphemy is clearly taught in that filthy revelation. (See paragraphs 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21.)

It is said by some that the "forbidding to marry" refers to the Roman Catholic Church. That church recognizes marriage as a sacred sacrament and they claim that one to be ordained to the priesthood must not marry. But the man is not compelled to be ordained. He must make his choice. Marriage prevents his being ordained to the priesthood, but he may marry if he is willing to forgo the desire to be made a priest.

Just think of men who have blessed the world, such as Paul, who never married, and Peter, with only one wife, will be just angelic servants to the men who have become gods because they had many wives and concubines. Peter, the servant of Brigham Young, Paul a lackie for Joseph Fielding Smith, and Mary and Elizabeth doing drudgery through eternity for the wives of Brigham Young. Now, to another point in the prophecy, "Doctrines of Devils." Murder is surely a doctrine of the devil. In a former lecture I told you of the Catholics and Protestants, each in their turn as they had the power, burned the heretics. But it is left for the Brigham apostacy to teach murder by professed revelation from God. While you might say that this revelation condemns murder, hold, not so fast. In every place where you are told not to commit murder, in that revelation there is a qualifying statement saying, "Wherein they shed innocent blood."

Love to the Point of Murdering.

But you must remember, as I will show plainly in a few moments, that the blood of an apostate is not innocent blood, and that his blood should be shed. Here I present the doctrine of murder as taught by Brigham and others: "All mankind love themselves, and let these principles be known by an individual, and he would be glad to have his blood shed. That would be loving themselves even unto an eternal exaltation. Will you love your brothers and sisters likewise when they have committed a sin that cannot be atoned for without the shedding of blood? Will you love that man or woman well enough to shed their blood? That is what Jesus Christ meant. He never told a man or woman to love their enemies in their wickedness. He never intended any such thing. I have known a great many men who have left this church, for whom there is no chance whatever for exaltation, but if their blood had been spilled it would have been better for them. The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid this principle being in full force, but the time will come when the law of God will be in full force. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help; and if he wants Salvation and it is necessary to spill his blood upon the ground in order that he may be saved, spill it. Any of you who understand the principles of eternity, if you have sinned a sin requiring the shedding of blood, except the sin unto death, would not be satisfied nor rest until your blood should be spilled, that you might gain the salvation you desire. That is the way to love mankind." (Journal of Discourses, volume 4, page 220; Desert News, volume 6, page 397.)

The above is from Brigham Young. Now I quote to you from his counsellor, Jedediah M. Grant: "I say there are men and women here that I would advise to go to the president immediately and ask him to appoint a committee to attend to their case and then let a place be selected, and let that committee shed their blood." Desert News, vol. 6, p. 235.) Now, this is from their own books. This is not a hasty pulpit ut-

terance; it was taken down and revised by the speakers and published. It means this: The person that dared to apostalize from the Utah faith, a thousand miles from civilization, where in those days there were no railroads, and who attempted to make his way back to the United States to oppose and expose that cesspit of iniquity in Utah, must be killed.

Revelation Denies Gospel Power to Save.

Leaving this chapter, I draw your attention to another prophecy concerning the same apostasy, 2 Tim. 3:1-7: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of their own selves; covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." You see, they would profess to teach the same doctrine of the true church. They would have a form of godliness, but they would deny the power. What is the power of Godliness? Paul tells us in the 1st of Romans, that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation; that is, the covenant made by Jesus Christ. But let me introduce to you a new covenant made by Brigham Young on polygamy, which declares that you will be damned if you don't enter into it. If this covenant be true, then it denies the Gospel power to save men.

Section 132, paragraph 4, "For behold, I reveal unto you a new and everlasting covenant, and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned, for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory." Paragraph 6, "And as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fulness of my glory, and he that receiveth a fulness thereof, must and shall abide the law, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God." Paragraph 26, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man marry a wife according to my word, and they are sealed by the Holy Spirit of Promise according to mine appointment, and he or she shall commit any sin, or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever, and all manner of blasphemies, and if they commit no murder, wherein they shed innocent blood, yet they shall come forth in the first resurrection." Paragraph 27, "And he that abideth not this law can in no wise enter into my glory, but shall be damned, saith the Lord." Paragraph 61-62 makes statements regarding a man having the right under the revelation of God to marry ten virgins, and that in so doing he is not committing sin. The language is so vile that I ask to be excused for not reading it before this great congregation.

Another Prophecy Fulfilled.

This prophecy continues to say: "They shall be lovers of their own selves and of this sort are they which creep into houses and lead captives silly women, laden with sin and led away by divers lusts." Let me show what the poor bond slaves, those Mormon women, have suffered, and I don't tell it from hearsay—it is from Brigham Young himself: "Men will say my wife, though a most excellent woman has not seen a happy day since I took my second wife. No; not a happy day for a year, says one, and another has not seen a happy day for five years. I am going to give you from this time to the 6th October next for reflection, that you may determine whether you wish to stay with your husbands or not, and then I am going to set every one at liberty and my wives have got to do one of two things: either round up their shoulders to endure the afflictions of this world and live their religion, or they may leave, for I will not have them about me. I will go into Heaven alone rather than have scratching and fighting around me." (Journal of Discourses, vol. 4, page 55 and 57.)

President Grant, his counsellor, has made this statement: "If they could break asunder the cable of the Church of Christ there is scarcely a

mother in Israel, but would do it this day, and they talk it to their husbands, to their daughters, to their neighbors, and say they have not seen a week's happiness since they became acquainted with that law or since their husbands took a second wife." (Journal of Discourses, vol. 4, page 50.) This just gives you a whisper of the perpetual moans and groans and the broken hearts, the ruined lives terminating in premature graves on the one hand and in the insane asylums on the other in Utah, because of this damnable system. Do you think that is strong language? I will read from the Bible and make it fit what is now being done in Utah, 2nd Peter, 2nd chapter, 1-3: "But there were false prophets also among the people even as there shall be false teachers among you who privately shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction, and many shall follow their pernicious ways by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of."

Now, you see we are told right here in the Bible that a section of the church is to go into apostacy from the true church and that "damnable heresies" will be introduced. Primarily I have shown you polygamy is a heresy, the most damnable you can think of. How was it brought in? Brigham says Joseph had the revelation and I showed he didn't, but he says: "I have kept it under lock and key for nearly nine years," and when he got to Salt Lake City he presented it to them. There is now it was privately brought in. Now, it says, they will deny the Lord that bought them. Let me show you the "Doctrine on the Godhead."

"When our father, Adam, came into the Garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael the Archangel; the ancient of days about whom holy men have written and spoken. He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do. (Journal of Discourses, vol. 1, page 50.)

I cannot read to you the vile language that is found on page 51 of the Journal of Discourses in regard to the birth of Jesus Christ. It is absolutely too vile to read before a congregation of this character. Talk about denying God and blasphemy, there is nothing to equal it in all the annals of history, and with that I pass on.

Which Church Has Been Reproached.

Now, one thought more: "Many shall follow their pernicious ways by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." Brethren, I want you to be fair and just to me to-night. Answer me this question from yours hearts: Has the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Baptist or the Presbyterian Church, or any of those churches recognized as orthodox, I repeat, has any of them been evil spoken of or been reproached or slandered because Brigham Young introduced polygamy and Adam-God, blood atonement and other principles of Utah Mormonism? Have any of these doctrines reflected upon any one of those denominations? And with one voice you answer, no. Now, let me ask you another question: What church has perpetually been reflected upon because of Brigham Youngism, and you must answer: "Bishop Evans, you and the church you represent have suffered every day in the year at the hands of the pulpit and the press because of the fall of Brigham Young."

The Way of Truth Evilily Spoken Of.

Thank you. That is what the Bible says: "The way of truth is evil spoken of because of this apostacy." That proves that the Latter Day Saint Church, as established by the hand of God under Joseph Smith, is the way of truth, and that the legitimate succession of that church, the

reorganized church that I represent to-day is suffering just as the prophet predicted it would. While I don't take kindly to be ostracized by my fellow men, yet I thank God that He has endowed me with the courage and strength to endure the unkind treatment I have received for the last thirty-six years at the hands of my fellow men in fulfilment of this very prophecy. But if ever there was a man on earth thankful for anything, it is I, that the brains of Toronto have not permitted the slanderers of the past and present to forbid me a hearing.

I am glad that for seven years the largest opera house in the Dominion of Canada has given me a right royal welcome and that the finest, largest and fairest illustrated paper in Canada, The Toronto World, has published from three to five columns every week, thus sending my sermons to the nations of the earth.

Bible Spoke of "A Salt Land."

I promised that I would show you that those that were to be guilty of this great apostacy was to not only depart from the Lord or the true church, but were to go to a salt land to perform their wickedness. Here-with I will fulfil that promise.

It seems from this prophecy that history is but repeating herself. Jeremiah 17:5: "Thus saith the Lord, cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh, but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land and not inhabited."

The Cap Fits Utah Mormonism.

Did Brigham Young answer to this prophecy? First, he departed from the Lord; second, he made flesh his arm; polygamy is a fleshly covenant. Third, he went to the parched places in the wilderness—Utah is a parched country and were it not for the irrigation of the parched land they could not live there at all; and all that know the history will admit that he went to a salt land, and the chief city of that land, and the headquarters of that country is called Salt Lake City.

He did not see when "good cometh," for the United States pardoned their criminals, returned their confiscated property and even gave them statehood, January 4, 1896, and then again Joseph Smith, the son of the true prophet and many others of the true church have gone to Utah and tried to reclaim them, but to all these overtures they have failed to "see when good cometh," and will surely bring upon themselves destruction, for the civilized world will not tolerate their criminality much longer.

The old countries and America are aroused as they never were before, and this insult to purity and the Church of Christ must be stopped, and I hope that it will be done according to law of civilization and not according to the lawless mobocracy of misguided churchianity.

Two Separate Churches—Absolutely Distinct.

My closing thought is to show you from Senator Burrough's speech in congress that there is no affiliation whatever between the Latter Day Saints and the Utah Mormons. "The death of Joseph Smith in 1844 spread demoralization throughout the entire membership of the church and scattered its adherents in diverse directions and for the time being seemed to presage the complete overthrow of the organization. Recovering from their shock, the scattered bands soon reappeared in various parts of the country, promulgated their doctrine and set to work to reorganize their scattered forces, resulting finally in what is known and recognized as the reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, presided over by Joseph Smith, a son of the prophet."

Court Evidence.

"The courts have repeatedly declared this organization to be the legitimate successor of the original Mormon Church, and its adherents number some 50,000 patriotic, peaceable and law-abiding citizens of the United States, conforming to the laws of the country wherever they may be, adhering to the faith of the founder of their creed, repudiating the doctrine of polygamy and its attendant crimes." I could read to you for half a day but that is enough. The above is quoted from the great speech of Senator Burroughs, in the Congress committee on the Reed-Smoot case, December 11th, 1906.

Now, just a short statement from Senator Dubois, of Idaho, before that same senatorial committee: "It is only fair, I think, for me to say that I am glad the distinguished senator from Michigan, Mr. Burroughs, has pointed out that there is a branch of the church called the Josephites who ought to be clearly separated in the minds of all the senators from the Brighamite Mormons. The Josephites claim they are the custodians of the church as it was founded; that Brigham Young has interjected doctrines into the church which the Mormons did not accept in the beginning."

"Wherever they are in whatever part of the country they are among our best citizens in all respects. They do not believe in polygamy and never practice polygamy. They discountenance it. They do not believe in church dictation in political affairs," and so forth. Thank God, the brain power of the United States, after spending thousands of dollars on that case, probing every point to get evidence, has shown that the church established by Joseph Smith was pure and clean and right, and that Brigham Young apostacized from the faith and that the reorganized church are patriotic, law-abiding citizens.

How Have the Courts of Canada Spoken?

The glory of my heart shines out as I come now to the courts of Canada.

On May 19, 1893, Elder Hiram Dickout, Niagara Falls, Ontario, officiated at the marriage ceremony of Abraham Taylor and Alice Vance. The preacher of the little town was later on summoned to appear before the courts on June 21, 1893, and was found guilty and fined \$10. When I went to pay that fine, the judge said: "Don't you pay it," and he gave me reasons why he found the verdict as he did. He told me to appeal and just as sure as I appealed, I was sure to win the case. Well, we did appeal, and the case came up before the high court of justice, Queen's bench division, Chief Justice Armour and Judges Street and Falconbridge associated judges. To show how the judges were moved in this case, I submit the following as given out by Chief Justice Armour:

"We think it quite clear that this conviction cannot be maintained. The defendant was clearly a duly ordained minister of this religious body, and there is no doubt that it is a religious denomination within the words of the statute. Assuming that Christianity is the law of the land in a sense there is nothing contrary to Christianity in the tenets of this body. It is true they have something supplemental to the Bible, but that is the case with every church or denomination. The Church of England has its creeds, and the Presbyterian Church its confession. That does not make the church an anti-Christian one. The statute does not say "Christian," but "religious." If it said "Christian," it would exclude Jews. The fundamental law of the country makes no distinction between churches or denominations.

Every person is at liberty to worship his Maker in the way he pleases.

We have, or ought to have, in this country, perfect freedom of speech and perfect freedom of worship. Conviction quashed."

Chief Justice Armour and the Latter Day Saints.

To show how the judges were moved upon this matter, I submit some other statements made by Chief Justice Armour, at the time: "This is not prosecution, this is persecution. I have read the books of the Latter Day Saint Church and they are eminently Christian."

Now, in the face of all this, why is it, my friends, that people will assert quietly, "Don't you go and hear that man. They are all one and the same with the Mormons of Utah." I leave these slanderers to a discerning public and in conclusion will say that the scattered members all over the world were awaiting the coming of the true successor to Joseph Smith to take his father's place. Many hundreds of them had received assurance that the seed of the prophet would take his place as the prophet of the church. Several organized branches of the old church which had never been disorganized, came together. The branches at Beloit, Waukeska and Yellowstone, Wisconsin and Jeffersonville, Illinois, came together in 1852 and they denounced the apostasy of Brigham Young and others. The church gathered in strength all over the world and on April 6, 1860, Joseph Smith, the son of the prophet, was ordained under the hands of William Marks, a high priest, who was president of Nauvoo state at the time of the prophet's death, and the church was incorporated in 1872.

Church Properly Incorporated.

I have much pleasure in presenting to this audience the evidence that this church was incorporated and stands incorporate to-day. Here is my license as a high priest with the stamp and seal of incorporation upon it. (Shows document). Here is my license as a bishop with the stamp and seal of incorporation upon it. (Also exhibited.)

Now, the brain power of the United States, the best judges of the Dominion of Canada, the prophecies of the Bible and the history of both churches should surely have some weight with you, and I trust that from to-night no one will ever say that the Latter Day Saint Church has anything to do with Utah Mormonism. They are an offshoot, heretics and apostates from the faith and are so decided to be by the Bible, the history of Canada, the courts of Canada, the history of the United States, the history of the church, and by anyone who is intelligent enough to investigate the matter.

The Truth vs. Utah Mormonism

An Examination and Criticism of Mr. Lewis' Recent Statement in the Light of Utah Mormon Practices.

PERMIT me to draw you attention to the 7th chapter of the gospel according to St. Matthew, 20th verse, where you will read these words: "Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them." During the last few weeks there has been considerable printed in the newspapers regarding the work of Utah Mormon missionaries in this city. Some very harsh statements have been made, which called forth a letter from Elder Lewis of the Utah persuasion. Since that letter has been published I have been approached by letter, by telephone and by private interviews, as also upon the street, to deliver a lecture on the real condition of things in the history of Utah Mormonism. It seems, notwithstanding the fact that we have lectured many times in this city on this subject, and have had our lectures published, there are quite a number of people who still cling to the thought that the True Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and the Utah Mormon Church are one and the same. I may here say that there is as great a difference between the True Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and the apostate faction known as the Utah Mormon Church as there is between truth and error, between light and darkness, between right and wrong. There is as much difference between the doctrine and teaching of the True Church and the apostate church, as there is between the Pope of Rome and King William, Prince of Orange.

Toronto and Utah Missionaries.

I am going to take up some remarks of Elder Lewis to-night, and examine them in the light of history. I wish to say at the outset that I have no sympathy with the threats of mobocracy and of violence that are urged against the missionaries of the dominant church of Utah. I believe that if they are breaking any law, they should be apprehended and punished according to the law of the land, and not abused by mobs, not terrified by threats. I would meet them as men who have gone astray, by showing their errors, as I hope to do to-night, and punish them as criminals when they are found guilty before a proper court of law.

Mr. Lewis makes the statement that the Utah Church has had a mission in the City of Toronto since 1830-1. I shall show to-night that the dominant church of Utah did not have any existence till many years after 1831, and if they have had a mission in Toronto the newspapers of Toronto evidently knew nothing of it. The great majority of the people had not heard of it, and the papers, if they can be relied upon, scarcely knew where to find a single Utah Mormon until this gentleman gave his name and address a week or so ago.

Now, it is all right to make statements, but I should like to know the men who have been preaching in Toronto, and the place where their public services have been held, and mission carried on from 1830 by that church. It seems rather to be one of those many doubtful statements that are very peculiarly connected with the Utah Mormons.

Preaching Damnable Heresy.

Mr. Lewis makes another statement; that is, that two thousand Mormon elders are preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ, "in its fullness."

I do not believe that, either. I shall show you from their own books to-night that they are preaching what is denominated in the Bible "damnable heresy," which is absolutely and altogether contrary to the gospel of Jesus Christ "in its fulness." A man knowing Utah Mormonism as this man must have known it when he made that statement, seems to my mind, to be fulfilling the prophecy referred to by Paul to Timothy, where he says: "They shall speak lies in hypocrisy." The man knows, if he knows anything of Utah Mormonism, that they have been preaching and practising that which is as contrary to the gospel of Jesus Christ as any crime can be contrary to virtue and holiness. He very pathetically asks the question: "Why should it be considered a crime to believe that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God? Why should men hate me because I preach that?" That remark, with those beautiful statements about how they pray, "Father, forgive them," and all that, is made to deceive and to solicit sympathy in favor of a cause that has dragged the fair name of truth and moral integrity into the lowest ditches of degradation; and I want to unmask this hypocrisy. These men have done more to fling a shadow o'er the name and reputation of Joseph Smith than all the ministers of every other denomination combined have done. And as it is stated in one of the speeches made before the house of Congress, that while they profess to venerate the name of Joseph Smith, they have besmeared it by their bad conduct, or words to that effect. This was published during the Reed-Smoot case in Washington. He says: "We court the light of intelligent investigation, are glad to enter into friendly discussion with any person."

The Invitation Accepted.

Now, we are going to try to intelligently investigate the main foundation stones upon which Utah Mormonism exists. We are invited to do it, and we are going to do it. We have held ourselves ready for over a quarter of a century to discuss these questions of Adam-God, blood atonement, and polygamy with these people, and time after time has the presidency of their church forbidden their missionaries to discuss these questions in the daylight. Why go to a paper and say they are willing to do that which they have refused to do for many years? I met one of their men right in the tabernacle of Salt Lake City. When he discovered that I was a representative of the reorganized church he issued a challenge, and I accepted it immediately; and I can prove by witnesses that while walking to the table in the tabernacle to formulate the proposition for the discussion he backed out. So much for that.

Briefly, let me say that the true church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was organized on the 6th day of April, 1830, under the presidency of the prophet, Joseph Smith. In fourteen years the church grew very rapidly. Some say it numbered two hundred thousand; others say it numbered more than that. At the death of Joseph Smith, which occurred on the 27th day of June, 1844, the church was split up into different factions, confusion reigned supreme, hearts were broken, and wicked men hurriedly began to figure for positions of prominence and power. Brigham Young was one who assumed the leadership, and drew off at a following in time to that part of the country known now as Salt Lake Valley, then a barren wilderness.

Young's Followers Duped and Misled.

I quote from one of their own historians, O. F. Whitney, in his history of Utah. He gives the following figures: "The first company reached Salt Lake Valley on July 24th, 1847, numbering 143 persons. In the spring of 1848 they had increased to 1671. About a year later they numbered 4,080." Some have said that perhaps 10,000 of the original church were induced

to follow Brigham Young to the Salt Lake land. Many of them, honest and sincere, darkened by the treachery and duplicity of their elders went with the thought that they were following the true church. But when young Joseph Smith was called and ordained to take his father's place, the church was reorganized, and many of those earnest, honest, suffering people, who had been awakened to the duplicity, treachery and criminality of Brigham Young and other elders, gladly denounced their allegiance to Young and Utah Mormonism, and returned to the United States and back to the true church. In 1847 Brigham Young and others of his following sent out an epistle, saying: "We now have it in contemplation soon to re-organize the church." (Millennial Star, volume 10, page 86).

He had got together that which he called a New Covenant, to which I will draw your attention (later), and had caused his people under this New Covenant to be re-baptized and re-confirmed. This occurred on August 6th and 8th, 1847. Brigham Young, himself, and every single man and woman that followed him, were all re-baptized under this New Covenant into this re-organization or new church. On the 5th day of December, 1847, in Orson Hyde's house, Brigham Young, supported by a handful, comparatively speaking, of the original church, was elected president of the new organization, and there they began to organize certain quorums, and started what has been known as the Utah Mormon Church. Here you will discover, under a new covenant, under a new baptism, under a new confirmation, a new church was established, as I shall show, teaching doctrines that were absolutely in conflict and diametrically opposed to not only the gospel of Jesus Christ, but to all the books recognized as the rule and guide of the true church. Jesus said, in the 7th of Matthew: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing." Brigham Young assumed the prophetic chair, attempted to don the garb of the prophet, Joseph Smith, and from that moment every step he took demonstrated that he was a "false prophet," teaching false doctrines and leading the people into the most putrid cesspool of abomination that the world has ever seen.

Doctrine of Devils.

Now, Mr. Lewis says that they are preaching the "fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ." We take the position that they are rather fulfilling the prophecy as stated in 1st Timothy, 4:1-3, that "in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." In support of the statement that the Utah Church has departed from the faith, I submit to you the verdict of two law courts. The following extract from the Kirkland Temple case supports the reorganized church, while it shows that Utah Mormonism departed from the organization of 1830. In the Court of Common Pleas, Lake County, Ohio, February 23rd, 1880, President Hon. L. S. Sherman, Judge F. Paine, jr., clerk, and C. F. Morley, sheriff, Journal entry, February term, 1880.

"The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, plaintiff vs. Lucien Williams, Joseph Smith, Sarah F. Videon, Mark H. Forscutt, the church in Utah, of which John Taylor is president, and commonly known as the Mormon Church, and John Taylor, president of said Utah Church, defendants.

Now for the verdict: "And the court do further find that the plaintiff, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, is the true and lawful continuation of, and the successor to the said original church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, organized in 1830, and is entitled in law to all its rights and properties." This case was held over the right to hold the great temple still standing at Kirkland, Lake County, in the State of Ohio. Here the court declared the Reorganized Church the rightful successors, and the property is held by us to-day.

Here is an extract from the decision of Judge Phillips, of the United States Court for the Western District of Missouri, handed down March 3rd, 1894. He says, beyond all cavil if human testimony is to place any matter for ever at rest, this church was one in doctrine, government and purpose, from 1830 to June, 1844, when Joseph Smith, its founder, was killed. It had the same federal head, governing bodies and faith. During this period there was no schism, no secession, no parting of the ways, in any matter fundamental or affecting its oneness. There can be no question of the fact that Brigham Young's assumed presidency was a bold and bald usurpation. This is all that I need to quote on that matter.

History's Indictment of Mormonism.

Now, to the history of the church itself, as compared with the "fulness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ," and you will see that the dominant church of Utah neglected to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ, but taught, as Peter said men would teach, "damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." 2 Peter 2:1. I am going to emphasize this point about "denying the Lord that bought them." The Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the Doctrine of Covenants, all support the doctrine as stated in the epitome of the true church. "We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost."

Now, let me read you what Brigham Young taught, and what his church stands by regarding God the Eternal Father: "Now hear it, O, inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, saint and sinner. When our father, Adam, came into the Garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He is Michael, the archangel, the Ancient of Days, about whom holy men have written and spoken. He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do. Now let all who may hear these doctrines pause before they make light of them or treat them with indifference, for they will prove their salvation or damnation." (Preached April 9th, 1852. Published in their own church paper, The Journal of Discourses, vol. 1, pages 50 and 51.)

Here Adam is made our God; Adam is made a polygamist; and the Utah Church doctrine clearly announces in this statement that "Adam is the only God with whom we have to do." And yet under the guise of Christianity this man (Lewis), has the impudence, presuming upon the ignorance and guilability of the people, to elicit sympathy by the statement, "We are preaching the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and while our enemies are saying naughty things about us we get down on our knees and ask the Lord to bless them," or words to this effect. A real plea for sympathy, "speaking lies in hypocrisy."

The Incarnation Denied.

Now to the Bible with reference to Jesus Christ: "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." (Matthew 1:20) "And behold, He (Christ), shall be born of Mary, she being a virgin, a precious and chosen vessel, who shall be over-shadowed and conceive by the power of the Holy Ghost, and bring forth a son, yea, even the Son of God." This is found in the Book of Mormon, Alma, 5th chap., 2nd verse.

Now, let us hear the gospel of Brigham Young on this matter; and I ask pardon of this great audience for reading this nasty, blasphemous statement: "When the Virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the father? He is the first of the human family, and when he took a tabernacle it was begotten by his father in Heaven after the same manner as the tabernacles of Cain, Abel, and the rest of the sons

and daughters of Adam and Eve. From the fruits of the earth the first earthly tabernacles were originated by the father, and so on in succession. Now, remember, from this time forth and for ever, that Jesus Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost." (Journal of Discourses, vol. 1, page 50).

And yet those men ask you to tender them support as ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ, who make Jesus Christ merely a son of Adam and Mary a nameless character who gave birth to an illegitimate child. Enough on that subject.

Wholesale Murder Condoned.

Now, Mr. Lewis says they pray for their enemies. Again I draw your attention to another deception there. Under the doctrine of murdering enemies. I read you what is known to them as blood atonement. I am not going to read all on this subject, because it would take a long time; but I am going to give you word for word the doctrine of murder as I find it in their own books. I have some of them here on the platform. "All mankind love themselves, and let these principles be known by an individual, and he would be glad to have his blood shed. That would be loving themselves even unto an eternal exaltation. Will you love your brothers and sisters likewise when they have committed a sin that cannot be atoned for without the shedding of blood? Will you love that man or woman well enough to shed their blood? That is what Jesus Christ meant. He never told a man or woman to love their enemies in their wickedness; He never intended any such thing. I have known a great many men who have left this church for whom there is no chance whatever for exaltation, but if their blood had been spilt it would have been better for them. The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid this principle being in full force, but the time will come when the law of God will be in full force. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help him, and if he wants salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood upon the ground in order that he may be saved, spill it. Any of you who understand the principles of eternity, if you have sinned a sin requiring the shedding of blood—except the sin unto death—would not be satisfied nor rest until your blood should be spilled, that you might gain that salvation you desire. That is the way to love mankind. (Brigham Young, in Journal Discourses, vol. 4, page 220.) This is the language of the president of the Church—their prophet.

Now, to give you the language of one of his counsellors, Jerediah M. Grant: "I say there are men and women here that I would advise to go to the president immediately and ask him to appoint a committee to attend to the case; and then let a place be selected and let that committee shed their blood." (Journal of Discourses, vol. 4, page 51.)

A Crime to Be Virtuous.

When Joseph F. Smith, jr., attempted to write a book in reply to some statements I was reported to have made in The Toronto Star here some years ago, he attempted to get away from these things and to deny their real import, and, of course, speak back and say "'Tain't so." I hold in my hand a work published by Chas. W. Penrose, one of their leading ministers, printed by their press in Salt Lake City in 1884, in which he tries to apologize for this doctrine of murdering their enemies, and those that were apostatized from their church. Remember that the people were many hundreds of miles from civilization; no railroads. The men or women who would not debase themselves and barter their virtue to the criminality of Brighamism, they were the ones to take out and kill. Now this is denied, and I will read you the apology for it. Now, immediately after the quotation, I read from this last book, in making his excuse for the horrid

statements above quoted, Mr. Penrose asks the question: "What kind of folks was he talking about? Let us see." (Now, we are going to see what kind of folks they were in Salt Lake City in the true church of Jesus Christ, as they call it.) "Some have received the priesthood, a knowledge of the things of God, and they dishonor the cause of truth, commit adultery and every other abomination beneath the heavens, and then meet you here or on the street and deny it." (The Journal of Discourses, vol. 4, page 51.)

Now, this is taken from page 32 of Penrose's book on Blood Atonement, acknowledging, mark you, that Young and Grant did make these statements, and assigning the reason why these people should be murdered is because they had been committing adultery and all kinds of abomination beneath the heavens.

The Wrong of Human Vengeance.

Now, while I admit that that man is a leading minister of the Utah Church and knows what he is talking about, that is, that the priests of Utah Mormonism were committing adultery and every other abomination under the heavens, I deny that Brigham Young had the right to appoint a committee to murder them for it.

Let us go a little further. On page 33 of this book by Mr. Penrose, he continues his apology, and says: "Now, Brothers Jerediah M. Grant and Brigham Young, because of the transgressions of the people, spoke as I have quoted. This was the time of the reformation, and the fears of evil doers were worked upon to induce reform, and hence the strong language used at that time. Do we need the same language now? (that is in 1884). I hope not, but if there was any need for it it would be just as applicable now as then."

Now, what are you going to do with Joseph F. Smith, jr., who wrote his book denying the statements, and saying that I misrepresented these men a few years ago? Here is the admission that Young taught this doctrine, that that man preached what their own books say he preached; and here is the apology for it, that the church's people were adulterers and guilty of all kinds of abomination, and that they taught that it was proper to kill them in order to stop this kind of thing. I ask, ladies and gentlemen, is that "the fullness of the gospel of Jesus Christ" that Mr. Lewis would have you believe Utah Mormonism is the only delegated authority from God to promulgate the world over? Enough of that.

Polygamy Denounced—Yea, Practiced.

Now to polygamy. I have already delivered several sermons against polygamy, and will therefore be very brief to-night. I draw your attention to the 116th page of the Book of Mormon, where you will read the most terse and emphatic denunciation of the doctrine of polygamy found in any sacred book that has ever fallen under my notice. I read it as briefly as possible: "Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord. . . . Wherefore, I the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me and hearken to the word of the Lord, for there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none; for I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women, and whoredoms are an abomination before me, thus said the Lord of Hosts." Farther on in the same page, he says: "Behold, ye have done greater iniquities than the Lamanites, our brethren. Ye have broken the hearts of your tender wives and lost the confidence of your children because of your bad examples before them; and the sobbings of their hearts ascend up to God against you." This is in the Book of Mormon. I want to show you that Brigham Young and his people, while they

professed to believe that book, are living in greater opposition to the doctrine that it teaches on the question of polygamy than any other Christian denomination that I know of; and the same fruitage of polygamy follows the people of Utah that followed them in the Scriptural times. That is, it breaks the hearts of their wives and daughters.

Destroyer of Happiness.

Let me read you a little as stated by Brigham Young as to the conditions of the women under polygamy, and see if you can gather from it any fruits of the "fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ," as stated by Mr. Lewis in the Toronto Star. "Men will say, my wife, though a most excellent woman, has not seen a happy day since I took my second wife; no, not a happy day for a year, says one. And another has not seen a happy day for five years. I am going to give you from this time to the sixth day of October next for reflection, that you may determine whether you wish to stay with your husbands or not; and then I am going to set every woman at liberty, and my wives have got to do one of two things; either round up their shoulders to endure the afflictions of this world and live their religion, or they may leave, for I will not have them about me. I will go into heaven alone rather than have scratching and fighting around me." (Brigham Young, in Journal of Discourses, vol. 4, page 55 to 57.) Brigham granted divorces at ten dollars each. This money went to his private bank. Journal of Discourses, vol. 8, page 202.

Jerediah M. Grant, his counsellor, in a sermon in Salt Lake City, preached September 21, 1856, declared, speaking of the broken-hearted women who were suffering there because of the galling yoke of polygamy, that they were compelled to carry under the pains and penalties of blood atonement: "If they could break asunder the cable of the Church of Christ there is scarcely a mother in Israel but would do it this day, and they talk it to their husbands, to their daughters, to their neighbors, and say they have not seen a week's happiness since they became acquainted with that law or since their husbands took a second wife." (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 4, page 50.)

This shows you the reason for the broken hearts of the innocent women, the ocean of tears, and the fearful criminality already confessed by Penrose in Utah. Is that the "fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ?" Mr. Lewis sweetly says, in his effort to blindfold the people of Toronto: "Is there any good that can come out of Utah? Come and see." We are having a look-in to-night. That is what comes out of Utah—nor is it printed by their enemies, remember, but stated by themselves, reported by themselves, printed by themselves, and sold by themselves; so you must not get up the hue and cry that I am reading their enemies' works against them.

Wives Galore.

I now draw your attention to the doctrine of covenants, the book they profess to revere as containing the revelation of God to the true church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Here is the commandment of God to the true church: "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else; and he that looketh on a woman to lust after her shall deny the faith and shall not have the spirit." This is taken from the 42nd section, paragraph 7. In the 111th section of this book is the obligation in the marriage ceremony. It reads as follows: "You both mutually agree to be each other's companion, husband and wife, observing the legal rights belonging to this condition; that is, keeping yourselves wholly for each other and from all others during your lives." In this same section polygamy is called a crime; that is the law of the true church.

Now, that, mark you, was published by the true church before the death of Joseph Smith, and when the Book of Covenants was republished by B. Young, in the year 1845, 1852, 1854 and 1869, and remained the law of the Utah Church and sold in their printed literature right up to 1876. "Speaking lies in hypocrisy." While they were talking to you the doctrine of one wife all over the world from 1852 to 1876, they were practising the doctrine of polygamy—preaching one thing and practising another. Can you find any greater duplicity, and greater deception, and greater hypocrisy than to print to the world the one-wife system, and to practise polygamy at home, till they have eight, ten, fifteen and more wives for one man moaning and groaning and dying under the cursed yoke of lust and infamy, than Utah Mormonism in its practice of polygamy?

Law Still Being Broken.

Now, have the Utah Mormons abandoned the doctrine of polygamy? President Joseph F. Smith is reported to have stated in Washington a week or so ago that he was not living with his five wives now—just one of them. How lonesome he must be with one, after having six wives and forty odd children. Just to be called "papa" by a dozen or so. Just to be husband to only one woman. It is a wonder the change has not wrought physical dissolution to the gentleman.

But I opine by the history of the man, if he made that statement in Washington, he was just telling another whopper. Let us see.

I have given you the doctrine of covenants of the true church, and given you what they published in their covenants up to 1876. Now I will give you the doctrine of covenants of the Utah Church as published to-day—as sold on your streets. This that I hold in my hand is the latest edition. I am going to show you from their doctrine and covenants that any man who believes in Utah Mormonism will practice polygamy, because he is afraid he will be damned if he does not. For they have denied that the gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation, and I am going to show you by what they claim to be the Word of God to them that the man who will not enter into the new covenant and practice polygamy will be damned. And if Brigham Young and Joseph F. Smith, and the rest of the other Utah Mormons believe that they will fool and continue to fool the United States Government rather than be damned. Now, I am going to read from their own book, section 132, paragraph 4 and 6: "For behold, I reveal unto you a new and everlasting covenant, and if you abide not that covenant, then are ye damned, for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into My glory. And as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fulness of my glory, and he that receiveth a fulness thereof must and shall abide the law, or he shall be damned, said the Lord God." Par. 26: "Verily, verily, I say unto you if a man marry a wife according to My word, and they are sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise according to mine appointment, and he or she shall commit any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever and all manner of blasphemies, and if they commit no murder wherein they shed innocent blood, yet they shall come forth in the first resurrection and enter into their exaltation."

Now, you will discover here that a man may lie and steal and commit fornication or adultery or polygamy or anything, just so long as he does not murder. (And every time the word murder is used it explains it by saying "shed innocent blood;" that is, you shall not shed the blood of any of the priests or officers of the Utah Church. Any apostate's blood is not considered to be innocent blood, so that when you read about murder here it is always followed by the statement, "Whereby they shed innocent

blood.' But he can commit any other crime, and yet he will come forth in the first resurrection. And this revelation shows that he will pass by the angels and become a god. Enough of that, however. Is that the "fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ?"

I think I will just leave polygamy right here for the time being, and enter into some other work.

Permit me to unfold to you the history of the most gigantic system of lying on record. It is in connection with the Utah Church. In 1882, Congress passed the Edmonds law, and in the enforcement of that law in Utah, it is said a thousand leading Brighamites went to prison. In 1887, Congress passed another law, by which the Utah Church was disincorporated, and all the church property confiscated, and their ministers in crime imprisoned, yet at that time the church which I have the honor to be credentialled representative of, was an incorporated church, recognized by the state. None of us were imprisoned and we were holding property in most every state in the Union. Now, what are you going to do with those pious persons who in public and private tell the people that the Utah Church and the Latter Day Saint Church is one and the same? There is no excuse for this wilful misrepresentation of the history. That those learned men are ignorant of what Congress has done and what the courts of Canada have performed regarding this matter, is hard to believe.

Woodruff Manifesto.

To resume, when the Utah Church realized that their leaders were imprisoned, their property confiscated, their people disfranchised, by the action of the government, because of their crimes, it is said that on Sept. 25, 1890, Wilford Woodruff, the president of the Utah faction, professed to receive a revelation from God, which is known as the "Manifesto."

In the proceedings before the master in chancery, President Woodruff, Joseph Fielding Smith, and other leading members of the hierarchy, were closely examined as to the meaning of the manifesto. They testified as follows: "Did you intend by that general statement of intention to make application to existing conditions where the plural marriages already existed? A.—Yes, sir. Q.—As to living in the state of plural marriage? A.—Yes, sir; that is to the obeying of the law." These men were asking for mercy and the restoration of their property, and promising to leave their plural wives and never permit the practice of polygamy. (Read McClure's for January, 1911, page 256.)

That the manifesto was considered a revelation from God, and that it was intended to put a stop to the practice of polygamy, read President Woodruff's address, delivered in Logan Tabernacle, November 1, 1901.

Joseph Fielding Smith testified under oath before the senate committee in 1904, vol. 1, page 177, that there were no more polygamous marriages being performed; that he, as the president of the church would not permit it, yet in "Everybody's" for March, 1911, Senator Frank Cannon, the son of George Q. Cannon, who was one of the presidency of the Utah Church, declares that notwithstanding Smith swore before the committee that there were no polygamous marriages being performed, and that he knew of no such marriage since the adoption of the manifesto in 1890, yet Cannon declares that Smith performed a polygamous marriage between Abraham Cannon and Lillian Hamlin, and gives the facts to prove it. This Abraham Cannon was the son of George Q. Cannon, and brother of Senator Cannon, and thus both father and son are on record in proof that Smith lied before the senate committee. Thus you see that "speaking lies in hypocrisy" is drawing it mildly.

Smith's Unblushing Confession.

One word more and then I am done. Joseph Fielding Smith and others, in order to get back the church property, in order to get back the right to vote, promised to abandon this vile conduct, the practice of polygamy. Did he do it? Did he break his truce? 2 Tim. 3:1-8. In a former lecture I gave you the evidence under oath where he stated in the Reed-Smoot case, vol. 1, page 334, that he was living with five wives, and that these wives had borne him thirteen children after he had promised the United States Government that he would not live with them any more. When they plied him with questions he acknowledged that he was living in rebellion to the law of God and in rebellion to the law of the land. And yet the Book of Covenants says: "Let no man break the laws of the land for he that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to break the laws of the land." Sec. 58, 5. Here you have Joseph F. Smith, the prophet of the Utah Mormon Church, confessing to being an unblushing criminal before the highest courts of his country, and yet Mr. Lewis wants you to believe that he is God's mouthpiece, God's prophet; that he is a president of the church that is preaching the "fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ."

Truth Must Be Defended.

In conclusion let me say that I am deeply pained to have to review this matter again, but when you stop to think that Peter declared that by reason of the introduction of this damnable heresy, the way of truth would be evil spoken of. This church has been evil spoken of the world over, and thousands still think that the Latter Day Saint Church and the Utah Mormon Church is one and the same. I have to disabuse your minds of that and show you clearly from their own books and ours that we differ radically, and as one has stated just lately, the greatest opposition that the Utah Mormon Church has ever received has been at the hands of the ministers, or the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

I wish to say that I have no ill-feeling or any bitterness in my heart, but I want the people of Toronto, that have sustained me for these many years as their minister for Christ, to know that Utah Mormonism is not preaching the "fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ," but that they apostatized from the true faith as Christ said they would, and as history proves they have.

Judas Iscariot

A Much Maligned Character Seen in a New Light.

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 18th chapter of the gospel according to St. Matthew, and the third verse, where you will read these words: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."

I have been requested to speak upon the life and character of Judas Iscariot to-night. In this, as in many other matters, I differ very widely from the general public. They would have us believe that Judas Iscariot was a thief, a liar, an all-round bad man, right from his youth up; a man who never had any religion, hypocritical from the start. And, in fact, some of them tell us that God made him just on purpose to do a certain work that was necessary to be done in order that the world might be saved; and that God foreordained, predestined and elected this character—in a word, made him right on purpose to do a work for Him; that is, to fix up a job on his own son, terminating in His assassination. Now, all I have to say with regard to the election matter is this: If it be true that God created this spirit, formed a body for him to live in, and brought him into the world for the express purpose of taking part in the nasty scheme which terminated in the assassination and cruel and cowardly murder of His own son, then God was in big business. I would think that of any man, let alone God Almighty; and I would never for a moment respect an act on the part of the Almighty that I could not respect on the part of a human being. What would you think of an earthly father who would plan and scheme to bring a villain into the country in order that his own son might be cruelly and foully murdered? Why, the English language is not big enough for you to describe your contempt for that kind of a man. Yet we have people believing that God worked that kind of scheme against His own boy, and manipulated affairs so that before the foundation of the world He had Judas Iscariot made to order to do that work. I may be on the doctrine of foreordination and predistination later, but I just want to say here, in passing, that I don't believe that our Heavenly Father is guilty of any such dirty work.

Judas a Worthy Disciple.

Now, that may strike some of you religious people rather hard, but if you have hitherto imbibed the thought that God Almighty was thus guilty, I take pleasure in the attempt, at least, to disabuse your minds of such a conception. As I read history in the Bible and elsewhere I conceive that Judas Iscariot was an honest man; he was a follower of John the Baptist, and according to the scriptures, he with the other apostles were doubtless baptized of John unto repentance for the remission of sins. At your leisure you may read Matthew 3:1-11; Luke 6:12-16; Acts 1:20-22; and John 13:5-39. These passages seem to support the contention that the apostles had been baptized by John the Baptist. These men were selected from the followers of John after an all night of prayer on the mountain top by Jesus Christ to be His consecrated apostles. I want to submit this thought in passing, that John's baptism was unto

repentance; and all those who dared to approach him asking baptism of his hands without repentance were repelled by him, so that it is pretty good evidence that Judas Iscariot, with the rest of the apostles, heard the gospel through John the Baptist, believed it, repented, and was baptized by immersion for the remission of his sins. In reading Matthew 10:1-8, we are instructed there that Judas with the other apostles was sent forth into the world to preach the gospel, to heal the sick, and to raise the dead; and I submit right here that you have no more evidence to prove that Peter preached the gospel and healed the sick, worked miracles, raised the dead, and cast out devils on that first mission than you have that Judas did. There is not one particle of evidence to indicate that Judas was not as prominent and as gifted of God in that first missionary trip as any other apostle with whom he associated. And if you will tell me that a man is worthy to be called an apostle of Jesus Christ, that he could be sanctified to preach the gospel, to cast out devils, to heal the sick, to raise the dead by the power of God, and at the same time could be a vile, wicked man with murder in his heart, you will teach me something that I do not at present believe. If one can accomplish all this and yet have murder in his heart, planning and scheming to assassinate God's own representative upon earth, to me that would be putting a premium on crime, and would be tantamount to saying that spirituality and influence with God does not depend upon the purity of life or the obedience to truth. And, therefore, I believe that he was an honorable man, consecrated to the work; and that he performed it faithfully.

Judas Held Honored Office.

Now, if there was any prominence given to any of those apostles by Jesus Christ, it would seem that Judas Iscariot received that prominence. Well, says one, I don't understand you at all. I always thought that he was the worst of the whole pile of them; but you are so contrary about every blessed thing in that record, that I fancy that if you are ever found drowned you will be found floating up stream against the tide! You, Mr. Evans, are so contrary to everything I have heard before. Let me see if I cannot prove the foregoing statement, in Acts 1:20, and John 13:39, we read that Judas was selected to act as the bishop of the church as well as an apostle. He practically held two offices in the church. He it was that carried the bag; he was the bishop or treasurer of the little church; to him was confided all the money they possessed. He received and he expended all finances; he dispersed to the poor; and there is no evidence in all the record that he was ever required to give an account. This, to say the least, indicated reliance in his integrity on the part of Jesus and the church.

The "Wolf" Principle in Human Nature.

Now, somebody in later years arose to say that he was a thief. But what argument is there in calling names. Was there ever any evidence adduced that he stole even a pin? Before I get through to-night I will show you that the man who said he was a thief is contradicted by his own brother right in the record on that matter. To-day, as in the past, when a man is down there are only too many who like to push him a little farther. You have heard the old story about giving a dog a bad name and all that. You have also heard the story of the wolf. If a pack of wolves is chasing a human being, and a man chances to turn and shoot down a wolf, the rest of the pack will stop, and not even wait till their companion and brother wolf is dead. Sometimes while just wounded, they will tear him to pieces and mangle his body and eat him almost before he is dead. And there is a whole lot of the wolf in the human family. Just as soon as some-

body is down, everybody is willing to throw the extra stone. And the church has not been guiltless of this in many instances, as the record and history will show; and as I purpose to show in the case before us of Judas Iscariot.

Money Not the Motive.

Let us try to find the motive for the betrayal of Jesus Christ on the part of Judas. History informs us that Judas Iscariot was about the only apostle that had any considerable wealth that he could call his own. The price of the betrayal was thirty pieces of silver, or in our money, about fifteen dollars. I have one writer stating that it is about twenty dollars, whereas four or five writers declare that it is only about fifteen dollars—a sum so insignificant that one hardly believes he would perform such a despicable act for the money. Now stop and think for a moment, friends. A man of means, a man who already was carrying the bag, and if he was a thief it would not take him long to nibble away at their resources until he had pocketed fifteen dollars. Is there anything to indicate that that was the real motive for the betrayal and assassination of Jesus Christ? I don't believe there is a man in this audience would so conclude. Then, if it was not the fifteen dollars that served as his motive for the betrayal, what was it?

The Jewish Nation Expected a Deliverer.

Judas Iscariot, with every other apostle of his time, and all the church with them, and the Jewish people outside the Christian Church, for years had been under the iron yoke of Roman bondage. The Romans had practically taken away their standing as a nation, and the Jewish songs, the Jewish prayers, the mothers' stories, told at evening hour in their cradle lullabies, all expressed the hope that was ebbing and flowing in their hearts that the day was soon coming when the Roman yoke would be broken, that emancipation would come to Israel, that the Prince of the House of Israel was yet to be born, and that He would come as the gift of God to ameliorate their condition, destroy the Roman power, be anointed King of the Jews, and establish the Kingdom of Israel in greater splendor than was known in the days of David and Solomon. And when Jesus came their hearts and minds selected Him as the Prince of the House of David; they followed Him daily and hourly, expecting that at the opportune time He would ascend the temple throne and there proclaim Himself the Prince of the House of David, and by some portentous move would break the yoke of Roman oppression and establish the kingdom. The glory of that kingdom was fully described in the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and other prophets.

Sordid Ambitions.

If any of you will be a careful student of the New Testament you will find that this thought was the dominant one in the minds of the apostles themselves. And so you read in Acts 1:6, that the apostles as they approached Jesus said: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" You can see that thought was uppermost in their minds. Again, Matthew 19:27. The disciples had been discussing the same matter, and when Jesus came up to them, one said unto Him: "Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?" We could call that in the political world to-day, kind of wire-pulling. Many a man leaves his home and business and takes to the stump and goes through the country discussing reciprocity and this, that and the other thing, in favor of or against Laurier—and what for? Because they love Laurier especially? Oh, no; they want to stand in, they are

looking for office, for position; they want a postoffice or some other office in the gift of the government. So the apostles came to Jesus and wanted to try to get a pledge out of Him, virtually, saying: Say, Jesus, if we forsake all, what is in it for us? How much is coming to us? What position will we occupy when You don the kingly robes?

Christ Rebuked Selfish Request.

Go a little further than that. Matthew 20:20-29. Here you find an old lady who thought that her two boys were eminently qualified to act as the prime minister, as the chancellor of the exchequer or some other big office in the kingdom just as soon as Christ had it established. And so she practically buttonholed the Master, and said: Say, Jesus, I should like to have a favor of you. Well, what is it? "Grant that these, my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in Thy kingdom." They wanted to be pretty close, didn't they? High up in the cabinet if you please. The old lady did not get a very satisfactory answer. We find also in Mark 10:37, that the two boys themselves tried a hand at the same thing, asking the same question; and they got pretty nearly the same kind of rebuke. And you remember upon several occasions—you find it in my text and elsewhere—that those brethren were often quarrelling among themselves, and the text upon which they preached their little sermon was: "Who is going to be the greatest." That is a text that has damned more men in this age of the world, and, in others, than any other text I know of. "Who is going to be the greatest?" Looking for power—for position. It was the curse then, it is the curse now. They then resorted to despicable things as Judas Iscariot did, and they frequently now say and do that that even the devil himself would blush at, in order to give themselves prominence by tearing down others. It has been the curse in the religious world and in the political world, and the social world—this false ambition, this love of power; and it has been the withering, blighting curse ever since the angel of heaven became the devil in hell—for it your Bible is true, it is that same spirit of selfish ambition that caused Lucifer, the Son of the Morning, to fall and become the devil.

How Judas Viewed the Betrayal.

We come now to this thought: Judas had been with Jesus for three years and a half; he had seen Him by the word of His power speaking to the stinking dead at Bethany and Nain, and they arose to life; he had watched Him as He touched the eyes of the blind and they saw, the lips of the dumb, and they spake; he had seen the withered limbs filled with plethoric blood, activity and life by the touch of His Divine hands. He was present when the wild, white-crested waves of the storm-tossed deep were hushed into perfect calmness and quiet; He was present when the hungry thousands were filled—their hunger appeased from a few loaves and fishes, when the remnants were twelve times larger than the amount was at the start. He had watched Him through hunger and cold, through poverty and distress, ever and always a perpetual benediction to the people. He loved Him, and believed that if he could get Him into that corner the night of the betrayal He would never submit to that midnight mob, but that He who had raised the dead and stilled the tempest would by some majestic wave of His hand, some potentiality that flowed from His lips. He would push back that mob and there and then proclaim Himself the King. He thought that if he could get Him in that place where He would be compelled to move, that the midnight gloom would be transformed and give birth to a perpetual day, whose sun in splendor would baptize the world beneath the halo of its glory. I admit the man's avariciousness, his thirst for power, his desire for prominence, had destroyed

his good judgment, and he made the mistake that broke his own heart and filled his remaining hours with an unspeakable misery, and finally brought him to an ignominious and untimely death. But he was not the first nor will he be the last man to go down under the same influence. He was not truly converted, "Except ye be converted." They had not the proper view of Christ's mission, as the text proves.

Scripture Twisting.

We will now turn to the night of the last supper and the betrayal. I have read a great deal of matter where men have struggled and tried to prove that Judas Iscariot was not permitted to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but when I read that it reminds me of a sign I saw once over a place of business. The man was a woodworker, and the sign read: "All kinds of turning and twisting done here!"

Matthew 26, says Judas was present when Jesus broke the bread and blessed the wine, and said: "Drink ye all of it." Nobody seems to have been left out there. Mark 14:17-23, also gives us an account of the sacrament, and the words there say: "And they all drank of it." Luke 22:21, says (Jesus speaking): "The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table."

Men Are Satan's Victims.

Now I draw your attention to a very pointed statement. Judas Iscariot's life and character had been such up to that hour that there was not a single apostle at the table gave any suspicion that it was Judas who should betray Christ. They all began to say: "Lord, is it I?" "Lord, is it I?" And finally Peter, looking over to John, said: Ask Him who it is. And John propounded the question to Jesus, who said: "He it is to whom I shall give a sop." And He gave the sop to Judas. That was the first intimation, showing that his life and character had been such as to hold him above suspicion. Therefore, all this rant about his being a thief and a bad man is simply nothing more or less than slander against a man that went down in the maelstrom of temptation. That is all there is to that. But it says that immediately the Master had passed upon him, that Satan entered into him. To me that is the secret of the whole thing. That Christ had to die is admitted; that it was the great plan of God goes without saying; that it was fore-determined Christ states; that it was not possible for the world to be redeemed without His sacrifice is clearly proved in the record. And Jesus said to Judas: "What thou doest, do quickly." Satan knew the weakness of the man, he knew the avariciousness of the man; he knew Judas was looking for position and place, and took advantage of his weakness and blinded his eyes, and inspired him to the performance of the dastardly deed that I do not want by any word of mine to seek to excuse. And that is how Satan takes advantages of us all. He picks his tools to work out his purposes, and we prepare ourselves for the performance of his plans. Hence good men and women fall, because they neglect to hear and obey, and they allow this evil spirit to lead them from the path of rectitude and righteousness. Christ warned the apostles of the temptations that were approaching, and bade them pray always that they might escape (Matt. 21 : 34-36). In the very next chapter, it says: "Then Satan entered into Judas." Please note the word "then." Not all his life, but then. In a word, the temptation referred to by the Saviour came, and Judas fell. He was not the only one that the Devil tried to get, and was near being successful. Peter is warned personally by the Saviour. "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desire to have you. (Luke 22: 31.) One has but to read the weakness of poor Peter to learn how near he came to his fall.

The facts are: Peter and Judas both were on a slippery place, both fell, and Peter escaped, while Judas remained the victim.

The "Judas Kiss" Explained.

It is said that Judas went out, met the mob, and brought them to Gethsemane, where Christ was praying. Now, if he were an enemy of Christ, if he were at heart a bad man, why didn't he go at the head of the mob and say: "There is the villain that has deceived me for the last three years and a half; there is the scoundrel that has been leading me over Judea and Samaria under a false plea. Take him!" No; there was not an unkind word escaped his lips, but he approached Him in the most affectionate manner, saying, Hail, Master. Or, as one writer says, Master, Master; and he kissed Him. Now, I don't profess to be an authority on kissing, but I have heard a great deal about the "Judas kiss." For my part I don't see anything bad in that kiss of Judas. To me it virtually says, O, Jesus, my Master, whom I have followed all these years: I was with Thee at Bethany, when Lazarus was raised by thy voice; I was in the dusty streets of Nain when you handed back a dead body to his mother, sound and well; I was on board the ship when you stilled the tempest. I was present when you fed the hungry multitude with those five loaves and two small fishes. I know that Thou art in touch with God. Now work Thy wondrous power; force back this mob; proclaim Thyself the King. I am thy servant, Master, Master. And Judas kissed Him. That is what I see wrapped up in that term, Master, and in that salutation, however you may look upon it.

The Man's Bitter Remorse.

The next thought is this: Jesus did not do what Judas expected Him to do, but submitted, and was taken away to the judgment hall and to death. But listen. If he was Christ's enemy, why didn't he just go right up to the judgment hall? They were looking for witnesses. They had scoured the country for somebody to testify against Christ, and they could not get a better witness than Judas. If he was what the world says he was, why didn't they subpoena Judas to say what a bad man Christ had been? But no; there was not money enough in Jerusalem to buy Judas to testify against his Master. What did he do? If it be a fact that he did it in order to get that fifteen dollars in his pocket, he had that, he ought to have been satisfied. But he was now suffering the pangs of the accusing conscience. He had allowed his love for place and power—his curse of unbridled ambition—to inspire him to the betrayal of his Master, and now what can he do to undo the wrong. I presume he was like that character in the Shakesperian play where, looking back in retrospective mood, he cried: "O God, turn back Thy universe and give me yesterday." What would Judas have given if he could have undone it, and he tried to. I see him rush into the temple. There with pallid lip and with blanched face, and with quivering form he rushes to the priest and testifies. That is what they wanted—witnesses. What did he testify? "I have betrayed innocent blood. Release my Master. Here is your money." And when they would not take it, he dashed it on the floor, the last hope had now gone, the last effort to rescue his Master was futile; and when he recognized the suffering, the agony, and thought of the ignominious death of the man he loved, it was more than he could stand. Rushing from that marble temple, on the wall he espied a rope, grabbing it he threw it about his neck and took the fatal leap. He who had dimmed the vision of his Lord cared not to gaze upon this world himself another hour, and he went down to an ignominious death, a sad, disappointed, broken-hearted man, a victim to his false ambition.

Was Judas Worse Than Peter?

Was he the only man that did wrong? Gentlemen, be fair. While we find Judas pleading for the release of his Master, we find another, who some men say bore the whole church upon his shoulders, Peter by name. We find him on three different occasions denying his Lord, swearing till the air was blue with profanity that he never knew Him. Did Judas do that? On the one hand, Peter cursing and swearing, and on three different occasions denying that he knew him. Judas did not deny Him, even in the face of the crowd. He said: "Hail, Master," and kissed him." But, says one, you know the Bible says that Judas was a devil. (John 6:10). Yes; I know, but Jesus also said to Peter: "Get thee behind me, Satan." (Mark 8:33). That is the same party—the Devil and Satan are two different names for the same individual. (Rev. 20:2), But, says one, in another place it says of Judas that it were better had he not been born. Similar statements to that have been made against those who do wrong. "He that committeth sin is of the devil;" and "If you offend one of these little ones, it were better that a millstone were hung about your neck and you were drowned in the depths of the sea." Well, but, says another, Judas is called the son of perdition—that is, the son of the devil. Yes; but there were a whole lot of people who were addressed by Christ: "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father will ye do." (John 8:44). And to the Latter Day Saints, let me say, your Book of Covenants contains the revelation that the people before the flood who did wrong are said to be doomed—that the devil is their father; and yet the same revelation shows that Christ was going to preach to them in the spirit land, and that they would be saved. D. C., Sec. 36.

John's Misleading Comment.

Now, just one more thought before I close. When a man is down he frequently is turned on by his so-called friends. Let me give you a case in point: John 12:1-8, speaking of the time when Mary anointed Christ with this expensive ointment. John, writing of it, says Judas complained of this—found fault with it—"not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief." Yes, put the whole blame on to Judas, of course. He was dead and could not speak back. But listen. The same thing is referred to by Matthew 26, 8th verse. According to this latter writer, Judas was no more to blame than any of the others. This is what he states: "When his disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, 'To what purpose is this waste?'" This makes all the difference in the world. How often have you heard a story told about somebody that is absent, and when you see the picture from life's other side it is altogether different.

Accounts Differ.

Even the manner of Judas' death and the time of it is contradicted. Matthew tells us the story in such a way as to lead us to believe, as I have already stated, that when the chief priest refused to release Jesus and take back the money, Judas threw the money on the floor and rushed out and found a rope and hanged himself. This is Matthew's story. Peter, when he is telling it in the 1st of Acts, tells it in such a way as to indicate that Judas, after the whole thing was over purchased some ground with his ill-gotten gains, and that he, falling headlong, burst asunder and his bowels gushed out. A different story entirely, you see. Another piece of history here—let me read it. It says: "Judas walked about in this world a sad example of impiety, for his body having swollen to such an extent that he could not pass where a chariot could pass easily. He was crushed by the chariot so that his bowels gushed out." This is stated by

Papias, who was a hearer of John and a friend of Polycarp. Theophylact, after quoting the above passage, continues to quote "That Judas' eyes were so swollen that he could not see the light—that they were so sunk that they could not be seen, even by the optical instruments of physicians, and that the rest of his body was covered with runnings and worms, and that he died in a solitary place, and that no one could pass the place without stopping up his nose with his hands."

I have taken these quotations from the apostolic fathers, pages 442-3.

Pity Rather Than Blame.

Evidently the man died like all the rest, but whether he died instantly after the affair in the temple, or whether he died some years afterwards, having contracted this loathsome disease as described by the later historians, we do not know. But, in closing, let me say I would not speak a word that in any way could be considered to palliate the wrong of Judas, but I just wish to say that he, with others, had no proper conception of the real mission of Jesus Christ; he had no idea of a crucifixion and of a resurrection, neither had the other apostles. And after the resurrection occurred they would not believe it until they were compelled to believe it.

I will continue this next Sunday night, showing you that the apostles had a wrong view of the first mission of Jesus Christ until after His resurrection, hence, as my text reads: "Except ye be converted." The subject will be: "Did Jesus baptize with water or with the Holy Ghost when on earth?" I thank you.

Foreordination, Predestination and Unconditional Election

HAVING been reading up upon this subject from such works as the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Calvin's Institute, and having had some conversation with a clergyman recently, who attempted to defend the doctrine of fatalism as found in those works, and having repeated some statements made by that clergyman to me, I have been requested to compare some of the doctrines there referred to, with God's Word, and while I may present to you from these books and other books written by the leading Presbyterian ministers of the past and present, that which you may consider not only blasphemous but diametrically opposed to the Word of God, ever taking care to give credit (if you may call it credit) to the men who are responsible for the God-insulting positions taken and I trust that you will in no way lay the blame on me for having exposed perhaps the most God-dishonoring positions ever framed into a religious creed. I shall first present the doctrines as found in their books; second, have them place their own explanation upon them, and thirdly, so far as time and ability will permit, show that the positions taken by these men are diametrically opposed to the Word of God.

Predestination.

1—"God from all Eternity did, by the most wise and holy council of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." 3—"By the decree of God for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death." 4—"These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designated, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished." 5—"Those of mankind that are predestinated unto Life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret council and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of His Glorious Grace." 7—"The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable council of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His Glorious Justice." Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chapter 3; verses 1-3-4-5-7.

The whole Confession of Faith is based upon and permeated by this doctrine. I make no comments upon the meaning of these statements at this juncture, but will give to you, in the language of the originators and propagators of this system. Calvin says: "Predestination we call the Eternal Decree of God, by which he hath determined in Himself what He would have to become of every individual of mankind, for they are not all created with a similar destiny, but eternal life is foreordained for some

and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or other of these two ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or death." Zachlus, the Swiss reformer, declares that "the reprobates are bound by the ordinance of God under the necessity of sinning." And Beza, his countryman: "That God hath predestinated, not only unto damnation but also unto the causes of it whosoever He saw meet." Calvin again says of God's designs in relation to sinners: "He directs His voice to them, but it is that they may become more deaf; he kindles a light; but it is that they may be more blind; he publishes his doctrines, but it is that they may be made more besotted; he applies a remedy, but it is that they may not be healed." And Peter Martyr, another confrere, says: "God supplies wicked men with opportunities of sinning and inclines their hearts thereto; he blinds, deceives and seduces them; He, by His working on their hearts, bends and stirs them up to evil." And John Knox says: "The reprobates are not only left by God suffering, but are compelled to sin by His power." Toplady, a Church of England Calvinist, among other awful utterances, says: "The sentence of God which rejects the reprobates is so immutable that it is impossible that they should be saved, though they have performed all the works of Saints, and, therefore, it is not true that those who perish through their own fault might have been saved through grace if they had not ceased laboring for Saving Grace." This, according to the exposition of its originators and advocates, is the Doctrinal System which the Presbyterian Church, and I believe also the Baptist and Congregational churches in all their sub-divisions, are pledged to believe in and propagate. It directly contradicts the scriptural statements. It dishonors God, and I cannot but fear that it has contributed greatly to the unbelief of the world by presenting such a picture of Him in whom it asks men to believe; that many minds could not receive it, and if it be said, as it often is, Presbyterianism has dropped all those distasteful doctrines now, their ministers do not teach it. I can only say I am glad of it, but Presbyterian doctrine without Calvinism is very like a pail without a bottom. The above statements are taken from a sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. Langtry, of Toronto, Canada, as it was published by The Toronto Globe.

Before leaving this part of the subject, I submit another quotation from a celebrated writer, as follows: "God has revealed it to be His will to punish some of mankind forever. You know not but what you are one of them, whether you will be saved or damned depends entirely upon His will, and supposing He sees it most for His glory, and the general good that you should be damned, it is certainly sure that you will be damned. On this supposition then you ought to be willing to be damned; for not to be willing to be damned, in this case, is opposing God's will." Doctor Hopkin's Works, volume 3; page 145.

Death Dealing System.

In order to show you that I am not the only man that disapproves of this doctrine of fatalism, that discourages many, disgusts more, I read the following: "Presbyterians by their doctrine and teaching not only destroy Jesus Christ, and the whole Christian system, but God Himself; it destroys all His attributes at once; it overturns both His justice, mercy and truth, yea, it represents the Most Holy God as worse than the Devil, as more false, more cruel and more unjust. This is the blasphemy for which I abhor the doctrine of predestination."—John Wesley's sermon on Free Grace. In the same sermon he says: "I would prefer to worship a huge gorilla than the Presbyterian God." John F. Rowe, the celebrated preacher and author, of the Disciple Church, in his now famous work en-

titled the History of the Reformatory Movement, has this to say of Presbyterianism: "Calvin ruled with a rod of iron in the city of Geneva, where he directed civil, as well as ecclesiastical affairs. In 1568, under the stern code which was established under the auspices of Calvin, a child was beheaded for striking its father and mother. A child sixteen years old for attempting to strike its mother was sentenced to death; but on account of its youth the sentence was commuted and having been publicly whipped with a cord about its neck it was banished from the city. In 1565 a woman was chastised with rods for singing songs to the melody of the Psalms. And other inflictions are recorded too numerous to mention. The expulsion of Castellio from Geneva, a highly cultivated scholar whom Calvin had brought from Strasberg to take charge of the Geneva school—and expulsion caused by the influence of Calvin himself—and the death of Servetus, instigated by Calvin and executed by those directly under his influence, because Servetus wrote a book entitled "Errors of the Trinity," which contradicted the opinions of Calvin. These heartless acts indicate the temper of Calvin's spirit. In our opinion there is nothing in Calvinism but the defeat of Christianity; there is nothing in it on which a sinful and helpless world can lean for support. There is not a gleam of hope in it. It is a death-dealing system." Page 59-60.

An Insane Idea.

With the facts fairly before us, let us now proceed to measure this "death-dealing system" by the scriptures and calm, cool logic. First, did God foreordain whatsoever come to pass? We answer, unhesitatingly, as we think of all the murders where little children, guiltless virgins and honorable women have been tortured and slain by the red-handed brute that God did not foreordain these atrocities. As we think of the millions who have fallen in the death struggle upon the battle field, in order to give such men as Napoleon power and satisfy the greed and lust of nations, we answer "no." If it be true that God foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, then such men as Booth, who slew the gentle Lincoln; Guiteau, who ruthlessly murdered the greatest American of his time, James A. Garfield, and Czolozsz, who, like a fiend incarnate, thrust dawn that Prince of men, President McKinley, were only acting under the direct command of Almighty God. Every right-minded man will admit with me that the framers of this article were either temporarily insane or were seeking to place the responsibility of their bad conduct through life upon him of whom it is written: "God cannot be tempted, neither tempteth He any man." And again: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man; but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed." James 1:13-14.

Man is Free.

Second: If God hath predestinated some to everlasting life and fore-ordained others to everlasting death; and further, if it be true that "angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished," as stated by the Confession of Faith, then Christianity is a fraud, Christ a myth, for the above being true the Gospel is not the Power of God unto Salvation. Rom. 1:16. If God had settled man's destiny before the foundation of the world, where in this doctrine is there one ray of hope; it stultifies effort and is a factor which supports infidelity in every form. According to this doctrine, Christ, the Church and all its inspired ministry has been upon a fruitless errand. They have not by all their efforts increased the number of Christians nor diminished one in the ranks of sin.

What do the Scriptures say upon this? Turn now to Deut. 11:26-27-28 "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing if ye obey the commandments of the Lord, your God, which I command you this day, and a curse if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord, your God; but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known." Deut. 30:15-19; See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore, choose life that both thou and thy seed may live." Josh. 24:15: "And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom you will serve; but as for Me and My house, we will serve the Lord." 1. Kings 18:21: "And Elijah came unto all the people and said: 'How long halt ye between two opinions; if the Lord be God, follow Him, and if Baal, then follow him.'"

The above scripture might be supported by many other passages, both in the old and new Testament, which shows that man from the beginning in Eden till the crack of doom shall sound, has, is and will continue to be endowed with his free agency; he may make his own choice as to whether he will serve God or not; but the certainty of the reward for doing evil or good will be the result of his own choice, and hence Jesus could say upon this very point: "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

Oh, what a solemn mockery. All the above scriptures are if man was a slave, compelled, foreordained, predestined before the foundation of the world to play on the harp of a thousand strings or to scream and groan in an endless hell, as the direct will of God and all for His glory. Right here, let us pause to ask our Presbyterian friends: Do you really think, down deep in your soul that God will receive glory by witnessing eternal torture, deathless agony and eternal woe? Your creed teaches thus, but let the Scriptures contradict your creed: "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die, saith the Lord, and not that he should return from his way and live; for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves and live ye." Ezek. 18:23-35. I commend a careful reading of this entire chapter. "Say unto them as I live, saith the Lord God; I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die. Oh, House of Israel. When the righteous turneth from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, he shall even die thereby. But if the wicked turn from his wickedness and do that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby. Ezek. 33:11-18-19: "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." Matt. 18:14.

Scriptures Clear.

From the above we have learned that the number to be saved and damned was not eternally settled before the foundation of the world, but that it depends upon the obedience or disobedience of the children of men. The Bible is clear in the doctrine that all may be saved if they will render obedience to the Gospel. "And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered." Joel 2:32. This is made still more emphatic in Acts 2:21: "And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Romans 10:11-13: "Whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed, for there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him, for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Rev. 22:17. And the Spirit and the Bride say come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will let him take the Water of Life freely.

That God foreordained the plan by which all may be saved, who will come unto Him, is quite apparent from the following scriptures. A careful reading of Acts, 2nd chapter, from the 21st to its closing, or I may say the entire chapter, may hear the sermon of the gifted Peter upon this question, where he is preaching to those who had by wicked hands crucified the Saviour, yet He shows them that God knew that Christ would be slain and foreordained the plan by which even those who were guilty of his assassination might be saved. He bids the murderers to be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their sins, and we are told that many of them gladly received the word, embracing the gospel and praising God. Surely if any one was predestined to be damned it would be those whose hands were streaked and stained in the royal blood of the King of Kings, but here you are shown the account of their salvation. That God foreordained the plan by which He would save man is quite apparent and that that plan was the gospel of Jesus Christ is quite fully supported by the scriptures. That He elected to save all who would render obedience to the gospel and continue to the end is fully supported in the scriptures, but we will present the scriptures on this matter for your consideration. Romans 1:16-17: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is the Power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek, for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith."

We are told here the gospel is the power of God. Paul, in the same letter, 13th chapter, 1st verse, says: "For there is no power but of God the powers that be are ordained of God." Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, said: "That we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world, unto our glory." 1 Cor. 2:7. Here it shows clearly that the plan was ordained by the Almighty, in the same letter, 15th chapter, 1st and 2nd verses, he supports this proposition, saying: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel, which I preach unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand, by which also ye are saved if ye keep in memory what I have preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain." Here we are clearly informed that the gospel had the saving elements within it unless they believed in vain; that is, as he explained in another place: "But ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you, being then made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness." Romans 6:17-18.

The Lord Calls.

Peter also stands by the thought that the gospel of Jesus Christ was the foreordained plan by which God would save those who would obey it, he clearly showing that Christ was elected to shed His blood to sanctify the people who from the heart would obey the gospel. Read carefully the first chapter. We are told by the supporters of the doctrine of unconditional election and foreordination that Paul supports their contention. We admit that Paul speaks of foreordination, election and calling, but turning to their most favorite passage found in the eighth chapter of Romans, it clearly shows that Christ was foreordained and called and predestinated that He might be the first born among many brethren. We admit that He speaks of those who were called, but it is not a certain number that is called as they vainly suppose, but as we have hitherto shown: "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely again." Rev. 22:17. "Look unto me all ye ends of the earth and be saved." Isa. 45:22. So that the Lord calls all. Acts 2:2, and those who will hear the call, that is to obey the gospel, will be elected to be saved because of their obedience to the foreordained plan. This is further supported by Paul in

his letter to the Ephesians, 1st chapter, that God, by His good pleasure, according to His own will and for His own glory, predestinated those who were adopted into His family through Gospel means. The Gospel means is clearly announced by Christ Himself in John, 3rd chapter, 3rd, 4th and 5th verses, where He teaches plainly the doctrine of the new birth, by which we are adopted into the family of God, or as Paul says: "Transformed from the power of darkness into the Kingdom of God's dear Son." Col. 1:13.

This is further supported by Paul in Ephesians 2:8-9-10, which I will read: "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works lest any man should boast for we are His workmanship created in Jesus Christ unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

Here you will discover that through the grace of God He has devised a plan created good works and ordained that whosoever would walk in them would be saved. We may safely leave that part of the subject right here.

Christ Our Redemption.

That Christ died for all and therefore that all may be saved and become elected to a seat in the Kingdom of God by obedience to the fore-ordained plan is clearly taught in the scriptures. "And the angel said unto them, fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." Luke, 2:10. "Jesus, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man." Heb. 2:3-9. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God. * * * The same came for a witness to bear witness of the Light that all men through Him might believe. He was that true light which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world. John 1:7-9. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." John 3:16-17.

We have tried to produce the scriptures in support of the position that God foreordained the gospel to be the plan by which the whole world would be saved if they would render obedience to it. We have further tried to show that sorrow and misery and sin is the result, yea, the direct result of disobedience to God's law, disobedience bringing sorrow, distress and misery.

I would not forget the chief scripture upon which the doctrine of fatalism, unconditional election or foreordination is based. It is found in Paul's letter to the Romans, 9th chapter. They would have us believe that God foreordained to hate Esau and to love Jacob before they had any existence. The scripture does not so state. It does say the following: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her the elder shall serve the younger, as it was written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Unfortunately the misunderstanding occurs here because two passages of scripture are coupled together, one showing the foreknowledge of God regarding these children. "The elder shall serve the younger." Here is where some confounded the foreknowledge of God with unconditional election and predestination. The fact is that God did foresee that Esau would undervalue his birthright, and sell it to Jacob and that in consequence of his rejecting, or undervaluing the law of primogeniture he would lose the blessings belonging thereto, and his posterity would serve the posterity of his younger brother, and the Bible shows this to have been the case. If you will read the original scripture, you will discover that this had reference particularly to the pos-

terity of Esau, and not to him as an individual. The sense is that the descendants of Esau, who were Edomites, should be inferior to, and subject to the descendants of Jacob.

Read it now, "And the Lord said unto her, two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger." Gen. 25:23. The other passage that Paul quotes in part, reads as follows: "The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi. I have loved you saith the Lord, yet we say, wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness," Mal 1:1-2. Now, while some would have you to believe that the statement, as to loving one and hating the other was made before the babies were born. The fact is it was made nearly fifteen hundred years after the babies were born, and their posterity were living, the one under the displeasure of God because of their disobedience and sin, the other loved of God because of their faithfulness to God. So much for the so-called strong point.

An Illustration.

Friends, I cannot close without drawing your attention to this thought. Suppose that one of you men in this congregation was told that there was born to you by your wife, a pair of twin babies. I ask would you, before ever seeing the little tots, make oath and say, I will call one Jacob and the other Esau; I will hate Esau no matter how sweet a child he grows to be; no matter how obedient to my wishes he is, I will hate him; but on the other hand, the other little chap will be loved by me. I will bestow all the love and tenderness upon him, no matter how wilful, mean, dishonest, and disobedient he will become. I will kiss the one and I will thrash the other. Just think of it, you all say. The man that would act like that would be a cruel, heartless father, unworthy of the name. I agree with you, and yet that is the position taken by the churches that teach the doctrine of unconditional election.

They say that God acted that way with Esau and Jacob, and worse than that, they teach that is the conduct of the Almighty God, Our Heavenly Father, toward His children. Making up His mind before the foundation of the world to save a few, independent of good works or faith, and to cast into eternal flames all the rest of mankind, not because of the sins they may have committed, but just because He willed it so, and all to the praise of His glorious justice.

In conclusion permit me to say that the Bible presents this doctrine: That God is an impartial Father, a faithful Judge; that He is no respecter of persons, and that all men are to be rewarded according to the deeds done in the body, and that all will be called upon to meet God and that whatsoever they have sown, that shall they reap. In verification of this, I ask you to read these scriptures at your leisure: Deut. 10:17-2; Chron. 19:7; Job. 34:19; Acts 10:34; Acts 17:26-27; Rom. 2:1-11; Peter 1:17; Col. 3:25; Eph. 6:8-9; Gal. 2:6; Gal. 6:7-8.

May the Lord help you to see the truth and in the words of the poet which voices the position that I have taken on this question, let me say:

We shape ourselves the joy or fear
Of which the coming life is made
And fill our future atmosphere
With sunshine or with shade.
The tissues of the life to be
We weave with colors all our own.
And in the field of destiny
We reap as we have sown.

The Bible

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 5th chapter of the gospel as recorded by St. John, 39th verse, where you will read these words: "Search the scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me."

The word Bible is derived from the Greek word "biblia," meaning the book. Sir Walter Scott, with a library perhaps worth thousands of dollars, when on his death-bed spoke to his servant, saying: "Bring me the Book," and the poor servant was bewildered. There were perhaps one thousand books in his library. Approaching the side of the dying man, he said: "Which book, master," and the great Scott made answer, and said: "There is but one book—the Bible."

Original Manuscripts Lost.

According to the reading that I have been privileged to indulge in, I find that there is not a scrap of the original manuscript of either the Old or New Testament upon the earth. The oldest manuscript of the Old Testament entire is less than 1000 years old. The oldest manuscript of the New Testament is hardly 1500 years old. I might remark at this juncture, when we have preached upon the Book of Mormon, told how the plates were shown to Joseph Smith by an angel, and that he translated from those plates the work now called the Book of Mormon. People frequently say "show us those plates, and we will believe." If there is any value in that argument, apply it to the Old and New Testaments, and he who would not believe the divine authenticity of the Book of Mormon because the originals from whence it came are not shown him, in order to be consistent would not believe that the Bible was the word of God, neither the Old nor the New Testament, because there is not a scrap of the original manuscripts known to exist upon the earth. You might just as well say we refuse to believe the Ten Commandments because no one can show to us the stone tablets upon which they were written.

The Old Testament was written only with consonant outlines, the vowels were not added until the 7th century after Christ. The New Testament manuscripts were all written in capitals and without punctuation. The chapter division was made in the 13th century and the verse division about the year 1555. It is said by certain historians that Ezra collected all the manuscripts that he could find and published them in Chaldean characters. It is also said that he wrote the last chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy, where we read the record of the death of Moses, who wrote the first five books of the Bible. This Ezra also changed many of the original names which had grown obsolete, and all this information now tendered to you, I learned through Gardiner's Encyclopedia, pages 203-4, and other books.

I am told in my reading that there has been about 290 odd translations of the Bible. The Encyclopedia Britannica, I believe, puts it at that number, in volume three. I have neither the time nor the inclination to give you a history of all these varied translations, but I shall bring into a little prominence a few of them. The first English translation was

made by John Wycliffe in 1380, but was never printed. I may say to you, in my travels through England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales I went to Lutterworth, entered the sacred church there where John Wycliffe preached the first sermon on the Reformation. I sat at the table where he translated the first English Bible. The first printed Bible in our language was translated by Tyndale, assisted by Coverdale. Many of these were purchased and burned by opposing authorities. This, however, was revised and republished in 1533.

Translations.

Our Roman Catholic friends put their first English translation of the New Testament in print in 1584, and the Old Testament was translated by them in 1609, at a place called Douey; that is why the Catholic Bible of to-day is called the Douey Bible. The most popular English translation is called the King James version. King James in 1604 ordered a new translation of the Bible made, which was published in 1611. It is said that 47 men took seven years to do it. This is the Bible from which we preach generally. In 1826 Alexander Campbell, founder of the Disciple Church, gave to us another translation, called "The Living Oracle." Campbell strongly endorsed this as being the best translation of the scriptures. He did not take part in the translation, however, but it was the work of Doctors Campbell, Dodridge and McKnight. This translation was found to be very faulty and was revised later, and Alexander Campbell wrote the preface to the revised. I believe this was brought out in 1832. There was yet another translation made by our disciple brethren, under the supervision of Elder H. T. Anderson, and I have never seen a copy of this last translation.

When I was preaching in the north several years ago, a Disciple made a great cry because Joseph Smith translated the Bible, and he pressed to his heart the King James' translation, and cried: "They would snatch from us our mother's Bible," and when I exposed this duplicity, showing that Alexander Campbell and Disciples in general of his time denounced the King James' translation very severely, and tried their hand at giving to the world two other translations of the Bible, it kind of took the wind out of that debater. A gentleman stepped up to me after one of my meetings and said if you want to see one of the Anderson Bibles, I can secure one for you. He made the effort, but came back with the sad news that they had thrown it into the garret with a lot of other worn out truck they had no use for, and when they went up to the garret to find it, they discovered that the rats had made a bed out of many of the leaves, and so I did not have the privilege of viewing the last Disciple translation of the Bible.

It is true that Joseph Smith translated the Bible, but I submit right here that if the religious world has given to us hundreds of translations before his time, certainly it was no crime for him to present another translation of the same book. I will make more reference to this later on.

Divine Help Necessary.

What is called the revised version, which I hold in my hand, is the work of 82 men of admitted scholarship. More than ten years was devoted to the task, and in their preface they admit that even their work has many imperfections and blemishes. They say that such a work can never be accomplished by scholarship, unless assisted by Divine help.

Here you will discover right in the preface of this book they admit the imperfections and blemishes, and declare that scholarship cannot correctly translate the Bible without divine assistance. Their confession of imperfections and blemishes is widely testified to, and the revised version is largely a failure. The majority of people to-day are reading

the King James' translation. The Literary Digest, for March 21, 1899, writing on this last Bible revision, says that: "It is an utter failure and an insult," but, now, that we are on the point where they admit their failures, and declare that Divine help alone can remove them, we present to you the translation made by the young prophet and seer, Joseph Smith, who, at the age of 25 years, and of whom the world has written that he was an uneducated man, yet he claimed to give us this revision, not as the result of scholarship, but by the Divine help. He has given to us a translation superior to the revised version, and one of the strongest evidences of the superiority of the prophet, Joseph Smith, who makes the claim to give to us this new translation by revelation is in the fact that when he, by the Spirit of God, revised what is called the King James' translation, his rendering is copied by the revised version.

Now, this sermon is going into The Toronto World. It will not only be heard by the hundreds who are here to-night, but it will be read by the teeming thousands of people, and while the scholarship of the country is busy reflecting on Joseph Smith. Now, they may just take this from me, that the translation he made in 1833 is followed in some parts by those wonderful scholars of both England and America, who gave to us the revised version of 1880. You may not believe that—I will prove it. Turn with me to the 1st Corinthians, 10th chapter, 24th verse, where it says: "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." This is pretty good for a highway robber, it might be considered support for a villain who takes another man's wealth. Let me draw your attention to Joseph Smith's translation of this same verse: "Let no man seek therefore his own, but every man another's good." It is a sermon against selfishness, and self aggrandizement and personal greed. The revised version following that reads: "Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbor's good." The word "wealth," as found in King James' translation is given by Joseph Smith as "good," and the word "good" is found in the version of 1880. What Joseph Smith said was presented to him as a boy by the Spirit of God in 1833. The eighty-two men from both sides of the Atlantic bring to us in the revised version of 1880 the very same word. Here, then, even in the translation of the Bible, Joseph Smith, not by reason of his natural ability, for he was not a college man, but, being divinely guided, gave to the world that which scholarship fifty years afterwards bears testimony to. This is all I need to say of that.

The Book of All Books.

The Bible is the transcription of the Divine man. It is a revelation of the Divine will, and the unfolding of the Divine purpose. It is the book of all books. There are thirty-nine books in the Old Testament, and twenty-seven in the New Testament—sixty-six in all. Thirty-six different writers took part in the production of this wonderful work. It was written by kings, poets, judges, generals, preachers, tax-gatherers, herd men, fishermen, tent-makers, and by both the rich and poor.

It reminds me of a great architect who plans a great building. He gives orders to this, that and the other quarry to get out stone of certain dimensions, bringing them from all parts of the globe, and putting them together and making one splendid symmetrical edifice. So the Bible is the product of the Divine mind, as it flowed through rich and poor, through the kings and peasants together, reflecting God's will to man. There is an objection made against the Bible in that it reveals the life and character of bad men and women. Now, that is what I like about it. It shows that God is impartial; that He is no respecter of persons, and that He is fair. In our days the young man whose father is wealthy gets

into a scrap, you may hear something about the affair, but the name is withheld. If it is a poor man's son who gets into trouble publicity is given to the name, but when God accuses a man, or inspires his servants to do it, he tells the whole facts, so that we may know them. Thus, emulating the good and profiting by the mistakes of others, we may perfect our own character, and thus we find in that objection the stamp of Divinity.

Numbers of men in the past have tried to demolish the Bible. They have said it was just about dead a number of times, but Voltaire thought he had it just about buried a number of times, but it lived and Voltaire died; and I am told in my reading that the very press that Voltaire used to print his lectures against the Bible, was purchased to print the Bible, and the house in which he lived was shelved in order to accommodate the thousands of volumes, and the door through which he entered and made his exit was the passage through which tens of thousands of Bibles have been carried and distributed to every part of the earth.

Ingersoll wrote a book of his lectures on the mistakes of Moses a few thousand years after Moses was dead. It would be interesting to have Moses write a book on the mistakes of the Colonel. Just think of it—Moses. After he was eighty years old, he led an army of 600,000 men forty years; he was a military leader; he was a legislator, but it does not require a very brave dog to bark at a dead lion. History shows that Moses was the most successful general that the Egyptian army every had, and he led God's people for 40 years. Another history shows us that the Colonel had one engagement, and surrendered to a young boy in a hog yard, and then heroically tendered his resignation. I have given this story as I read it in different papers, and one book. But in justice to Mr. Ingersoll I will say that those who profess to know declare the story to be without foundation in fact. That is the difference between the two men. Oh, yes, they have killed the Bible, but just think when this revised version was given to the world in 1880, the longest telegraph message that ever went over the wire was 118,000 words from Matthew to Romans, sent from New York to Chicago, just to get it there and have it published 24 hours before the train could carry it to them. Oh, yes, the Bible is dead.

Safeguard of Women.

The Bible is the civilizer of the world. Where there is no Biblical influence, women are slaves and playthings. Why, one large council, who sat for eighteen years, and who knew more of the priestcraft than the word of God, discussed for sometime as to whether a woman had a soul or not, but when we become acquainted with God's word, we cast away superstition, priestcraft and idolatry, and find that in that Book of Books God made them male and female and they twain were to be one flesh.

How any woman reading the history of the nations, who are not governed by God's word, seeing the degradation and the humility of her sisters, the maze-bound slaves of heathen countries, and contrast that with her condition under Bible civilization is a question to me. I remember reading one time about a number of shipwrecked sailors reaching an island on a raft. One of the sailors had been there several years before, and he knew that cannibals inhabited that island. It was a choice between drowning in the billows of the mighty deep and reaching land in order to be devoured by the inhabitants thereof. However, they made for shore, and climbing upon the little hill the old sailor cried to the rest of them: "Come and see." He discovered the steeple of a church, and instantly all fears of cannibalism were gone.

Oh, it may be fun and pleasure for some to ridicule the Bible, but they know where their safety lies. It is in the country where the Bible is regarded as the word of God. I was told a story once of an old man, who was very wealthy and his nephew who, having lost their way, had to seek shelter from a midnight storm in a little cabin by the way side. They were welcomed to it, but at once, when they looked in their suspicions were aroused, and they thought, perhaps they would be murdered if they went to sleep for the money they had, so they agreed that the old man should go to sleep and the young man with the revolver should stand guard. The old man got ready to retire, and the young man peeping through the crevice of the door, saw the old rough hunter, clothed in bear skin, reach up and take down a book. It was the Bible. He read a chapter, and bowing in prayer he asked God to bless and protect the strangers in his humble cabin. The nephew at once turned round, put up his revolvers, and began to uncliothe himself, when the uncle saw him and asked him if he was not going to keep guard. The nephew replied: "Oh, we may talk against the Bible, but a man who reads the Bible and prays for the stranger, as the old man in the outer room has just done, does not murder people.

Bible Spiritualizes Sciences.

My friends, would a copy of Tom Payne's Age of Reason, or Ingersoll's lecture on skulls have eased his mind? Oh, no; he would have held tight the revolvers. The Bible comprehends all sides. It takes the sciences and spiritualizes them until we have some of the most beautiful images of the Bible reflected in the name of science. Botany you say: We read of the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valley. Astronomy: We read of the morning star, of the sun of righteousness, and the glories of eternity and resurrection, and the record says there is one glory of the sun, another of the moon, another of the stars, and as one star differs from another star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead. Geology: Let us read of the rock of ages, for upon this rock will I build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Anatomy: Why, friends, if you want to read the history of anatomy you will find it in this book, the creation of man, and all about him, both the inward and the outward man. But they tell us that Newton discovered the science of gravitation. This is nonsense, read Job 26th and 27th and you read there that the earth hangeth upon nothing. That is gravitation written up by the first writer of antiquity—Job.

You regard the telegraph and the telephone a modern invention and you crown Morse and Bell with honors, but Bible writers knew about it. Read Job, 38th chapter, and 35th verse, where you are told that they will yet take the lightnings from the clouds, and say unto thee, here we are. God was the inspiration that moved both Morse and Bell. He knew all about the telegraph and telephone before these heroes of science were born, and in the proper time inspired them to make the discoveries.

A Description of Railroads.

You say the railroads were unknown until within perhaps the last 100 years. Oh, no, the Bible describes them as well as Charles M. Hays could describe them. Read Nahum second chapter, 3rd and 5th verses, where you are told that in the day of God's preparation the chariots shall rage in the streets; they shall jostle one against the other in the broad-ways; they shall run like lightnings; they shall seem like torches; they shall make haste to the wall thereof, and the defence shall be prepared. I have not time to take this matter up in detail, but there is a splendid description of the railroads. Go out on a dark night and see the head-light of a locomotive. Does it not seem like a torch? We have them now

running something like 80 miles an hour, and the Bible says they shall run like lightning. Sometimes they are called the lightning express, or the cannon ball express. He shall recount their worthies. Does not the conductor go through the train calling for tickets, tickets, recounting to see who is worthy to ride. They shall jostle in their way. There is a complete description. They make haste to the wall thereof. What do you make out of that? Go to Niagara River, now there was a wall where trains had to stop until God taught a man by a little spider to make a suspension bridge, and it was prepared and they go over the bridge.

The Greatest Love Story.

Some say: "I care not for the sciences, I like to read love stories." I don't blame you—the world would be better and brighter if we talked love, wrote love and lived in love.

Let me say probably the greatest love story that was ever written, and the truest love story that ever happened is found in the Bible. Oh, says one, now, Brother Evans, I mean a love story where there is a hero and a girl and a fuss between the hero and the villain, and where the hero wins out and there is a beautiful bride, a splendid wedding and a grand supper, and the hero has a happy home and the villain is caught in his dirty work. That is just what the Bible love story is. You say what part of the Bible? Well, you can read that from Genesis to Revelations.

Let me give you the characters. Christ is the hero; Satan is the villain in the plot; the church is called the bride. Does the hero suffer for his girl? Indeed, he does. Witness Gethsemane with its tears and groans. Here is determination when he says that he will fight until winning the bride they shall have a marriage supper, and the bride shall be presented to the groom's father, without spot or wrinkle or anything of that kind. Now, that is the desire of most women not to have any spots or wrinkles. That is the type of Christ's Church. When the love story is ended and the marriage takes place and the bride, (the church), is presented to the father, Eph. 3:25-28, and what becomes of the villain? Why, it says in Revelations that he will be sent down for 1,000 years chained and bound. Rev. 20. But we are told by another that this Bible has caused wars and bloodshed. Ingersoll on Orthodoxy, page 22. That is not true. The law of Christ as reflected in the Book never caused a drop of blood. The true Christian never killed his fellowman. I am not here to apologize for churchianity which has killed its millions, but churchianity and Christianity is different. Turning to the Word itself, I read, "Love your neighbors; do good to those that hate you and pray for those that spitefully use you." Matt. 5:38-45.

Bible Denounces Churchianity.

Paul wrote: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. Rom. 12 and 20. The great trouble with infidels is that they think that the Bible supports churchianity with its hatred, envy and jealousy, when the facts are the Bible denounces it; but I am not here to defend the Bible. I am here to ask you to read it, and it will prove its own defence. Well you might just as well say get a little poodle dog to defend a great lion in the cage; let the lion out of the cage and it will defend itself. So let the Word of God be the man of your council, and you will find it a glorious fountain flowing with the words of love, overflowing with the information that goes towards the development of character and bringing you to the tree of life in the midst of the paradise of God.

Angels

THE subject under consideration to-night is "Angels;" what are they? What are their duties? Permit me to draw your attention to the 34th Psalm, 7th verse, where you will read these words: "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them." Here is a standing promise from an unchangeable God that His messengers, His servants, His heavenly attendants, who are called Angels, will be round about those that fear Him, to bring help, consolation, comfort and instruction to them.

A Present Help in Trouble.

We believe that this promise is as invulnerable as the God that made it, and therefore, while it may be unpopular for me to preach it in this day and hour, yet it is a fact that from this text, supported by all the rest of the Bible when it speaks of Angels, all supports me in the thought that God intended that his Angels should visit His people whenever necessity required, to bless, to comfort, and to instruct, until Jesus comes in glory. We are told by the great apostle Paul in his letter to the Hebrew brethren, first chapter: "That Angels are ministering spirits sent forth to minister unto those who are heirs of salvation." Now, this would indicate that as long as there were heirs of salvation they might expect to see angels to converse with them. This is further supported in the second chapter of Hebrews, 9th verse: "But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor that He, by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Here we are told that Jesus is made a little lower than the angels.

When was He made a little lower than the angels? When He laid aside the glory that He had with God in the pre-existent world, when in His humiliation His judgment was taken away and He was clothed upon with mortal flesh, when He became like His brethren in all things, when He came to act His part in the drama of humanity, became subjected to all the varied spheres of human life, and when He became subject to death; that is what made Him a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, the angels do not die.

Angels But Men Immortalized.

There is another statement along that line that will be found in the 20th chapter of Luke, 34th and 35th verses, which reads as follows: "And Jesus, answering, said unto them: 'The children of this world marry and are given in marriage, but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.'" Here then we discover that men may become angels when their bodies are immortalized; that angels are men immortalized. This is clearly proven in the 22nd of Revelations, 9th verse, when the angel appears to John on the Isle of Patmos. Now, I want to show you that angels are governed by law and they keep the commandments of God. This is fully supported in the 103rd Psalm: "Bless the Lord, ye His angels that excel in strength; that do His commandments; harkening

unto the voice of His world." Revelations, 7th chapter 11th and 12th verses, has a statement along this line, which reads: "And all the angels stood round about the throne and the elders and four beasts and fell before the throne on their faces and worshipped God.

Now, I want to emphasize that by again calling your attention to Revelations, 22nd chapter, 8th and 9th verses: "And I, John, saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. Then saith He unto me, see thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren the prophets and of them which keep the sayings of this book, worship God." It has been said that order is heaven's first law, and if there is a law to be kept, if God requires obedience to His commandments on the part of his angels, then they must have their free agency. Free agency presupposes the right of action; the right of choice. The power to obey or disobey, and so we go to the scriptures and perhaps will bring a surprise on some of you by showing that these angels who have this right of choice, this agency, some of them choose to do wrong, and did wrong, and we will follow them and see the consequences of their wrong.

This thought is first suggested by Job in the 4th chapter and 18th verse, speaking of the angels, he says: "For behold, He (God) putteth no trust in His servants and his angels he charged with folly." Now, in this life we may frequently charge each other with folly and because of human weak judgment we accuse one another at times wrongfully. But I think you will agree with me that if God charged the angels with folly, they were guilty of the charge; hence they had done wrong.

The Fall of Lucifer.

If you turn to Isaiah, 14th chapter, you will read a brief history of one of the most momentous events that ever transpired in heaven, earth or hell. It gives you a brief history of the disobedience and fall of Lucifer, the light bearer, one of the chief angels in heaven, who became Satan, and who is commonly called the devil. I begin to read in the 14th chapter, 12th verse, and following: "How are thou fallen from Heaven, oh, Lucifer, son of the Morning; how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations. For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms.

Here you will discover through the false ambition, through envy and jealousy, an angel became the devil. Some people think that God made the devil; that is not true. God made an angel, and that angel by disobedience to God was charged with folly, with envy and with jealousy, and in consequence became a devil. It may be proper at this juncture to support this Bible statement, by some of the prominent writers of later date: "It is agreed by all writers, as well sacred as profane, that this creature we now call the devil was originally an angel of light, a glorious seraph, perhaps the choicest of all the glorious seraphes. Some think that he was chief of the arch-angels." History of the Devil, page 21. "The first cause of Satan's disgrace and rebellion was occasioned upon God proclaiming his Son, with Himself, supreme ruler in heaven, giving the dominion of all His works of creation to Him, which post of honor Satan expected to be conferred on himself, as next in honor, majesty and power to God the Supreme. Satan withdrew with all his followers

malcontent and chagrin resolved to disobey the new command and not yield obedience to the Son." History of the Devil, page 22: "Hear, all ye angels, progeny of light, thrones, dominions, powers, hear my decree, which unrevoked shall stand. This day have I begot whom I declare My only Son, and on this holy hill have Him anointed; whom ye now behold at my right hand, your head I Him appoint and by Myself have sworn, to him shall bow all knees in heaven and confess Him Lord. Under His great visegeregent reign abide united, as one individual soul, forever happy. Him who disobeys me breaks union, and that day, cast out from God, and blessed vision, falls into utter darkness. Deep engulfed, his place ordained without redemption, without end. Satan, so call him now. His former name is heard no more in heaven. He of the first, if not the first arch-angel, great in power and preeminence." Milton's Paradise Lost, b. 5.

"Sin originated with him who next to Christ had been most honored of God, and who stood highest in power and glory among the inhabitants of heaven before his fall. Lucifer was first of the covering cherubs, holy and undefiled. Lucifer allowed jealousy of Christ to prevail. Why, questioned this mighty angel, should Christ have the supremacy? Why is He thus honored above; Lucifer leaving his place in the immediate presence of God, Lucifer went forth to diffuse the spirit of discontent among the angels. With one accord, Satan and his host threw the blame of their rebellion wholly upon Christ, declaring that if they had not been reprov'd, they would never have rebelled. Thus stubborn and defiant in their disloyalty, seeking vainly to overthrow the government of God, the arch-rebel and all his sympathizers were at last banished from heaven." The great controversy between Christ and Satan, pages 493-500. "Behold, the devil, was before Adam, for he rebelled against Me saying, give me thine honor which is my power and also a third part of the hosts of heaven turned He away from me because of their agency and they were thrust down, and thus became the devil and his angels." Doc. & Cov., Sec. 28., par. 10.

"By collecting the passages (says Cruden) where Satan, or the devil is mentioned, it may be observed that he fell from heaven with all his company; that God cast him down from thence for the punishment of his pride." Gardner's Christian Encyclopedia, page 798.

"All that we know on the subject leads us to suppose that at some time there was a revolt among the angels, and that the rebellious part were cast out of heaven," Barne's Com. Rev. 12.

"Lucifer was one of the first arch-angels who fell and became the devil." John Wesley, Sermon 74.

I have given you the statement of the Lord found in the Bible, giving you the revelations of the church found in the Book of Covenants, and the position there stated is supported clearly by all the writers of history, all confirming this great truth: That the devil was once one of the chief angels of God, that he became envious, jealous and rebellious, and as a result of this condition, he does just as his children do when they become sinful and are at time rebuked for their folly. They will not submit to the rebuke and they become envious and jealous and then they start to whisper and circulate stories against those who are trying to keep the law and honor the law giver, and as a result they lose the spirit and by and by become apostates to the law of God, and the Church of Christ.

Church Gathers Good and Bad.

I follow this individual and I draw your attention to the 12th chapter of Revelation, 7th to 10th verses, where you may read quite an extended account of that which has already been presented for your consideration, beginning at the 7th verse: "And there was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his

angels and prevailed not; neither was their place found in heaven any more. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the devil, and Satan which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." We must not think it strange that there are sometimes wars in the church. Why that condition obtained even in heaven.

There are those who think that when you come into the Church of Christ, you will find everything peace, harmony and purity personified, but that is not true, it never was, is not now, and will not be this side of the immortal sphere. As long as angels or men and women have their agencies, they are subject to come under this power described here, and hence Jesus said to those that were rebellious: "You are of your fathers, the devil, and the lusts of your father will you do," and so the church being like a net cast into the sea, gathers both the good and the bad, and you will have more or less occasion to rebuke folly and expose wickedness in the church just so long as that is incumbent upon the true servant of God, so long will there be envy and jealousy and opposition. It always was and it always will be, but notice the secret of all this is God acknowledged and blessed and annointed His son that was willing to give God the glory, that was willing to act his part as per the commandments. God honored the obedient children, and because the honor was conferred upon him that was obedient, the disobedient ones became envious and jealous, hence the war. Jesus tells us something of the results of this war. You will find His statement in the 10th chapter of the gospel recorded by St. Luke: "And He said unto them. I beheld Satan as lightning falls from heaven." He was there, saw the fight, witnessed the casting down, and so testified. Second Peter, 2 and 4, has another statement upon this same matter: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."

The Judgment.

He goes on to show in this chapter that if the angels who sinned were not spared, neither would be the saint in the church if he refused to be governed by the law, he too must be rebuked. Jude speaks in the 6th verse as follows: "And the angels which kept not their first estate but left their own habitations, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."

Now there is a peculiar expression there, and I shall take time to try and figure out a conclusion regarding it, but it is worthy of your consideration. These angels that fell are reserved unto the judgment of the great day. There is a judgment to follow and so we read in 1st Corinthians, 6th and 3rd verse: "Know ye not that we shall judge angels." I would not have you to think that the saint on earth will be called upon to pass judgment upon the pure celestial being that keeps the commandments of God and worships Him in heaven, but it may be that we shall be witnesses to pass judgment upon those who have tempted and sought our ruin and destruction when they come before God to answer in that day of judgment. With the devils this is recognized, that there was a set time when they would have to meet the consequences of their conduct, and it is made apparent in the 8th chapter of Matthew, 29th verse, where Jesus as having something to do with them upon the earth and they cried out: "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time," showing that they recognized that there was a certain time when they would have to meet the judgment; that opens a door to which you may enter a field of investigation that is as high as heaven and as deep as hell.

Angels Are Ministers.

My next thought is that God has and will keep His promise in that the good angels will minister to men. For the facts all through the Bible indicate that they have appeared to men. Genesis 18:1-33 contains a very interesting narrative, where angels appear to Abraham. They looked so much like men that he said he saw three men approaching. The record shows that he prepared for them a meal, fresh veal, hot biscuits and new milk, and they sat down under a tree and they did eat." They looked and acted very much like men. If you tell me they did not eat, they only pretended to eat, then you will reduce the angels of God to the level of a trickster, and by the slight of hand and the simple twist of the wrist, there presence before you is an illusion.

I would not accuse God or the angels of playing tricks or taking part in slight-of-hand work. The facts are they ate, drank and talked and looked like men. Genesis, 19th chapter, verses 1 to 26, contains another interesting story of two of these same angels who came to Sodom to tell Lot and his family to escape from the condemned city, for God had seen the wickedness of the city and had sent them to warn Lot so that he might escape the destruction that awaited the wicked. They looked like men. When they went to Lot's house, the neighbors around recognized them and wanted to take them by force and to abuse them. Josephus describes them as two beautiful young men or boys, so that they walked, talked, ate, stayed all night with Lot, and they looked like two fine looking young men or boys. In the 8th chapter of Daniel, 15th verse, we are told there that the Angel Gabriel appeared to Daniel.

You will read another beautiful narrative in Daniel, chapter 10, 11th to 14th verse, that will touch, perhaps, some thoughts suggested by some of you in your prayer meetings. God answers your prayers, but some bemoan the fact that they thought God had not heard their prayers for He had not answered them. In this instance we are told that as soon as a prayer was offered God heard him, and sent an angel from heaven, but that certain power, supposed to be Satan, who was once an arch-angel, hindered him, and he delayed him for twenty-one days, and goodness knows how much longer he would have been delayed, but we are told that Michael of the prince of angels came to the assistance of the other angel and he got through and came on with the message.

The Annunciation.

Luke 2nd chapter, 26th to 38th verse, tells us of the angel that appeared to shepherds announcing the coming of Jesus Christ. Luke, 1st chapter, 11th and 20th verses, tells us that same angel, Gabriel by name, appeared to Zacharias in the temple and told him that his wife should have a child and the child should be John the Baptist. Luke, 2nd chapter, 8th and 14th verses, tells us how the angels appeared to the shepherds the night of the Saviour's birth. Luke 22:43, gives to us one of the most encouraging paragraphs of history ever written. It tells the story of Christ suffering in Gethsemane, and when He had reached all human limitations, when all His powers had been about expended, then an angel appeared strengthening Him. Oh, I have often thought about that.

What would have been the consequence had that angel not arrived at that juncture? Would Christ have failed and human redemption never have been accomplished? But the angel of God, according to the text, encampeth about the righteous one and delivereth Him, so that His mission was a grand, splendid, stupendous success, which will ultimately bring about the redemption of the world. After the death of Jesus Christ you will remember that Mary went to the tomb gazing in. The record says she saw two angels clothed in white apparel. Here you discover, as

may be seen in many other parts, that the angels being in the form of men, wore clothes, and you read again that angels' food was given to Israel upon the desert, and it was called manna coming straight from heaven.

Again you will read in the 10th chapter of Acts, 2nd and 7th verses, how the angel appeared to Corneillus and bade him send for Peter to preach the gospel to him and baptize him. Again, Acts 12:7-11. Peter is in prison and an angel of God came down, the prison doors swung ajar and Peter was led out by the hand of the angel, and immediately he struck out for the prayer meeting that was being held at St. Mary's house behind the temple. Now, I want to show you the weakness of humanity, and the patience of divinity. Peter had been arrested and thrown into prison, and the saints with sobbing voices and trembling lips pleaded: "Oh, God, send deliverance to Peter." God answered their prayer so quick that when the answer came they did not believe it. Peter knocked at the door, and when they asked who is there, they heard Peter's voice, and they went back and told the other folks, who would not believe it, and Peter had a very hard time to get in. How many of us have prayed and prayers have been answered and in a little while we begin to doubt. That is human weakness and it calls for pity. Paul gives an account of a shipwreck, Acts 27 and 23: And amid the wild tempestuous waves, Paul stood quiet and undisturbed, and when he told them that not a soul would be lost, we learn that he received the information from the hand of an angel who stood by.

Our Belief Different.

Now let me say here that in this subject as upon many other, we stand separate and distinct from the great majority of what might be called the religious world. They tell us there are no angels now. Many of you will remember when I had my discussion in Cedar Valley, the Baptist clergyman there, when I told him the story about the angel appearing to a certain individual, the parson almost fell and fainted, and he cries out there are no angels now, while I read in Matt 26:53, that Jesus said: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." There is said to be 6,000 in a legion—12 times 6 is 72; here is 72,000 angels alive and well at that time.

II. Kings, 6:17, says: "The mountains were full of them." Daniel 7:10, says: "Ten thousand times ten thousand." Hebrews 12:20, says there are a vast multitude of them. Revelations 5:7 would indicate that they were numbered by the millions, and as the Book of Revelations is the last one said to contain a word from God to the world, so the churches say, if when last heard from, heaven contained millions of angels, just see what prejudice will do. The brethren would sooner have you believe that an epidemic had struck heaven and that all the angels were dead than to admit of the bare possibility that one living angel appeared to Joseph Smith, who under God was the founder of this church, but upon this we take our stand.

Angels Appear to Our Founder.

Joseph Smith tells us when he was a child in his fourteenth year, being converted to the fact that he should serve God, and not knowing just what God would have him do, went to the rear of his father's farm under the whispering leaves in a clump of woods, and there he poured out his soul to God, and he declared to us that God spoke to him; that he saw Christ, and that he heard many wonderful things, and that from that time forward upon a number of occasions, angels have ministered to him. He declares that the angel that came to him gave him the instruc-

tion and the authority to preach the gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof, and we read in Revelations 14:6-7: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation and kindred and tongue and people. Saying with a loud voice: Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come, and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water.

In conclusion let me say that this indicates that the people were not worshipping the true God, as my sermon of last week showed, and they were called to worship the God who created heaven and earth, and it was shown clearly that this angel's visit would be God's demand in the harvest time before the end of the world. Our position is that under perfect administration this work was brought into existence by command of the Almighty, given through angels to Joseph Smith and others. I trust that this will not appear to you as a fable, but that you will know that the promises of God are yea and amen, and those promises are that if you obey the gospel as taught in the record you will become righteous in the sight of God and His angels will minister to you as in the past.

Walking With God

THE subject under consideration to-night is "Walking With God." I desire to read a few verses beginning with Genesis 5:18-24: "And Jared lived an hundred, sixty and two years, and he begat Enoch. And Jared lived after he begat Enoch eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters; and all the days of Jared were nine hundred and sixty and two years; and he died; and Enoch lived sixty and five years and begat Methuselah; and Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuselah three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters; and all the days of Enoch were three hundred, sixty and five years; and Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." Hebrews 11:5: "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found because God had translated him; for before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God." Again, the 14th verse of the epistle of Jude, reads as follows: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against them."

Valuable Record Lost.

This is every word, so far as I know, that is recorded in all the sacred scriptures concerning this great prophet and seer, Enoch, the seventh from Adam. You will recognize at once that if there was no more written concerning Enoch than we have in these few verses, in the 5th chapter of Genesis already read in your hearing, then Paul could not make the other statement that I have read to you, as found in the letter to the Hebrews, nor could Jude refer to the prophecy made by Enoch, because history does not hint at the facts stated either by Paul or Jude. Therefore, it is but fair to admit that the record concerning one of the most wonderful men that lived in the history of humanity has been lost. I remember reading a sermon preached by the great Talmage, wherein he said that the Bible was the word of God, that he believed it was inspired by the Almighty from the first letter of the first word of the first verse of the first chapter of the first book to the last letter of the last word of the last verse of the last chapter of the last book, and that between these two books, the book called Genesis and the book called Revelations, is written all that God has ever said to man, and that here was a perfect complete revelation of God to man, and that the voice of inspiration had ceased, and that God would never again reveal anything to man.

Don't Believe It.

Now, I scarcely believe a single word of all that. In the first place, there is an immense amount of reading in the Bible that God did not give at all. We have the word of man; we have the word of good men; we have the words of bad men; we have the words of devils and we have plain historical facts. I do not believe the statement that all scripture is given by inspiration of God. I believe the proper translation of that phrase is: All

scripture given by inspiration is profitable for reproof, for correction, that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished. I believe that most of the Bible was written by inspiration, but I do not believe that the Bible contains all that God has given to man. To me it is nothing short of an insult to Divinity to say that man has captured every word that fell from the lips of God and has it down in that volume. Why there are lots of women here to-night who have spoken more words in the last year than is contained in the Bible. And yet our Heavenly Father is bound by the lids of this book, and they tell us that he has not spoken for 1800 years and the last word He ever spoke was revealed to John, and that He will never speak again as long as grass grows and water flows. What do you pray for? There are thousands of people who pray and then fill their minds with trying to have a feeling that God in some way or other will answer them, and they go to guessing at what will be the answer; such as, I will open the Bible with my eyes shut and the words at such and such a page will be my answer. I remember one time I heard a great deal about answers to prayers. It was about 35 or 36 years ago. Now, I thought I would try that way of getting an answer to my prayer, and I shut my eyes and opened the Bible, and what do you think I read? "And Simon's wife's mother lay sick with a fever." Mark 1:30. What did I care if Peter's mother-in-law died of a fever; that had absolutely nothing to do with the prayer I had offered?

Ye Shall Receive.

Now, there is an immense amount of superstition, and it has taken the place of trust in God, faith to believe that God is an ever-present revelator to men, and it is a folly to teach, preach or believe that the voice of inspiration is forever hushed, and that God will not speak to men again. The revelations from one end of the Bible to the other are freighted with the promise "ask and ye shall receive; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you;" and to one is given the gift to speak in tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues, to another prophecy, and the whole record is bubbling over with the invulnerable promise of God that if man will obey His commandments and lead a Christian life, he will be born into a new life and God will answer his prayers and speak to him as he spoke through Moses and the prophets and as he spoke through the apostles and saints of the New Testament times. This idea that God will not now answer your prayers is a fallacy.

One man accuses me in The World this week of hitting orthodoxy. Every now and again I take a crack at churchianity, because the majority of churchianity are in direct opposition to this book. I am here to stand by what God has said, and when he is in opposition to what man has said, no matter whether the utterance of man be sanctified by the great titles of doctors of divinity, of bishops, and fathers in God and all that, whenever man contradicts God, whenever man differs with Jesus Christ, I will everlastingly say let God be true, though every man be made a liar. It is well enough to slur and slander and resort to downright falsehood, and put it in the paper as against me. It is the work of a dishonorable man. There is no man who can point to an utterance that I made against Christianity. Put your best ordained minister in this town upon any platform, and all I ask is fair play and half the time. Do not slander me behind my back. If I have misrepresented any doctrine of any church, I am here to answer for it. I am not asking for pity, I am asking for fair play. It is true that I have quoted from the prayer books, disciplines, sermons and confessions of faith of the various churches. If what I have read to you is false, abandon it. Come with me in the agreement that it is wrong. Do not blame me for exposing it, but on the other hand, if I

have misrepresented it, this church will fling its doors ajar for any ordained minister in this town to come right here and expose me. I guarantee he will be well treated and all I ask is half the time. That is my answer to the batch of slanders that has been printed against me this week.

Been Talking For Seven Years.

So you see I am not dead yet. I have been making these statements for seven long year in the largest halls you have in Canada, and not up to this minute has a single ordained minister attempted to reply to me. If I am a wolf in sheep's clothing, then it is high time the shepherds were taking care of their flocks. Now, it is a fact that I differ from every church in the Dominion, either Protestant or Catholic. I do not say that there are no good people among the churches. I am glad to admit that I believe the majority of men, both in and out of the churches are striving to do good, and that many self-sacrificing, God-fearing people are worshipping Him to the best light they have in every church I know anything about, and that God is blessing them, and I would not pluck a flower that blooms in the garden of their faith, but I have striven earnestly, and as kindly as I knew how, to pull up the weeds of tradition, priestcraft and superstitions, so that the flowers of truth may grow and bring forth fruit to the glory of God. In doing this I am walking in the footsteps of the Master, who declared: "Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Matt. 15:13. And if I will walk with God, I must denounce everything that is ungodly, whether I find it in the pulpit or the pew; whether I find it in the church or the world, and that is the mission of the servant of God, and as another child of God once said: "If I yet pleased man I would not be the servant of Christ." I do not expect that the gospel I preach will meet with popular favor. Did Christ or His apostles meet with popular favor? No; and we must remember "the disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant is not above the Lord." Matt. 10:24. I do not expect that the hypocrites hiding in the church will endorse my exposition of the false doctrines of the churches. They do not endorse Christ along that line. I need not hope that they will endorse me. But which of them can bring to my door the guilt of having misrepresented a single denomination. If I walk with God, I must denounce evil; I must expose hypocrisy.

Must Teach Truth.

I must teach the people the truth. I must antagonize that which is diametrically opposed to God's word. To my mind that is walking with God. Now, Enoch is said to have walked with God, yet we have but half a dozen verses in all the record about him. Those of you who have read the translation of the Bible by Joseph Smith, as he was able to perform the task by inspiration, will remember over 125 verses concerning the work and prophecy of Enoch is recorded in the Book of Genesis in the inspired translation, but it is not in the King James' translation at all. You only have a hint with regard to the work of this great man in the King James' translation. In the inspired translation you have a splendid history of his work and labors. The world has been prone to believe that there was only a few people living in the time of Enoch, but you must remember that men lived then six, seven, eight and nine hundred years, and their posterity were very numerous, and thousands and hundreds of thousands of people inhabited the earth according to the historians of today in the days of Enoch. Enoch walked with God.

Let us examine that thought a moment. Suppose that I am going in one direction and you are going in another direction. To walk with me, you must turn around and go in the direction that I am going in. Then

you are walking with me, but if I turn around and go with you then I am walking with you, and to walk with God means to go with Him wherever He bids you go; to believe in Him; to think as He thought, or as the New Testament has it, having the mind in you that was in Christ, not earthly things but heavenly things; to have your heart set to do the things of God; to render implicit obedience to the commandments of God; that is walking with God. It is the abandonment of selfishness, and the exhibition of obedience that entitles us to the claim that we are walking with God. But if I believe what I like and do as I please and go any old way that somebody wants me to go, I may be walking with a number of different persons, but not walking with God. To walk with God is to obey Him, to believe in Him, to comply with every request He makes; that is walking with God. To have perfect faith and confidence in God is to walk with Him. Faith is believing and acting like it. Enoch was a man of decision. The world with all its frivolities, with all its allurements, with all its sins, was spread out before him and he had to pass judgment and reach a decision of whatever God commanded him to do that would he do. He held nothing back. There was no reservation. It was a perfect obedience to a perfect law that emanated from the perfect God: that was walking with God. The man that formulates a creed that is in opposition to the will of God, the man that subscribes to a discipline that is diametrically opposed to the word of God, may be walking with a great crowd, with a popular throng, with an immense gathering, but he is not walking with God. The man that is rendering obedience to the commandments of heaven, he only is walking with God; and in this sense Enoch and his people, according to the revelations that we have concerning him, had perfect faith in God. They rendered perfect obedience to the mandates of heaven. They were absolutely unselfish. There was no poor among them. They loved fervently and with a pure heart. They were brothers and sisters in the highest sense. Every man loved his neighbor; there was perfect peace; absolute confidence, true manhood, and so we read that in this condition they pleased God to such an extent that they were translated and taken to dwell in the happy abode where just men are in perpetual bliss.

Did Not Die.

The brief statement of the record shows that Enoch did not die. He was translated, thus showing he was a wonderful exhibition of the great doctrine of the literal body in the beyond. Enoch, without tasting death was brought to the condition that we shall arrive at, after the first resurrection has done its work with us. Enoch is not the only man that walked with God. The revelations tell us that his people walked with God. They were with him not only in their church work, but they were with him in their business. They treated their fellows with equity and justice, and, oh, if we could walk with God in our business relations to-day, there would be no millionaires on the one side and poverty-stricken victims of oppression on the other side. There would be equity. The pure in heart would be with us. If we would do business in God's way, every man would receive justice, and there would be no poor amongst us. Selfishness reduces some to abject poverty and raises others to multi-millionaires, who do not walk with God. We forget God in our business. Very often we hear the statement made, "oh, well, business is business. You do not want to mix your business with religion. Religion is one thing and business is another. Yes, but a man should live so that he can take God into his business. He should take Him with him in politics, he should vote for the best interests of the people, for the bettering of conditions until man were lifted out of the grave conditions of poverty and strife that now darkens our very land.

They should be with God in their homes, or the home should be a sacred altar where the family meet with God, till every child is sanctified with the inspiring fires that flow from these frequent meetings with God. I do not wish to take up all the evening with Enoch.

What About Moses?

I want to say a few words regarding Moses. We have a long chapter, a more perfect revelation of Moses and his life work and his people in the Bible than we have of Enoch, though I would not say he was the greatest man. One was so far above the other that he was permitted to go and dwell with God without ever tasting death, while the other dies as a result of his disobedience. And while Moses was wonderful and grand and one of the greatest law givers and legislators, generals and preachers the world has ever heard of yet, he was infinitely far below Enoch of whom we know so little. We are told Moses was born at a time when the Egyptians came and decreed that the male child should be slain. The mother saw that her baby was pretty; all history shows Moses to be a very pretty baby. She hid him in a vessel made of bullrushes, and then stood afar off while Moses' little sister was quite near, and the king's daughter came down with her maids to bathe in the sacred waters of the Nile. Here she discovered Moses, and she saw him to be so beautiful that she decided to take him home. Now as soon as Moses' sister heard this, she ran up to the king's daughter and asked: "Shall I get a woman to nurse him?" and she got the mother of the babe and Moses was soon on the throbbing breast of his own mother. Oh, it is a wonderful story. He was educated in the halls of Egypt. He became one of their mighty generals. He wins battles that other generals were afraid to engage in, and by and by as a peace-maker, he intervenes between two men, and one of them gets a little offensive and he killed him. You remember the story: He escapes, and gets away down to Midian. There, after leaving the glitter and gold of the great and grand society, we see him alone watching sheep, when the bush is suddenly all aflame and a voice calling gives him the great mission to go and redeem Israel, who are slaves in Egyptian bondage. At first he made excuses, declaring he was a man of poor speech, and finally his brother was called to assist him, but he was the leader.

Miracles.

You will remember the wonderful miracles that were wrought by him. How the Egyptians were compelled to release a million people. Some writers declare that the Israelites numbered more than two millions when they left Egypt, 60,000 men were armed, to say nothing of the thousands who were unarmed. Old men, too old to be warriors, young men, too young to be warriors, besides the women and children. That great throng starts out from Egypt and goes on towards the promised land. You will remember the awful experience. The mountain on either side of them. The waters of the Red Sea in the front of them, and Pharaoh's army behind them. Oh, God's people have often been there, with mountains of difficulty on either side, and all the malice and hatred in the rear and seeing an impassible barrier in the front, but God came to the rescue of Moses and he bade him strike the waters with his rod, and immediately a passage was opened up for them, and they crossed dry shod. You will think perhaps that I am hitting some church when I say that there are some who claim they get the doctrine of sprinkling out of this, by saying that God sprinkled Moses and his people from a cloud in the sky. All I ask is a careful reading of this part and you will find that not a drop of water touched them. The record shows that God went before them by a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night; Ex. 14, 21; no water there. Where did they baptise? My reading

has taught me to believe, that when they saw the wonderful protection of God, their hearts were melted, their rebellion ceased, they loved God, and Moses preached to them the gospel. The Bible clearly tells us that Moses did preach the gospel. Heb. 4, 2, and Heb. 2, 26-28, I. Cor. 10, 1-4. History tells us of the place where they crossed the sea. It was ten miles wide, fourteen fathoms deep. Bible History, Bio., pp. 129. But the Bible shows that the waters were divided and that Israel passed over on dry land again. It says dry ground. Read Ex. 14:21-22; Ps. 66:6; Ps. 78:13; Isaiah 63:13, and in all the story not one word is said of them being sprinkled with water from a cloud. But it clearly shows that the Lord was in the cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. It is fair to say that after they reached the shore that they believed God. Ex. 14, 31, and it is said the Lord was their salvation, and to me it is plain that then and there they were baptized for the remission of their sins, and the Lord blessed them with His spirit.

I believe that the cloud stood above them. The Lord being in the cloud, while Moses and perhaps many other priests baptized them and upon their new birth of water and the spirit, they sang the new song referred to in the following chapter, and I think that was what Paul referred to in his letter on the subject. Surely this would be according to all the other parts of the Scripture, both Old and New Testament, and in preaching to them the gospel and baptizing them. Moses was walking with God in that he was complying with the conditions of the gospel law. But you will remember how they rebelled against him. Several times they went to stone him to death, and their rebellion was the result of great sorrow, at one time 14,000 of them went down to death in one minute. Over and over they rebelled against him. When there was nothing to eat God sent them quails; when they had no bread God sent them manna; when they had no water the rock was smitten, when immediately gushing streams of pure water flowed through the wilderness. Several writers are on record as having said that when they started from Succoth on their road to the promised land that they had just a few miles to go and they could have gone the distance in a few short days, but they travelled round and round, lost in the wilderness, for forty years. Dr. Talmage made this statement: "I am of the opinion that if the Israelites had traveled straight, they would have reached Canaan in eight days, though it took them forty years, but it was best they were lost in the wilderness, they were a nation of slaves and had they gone into Canaan thus undisciplined, the natives of Canaan would have made only one meal of them." "Talmage, Travels in the Orient," pp. 64.

Walked Not With God.

One writer says it was only 25 miles if they had gone in a certain direction. However, I would hardly agree with that writer. But it was a very short trip, and the reason it took them so long was because they were not walking with God. When we are walking with God we turn neither to the right nor to the left, finding the narrow path, though it leads to Gethsamane in sorrow and gloom; though it brings us up the thorny-clad path of Calvary; though it compels us to cry in Golgotha that is the way to be with God. We must reach Calvary, we must crucify the flesh, the pride and the selfishness thereof, being brought by baptism into Christ's death, we must die with him that we may rise again to live with him forever more, and the only way to live with him hereafter is to walk with him here. Poor Aaron, he walked with God, but sometimes he left the path, and as a result the displeasure of heaven fell upon him, and God said: Come up upon this mountain. I think I can see poor Aaron. He had been with the people forty years. He ascends the mountain, looks over the tented city with its millions that he had loved and blessed, taking off his priestly robes

they were put on his son and he laid down to die, just because he had forgot to keep the commandment to walk with God. Moses, heart-broken and sad, went on the journey, but alas! alas! he too lost the way, and for a time, however short, he did not walk with God, and as a result when the Lord had permitted him to reach Mount Nebo, he says, Moses you can climb upon this mountain high, look over Jordan, the Land of Canaan, but you can not go over. In a word, he had failed in all the march to walk with God. God's displeasure rested upon him and he went down to death. So my brothers and sisters the way of God is plain, narrow and strewn with thorns of sorrow and trial. Persecution attaches to it all along the line. To walk with God brings us to the tree of life in the midst of the Paradise of God. May we abandon every sense of selfishness, everything that is worldly in its character all that is wrong, throw off our creeds, our disciplines, our confessions of faith, and everything that is in opposition to God's way, receiving with meekness that which is able to make us wise unto salvation; thus walking with God we may finally dwell with him is my prayer.

God Sends Strong Delusion. Why?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the second chapter of the 2nd Thessalonians, 11th and 12th verses, where you will read these words: "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believeth not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

This is one of the most severe and emphatic texts of scripture within the sacred record, indicating with no uncertain sound that for some reason God is to send the people strong delusion that they should believe a lie and be damned. I hope that you will look at this and measure it by other scriptures that you may be fully equipped to answer the attack made upon the Almighty, because of this passage of scripture.

Many Reasons.

I have heard it presented in this way, that the Christian's God was worse than Satan himself, in that he would send the people strong delusion, resulting in their believing a lie, and then He was going to damn them for believing the thing He sent to them, and, of course, they make the argument that that would be eminently unjust. But if you will notice the text carefully, it says "and for this cause God shall send them strong delusion." What cause? That is the point upon which the matter hinges. There is some reason why God will send them strong delusion. Or, perhaps, we might say it in this way, that God will judiciously permit to come upon them strong delusion. Perhaps in the reading of the text and the context, this is the real sense of the statement, that God shall judiciously permit the people to become deluded, which will result in their condemnation for certain reasons which are assigned. We want to get at these reasons tonight if we can.

It is a fact that because of some conditions that will obtain, the people will be deluded to such an extent that they will believe that which is false, and because they have faith in that which is false, they will be damned, or to use a milder expression, which conveys the idea, they will be condemned by the Almighty. We read in the scriptures "I, God, am a jealous God." Ex. 20, 5. We sometimes think that for any being to be jealous they are in a condition that is to be condemned, but that does not always follow.

For instance, if a woman has given her undivided love to a man, if she has sacrificed the comforts of a loving father's home and all the pleasant associations of girlhood life, and gave to him her love, her time, her talent, and as has frequently been the case, she lays at the foot of that man's child's cradle her health, her beauty, and she then discovers that that man is under-valuing the priceless gift that she lavishly bestowed upon him. Has she not the right to be jealous? All right-minded men would say that this woman is being robbed of that which belongs to her by the law of God and the law of man.

God's People, Examples.

Now, sometimes God takes men and women as examples to draw illustrations as between God and the church. In fact, the church is called the bride. Now, when we stop to think as the scripture saith that in God we live and move and have our being, that we are the monuments of His

mercy, the creatures of His character, that we are momentarily being made the recipients of His potentiality, of His matchless love, of His wisdom and of His favor, that all we have physically, mentally, spiritually, morally, domestically, and in every other way, is the result of God's love and kindness.

This being true, has He not the right to expect of us our love, our faith, our confidence, and our trust. When we refuse to give evidence of that love, but on the other hand we give Him indubitable evidence that we do not believe Him, that we have refused to trust Him, that we have declined to follow Him, I ask you then, my dear brethren, has He not the right to be jealous; in that we have robbed Him of His just rights. I think you will answer in the affirmative. Let me follow that up a little further.

Suppose that you, as a father, had done everything within your power for your boy, and he refused to believe you. After you had warned him, entreated him, given him every evidence of your fidelity, of your love, he spurned you and took the council and the advice of those who are diametrically opposed to you, would you not be liable to say, "Well, he is making his own bed, he will have to lay on it. If he will dance, he must pay the fiddler. If he will not believe me, he must meet the consequences." Would that be right? You answer in the affirmative. Now, I believe that this is what God means here. It clearly says that they believe a lie, they receive not the love or the truth that they might be saved. That is to say, that all that God has done for the people in presenting them with the best thought of divinity, as couched in the divine plan, which we call the gospel, they set aside the truth, they abandon the doctrine, they despise the church organization, and refuse to receive the word of God, the will of God, the plan of God, but formulate unto themselves church organizations, man-made creeds and human systems that are diametrically opposed to His word, then is God not justified in judiciously permitting them to be deluded. I think so.

Christ Made a Plan.

I draw your attention to the first chapter of St. Paul's letter to the Church at Rome, and you will get a few ideas there that are well worth your consideration. 16th verse says, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. Here you will discover that God had inaugurated a divine plan which Paul calls the gospel of Jesus Christ, that by obedience to that divine system, we are to be saved.

But, suppose a man comes along and says, "Oh, well now brother, we do not need to obey that gospel just as Christ and the apostles taught it. Why, that system is passed away. This part is abrogated; this part is no longer needed, and we are now saved not by obedience to any gospel ordinances, but faith alone is a good and wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort. The moment any man believes that Jesus is the Christ, he is saved without obeying any part of the gospel, only believing."

On the one hand we are told that the gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation; that is to say, the gospel is the divine plan inaugurated by the Almighty by which He will bring about the salvation of those who obey it. And we are told that all that is done away with now. In this same chapter, in consequence of their refusing to obey it, we are told "Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts." Again he says, "who changed the truth of God into a lie." They were going to change this truth of God; they were going to change this fine plan, they were going to hew out cisterns that would not hold water; going to have a way of their own, and in doing that God gave

them up to their own delusions. This is clearly taught throughout this chapter.

In the very next chapter the same thought is suggested as to the gospel being the plan by which we are to be saved, so we read in the second chapter of Romans, 16th verse: "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." They are not going to be saved because of some peculiar faith that they have embodied, but we are going to be judged according to the gospel. It does not say that Jesus is going to save anybody who refuse to submit to the divine plan, but He says upon this question: "In vain do you worship Me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, and by the tradition of your elders, you have made the commandments of God of none effect." Mark, 7,7-13. But we will touch on that point later on. The thought suggested here is that the gospel is the divine plan by which man is to be saved, and by that gospel we are to be judged.

The Gospel First.

Now, if God inaugurated this system called the gospel, and I am going to be judged by that which He devised, will I not be found guilty if I put the creeds of men before the old-fashioned unchangeable gospel of Jesus Christ. The very moment I do that I insult God; I reject Christ and down through the avenues of all the ages from the time Christ spake in Jerusalem to this very moment will come the cry: "Why do you call Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" Luke 6, 46: "Yet we have been changing this idea of doing things, and so we are told there is nothing to be done."

From the pulpit and the hymn book comes the perverted gospel, perhaps voiced in these words:

"Nothing either great or small, nothing, sinner, no,
 Jesus died and paid it all, long, long ago,
 Weary, working, burdened one, wherefore toil you so?
 Cease your doing, all was done long, long ago,
 Till to Jesus' works you cling by a simple faith,
 'Doing' is a deadly thing—doing ends in death."

And yet, measuring these hymns and this doctrine of justification by faith only, by the Bible, by the gospel of Jesus Christ, by which we are to be judged in eternity, as Paul tells us in this chapter, what do we find? Listen: "Why do you call me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" Does that indicate that doing is a deadly thing, that doing ends in death? Again: "Whoso looketh unto the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed," James 1:25. Again: "If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments."

The antithesis to that is, if you do not keep the commandments, voiced in the gospel of Jesus Christ, you will not enter into life. And yet, when we present the doctrine of Jesus Christ to-day, and the commandments and ordinances that go to make up this divine plan called the gospel, we are told we do not want any doctrine; we are not saved by doctrine.

Listen: "Whosoever abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed, for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds." This is the statement of John the Apostle. 2 John 9-11. What will you do

with General Booth's statement made to me in London. "We do not want any doctrine, we are saved by the Blood."

Baptism Necessary.

Do not forget, my friends, that the blood of Jesus Christ reaches only those who are indoctrinated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. We must be baptised into Christ, having put on Christ through the obedience to the doctrine of Christ in order that the blood of Christ reach us, for the blood of Christ does not flow outside of His body, which is the Church. If you are going to get the benefits of the blood of Jesus Christ, it will be because you were brought into the body of Jesus Christ. Your blood does not flow outside of your own body; neither does the blood of Christ flow outside of His body, so that this idea that you can spurn the ordinances of the gospel and set aside the doctrines of Christ and just be saved by believing that Jesus is the Christ without obeying the gospel, is a fallacy, it is a snare, and when we take the word of man and put it in opposition to the Word of God, we insult God, and He allows us to rest under the delusion. He permits us to believe the lie because we have rejected the truth, and consequently when we are to be judged by the gospel, we will stand condemned.

Our Belief.

We, as Latter Day Saints, believe that God inaugurated a system called the gospel, under which He designed to save all that would obey it, and that gospel was a perfect law not subject to any amendment, nor any alteration. You could not add anything to it, nor could you take anything from it. It was the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God, producing the perfect result, a perfect salvation, and in this gospel economy, we find the doctrine of baptism in water for the remission of sins.

We read the record, "Repent and be baptised every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts, 2, 38. Remember that is not the word of man. I want to give you a little history on that. Christ bade the disciples tarry in Jerusalem until you be endowed with power from on high. When the Holy Ghost is come He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you. The history shows they tarried there, they were in an upper room. God heard the prayer of His Son and fulfilled the promise in that the Holy Ghost fell upon the disciples and they spake in sixteen different languages. The people came running together, hearing the wonderful works of God in their own tongue and they cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" If Torry and Alexander had been there, or some of our other great divines, they would likely have replied, "Doing is a deadly thing; doing ends in death. You have not got to do anything, only believe." But there were no man-made preachers present, they were apostles directly inspired, and they answered the question in the promise Christ made them, "The Holy Ghost will bring to your remembrance what I have said unto you."

Now, what was brought to their remembrance in answer to that most momentous question that ever was propounded by human hearts? Listen "Repent and be baptized, everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Acts, 2, 38. That's the word of God. When the Latter Day Saints stand for that, the whining, sniffing, man-made parson rises to say "you have got water on the brain my dear brother; you can be saved without a drop of water; we do not believe that water baptism is essential to salvation; we reject the idea that baptism is for the remission of sins." That is what Jesus himself said they would do. By tradition of the elders you make the commandments of God of non-effect, and then we say well what are you going to do with this baptism?

God's Word Everlasting.

Paul asked the question what shall I do, and he was told go into Damascus and it shall be told there what thou must do; not what you can do if you feel like it; but what you must do. What was he told to do? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. Oh, well, now, said one, I think you put too much stress on what Christ died to establish. Have ye forgotten men and brethren that the record says the grass will wither, the flower thereof will fade away, but the word of the Lord endureth forever, and this is the word by which the gospel is preached unto you. Am I putting too much stress when I plead for a return to the sunny way marked out by the light of life Himself? If I am to be judged by that gospel plan, what excuse can I offer in that day of judgment if I reject the commandment of God to give place to the tradition of men.

An Illustration.

I remember sometime ago in the State of Missouri I was preaching along this line and a lady approached me and she said: Brother Evans, I listened very attentively to you last night. You quoted the words of Jesus Christ, except a man is born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. I always believed that, but a moment later you quoted Him as having said: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3-5. Do you think that is true, now, Brother Evans, and I replied: Sister mine, how long must the truth live before it is old enough to become a lie. Such a question, do you think that is true now? Why if it was true when Jesus said it, it is true now. It always will be true. Well, she says that's so strange; why, our minister never teaches baptism as being essential. No, I replied, that's the trouble. They say that I am not orthodox because I believe that Jesus spake the truth and that the truth lives and abides forever as the sanctifying power of the Almighty.

I went right on and I taught her the Bible doctrine of water baptism until she was thoroughly convinced and admitted it, and I said: Well, then, when will you be baptised. Oh, Brother Evans, she said, the whole town would howl if I was immersed at a Latter Day Saint Church. Well, I said, you can have your choice, but so far as I am concerned I would sooner the whole town would howl now than that I would howl in eternity. Well, she says, you go after it in a rather matter of fact way, but she says I will tell you what I will do. I will ask the Rev. Doctor so and so, who is our pastor and one of the most beautiful of men. Well, I said good-bye. You will not talk with me again on this subject. Why not, she said? I made answer because you do not believe Jesus Christ unless you can get the pastor to back Him up.

It is just like a man advertising money for loan. You can borrow thousands and some poor starving wretch rushes up to the loan office, and seeing the gold lettering on the door thinks that this man must surely be kind and good, and he says, are you the man who loans money? How much do you want he hears in reply: Oh, my wife and child are starving for bread and freezing in the pitiless storm, please loan me a dollar to buy food and firewood. Why, the loan agent says, you may have a thousand if you want it. Well the poor man thinks he has met an angel in disguise, but how suddenly his mind is changed, when the question is put to him, what security have you got? Security! Oh we do not loan money here unless there is good security, a responsible man to back your note, or a little real estate on first mortgage, and the man's heart is broken. He goes out in the bitter blasting storm. He has nobody to back his note, and the loan agent will not trust him.

That's how this woman held Jesus Christ. She believed Him all right providing the parson stood up for Him, but when the parson contradicts Jesus Christ, then Christ is a back number. If you do not believe this, try it next week, and come next Sunday and tell us how you have succeeded. But back to our first story. The lady went to the minister and presented to him the convincing, indisputable scriptural quotations which I had taken from the Bible in support of water baptism, and the minister said, Oh, sister, you have evidently been down listening to that Evans. Now you take my advice and keep away from him. He is a bold, bad man. What made me bad? Just because I believed that Jesus told the truth and that His words live and abide forever. But when she got to the parson and presented this scripture, he just pushed it aside and said: "Now, sister, thousands have gone to heaven who have never been baptized. Get behind the blood, dear sister. Keep close to the Cross, my sister. Never mind about doctrine, we are not saved by doctrine." And so she came back to us a couple of nights afterwards, and finally she said: "Brother Evans, we will not talk about it. My minister gives me to understand that there is absolutely nothing in baptism; we are saved just simply by believing." You see, she would be willing to believe Christ just as He is reported in the Bible, but she could not get the parson to take Christ's note, and therefore she would not trust Him. I ask, is that not an insult to Divinity? Is there any wonder that the Lord says: "For this cause shall God send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believeth not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Tradition of Men Misleading.

I want to try if I can by these remarks to-night to bring home to you this great truth, that no man has a right to say that a single ordinance of the gospel has been abrogated, that no man has the right to say that God has set aside a single item in the doctrine of Jesus Christ that should not be obeyed. Paul's statement still lives as he read it to Timothy: "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them, for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." I. Tim., 4, 16. So when General Booth said we do not want any doctrine, he did not want any God. He did not want any Christ, for whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine hath neither the Father nor the Son. Now, you may say Brother Evans, that is too strong. Gentle hearers, I cannot emphasize this too much.

I am here to stand up for this thought that the traditions of men have led the people away from the commandments of God; that the creeds have made the people go away from the doctrine of Christ, and that churchianity, as has been said before, is against Christianity. Now, I would like to agree with everybody and I know just how that glorious condition can be brought about. That is by everybody making up their minds to trade off the creed for the New Testament; do away with the traditions of men, and accept the doctrine of Jesus Christ; be willing to render a perfect obedience to the perfect law that emanated from the perfect God which will produce the perfect result, salvation; but when we reject the plain ordinance of heaven, spurning the voice of the Lord, rejecting Jesus Christ as our Saviour, and refuse to believe Him, then for this cause God judiciously permits us to be deluded and unto that delusion we will believe a lie and in the judgment day when tried by the gospel, we will stand condemned.

Why I Am A Latter Day Saint

I AM sure I can count myself happy notwithstanding the very many special meetings that are being held in the city to-night, that I gaze with unspeakable delight upon an audience that is occupying every seat of the main floor and gallery of this great assembly hall. I feel that this is a strong testimony, after my services of seven winters in the Toronto Opera House, that in the beginning of the eighth winter I see the place packed to the doors, and I would like to notify the ushers, that they must not permit people to stand in the aisles.

Bible Evidence.

I am here to-night to answer a very important question, as I take it. Why I am a Latter Day Saint? As it is customary to take a text I present to you one found in the third chapter 1st Peter and 15th verse: "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." About thirty-seven years ago, when but a boy, I heard this gospel under very peculiar circumstances, and I have been following it up, reading, studying and thinking about it ever since. On Nov. 5th, 1876, I was baptized into Christ, and from that time I have been diligently searching, reading, praying, listening and thinking. I cannot say with the great Lyman Abbott, D.D., when asked "Why I am a Congregationalist," he made answer saying, "Probably chiefly for the same reason that I am an American. I was born and bred so. We adjust ourselves to our environments. If we live in the Arctic regions we eat blubber, if we live in the tropics we eat bread fruits, so we fit ourselves to the religious climate to which we are accustomed."

Many other clergymen of other religious denominations have given about the same reason as Dr. Abbott. They were born Roman Catholics; they were born Protestants, Unitarians, Baptists, and all that. They went with the crowd that they found themselves in. It seems to me anybody can go down stream without much of an effort. When Abraham made a start in the religious life, he gave a splendid exemplification of his manhood, and his unreserved love for God and the truth, by leaving home and country by direct command of God.

Jesus Denounced Them.

Moses had to leave the home in which he had been educated by the greatest teachers of Egypt and strike out with nearly two millions of slaves in a barren wilderness, receiving the commandments of God direct from Heaven. Jesus Christ had to leave the popular throng, the great temples of worship, and come right out squarely and emphatically declared against the religion of the times, and while He was filled with faith and love, tenderness and gentleness was the element in which He lived, and yet His love for God and for the truth inspired Him to make the most fierce denunciation of the ministers of the different churches that surrounded Him from the highest priest to the lowest parson in the country, declaring: "Ye hypocrites, ye generation of vipers, how can you escape the damnation of hell."

He rebuked them for their hypocrisy, denounced them because they

turned aside from the commandments of God and complied with the tradition of their ministers. Paul did not follow his immediate predecessors. Though a Pharisee after the strictest manner, he turned against the church and stood alone to be mobbed and beaten, declaring after the manner which they (the churches around them), called heresy, he worshiped according to the perfect law that God had given. And so we find it was true, as we come further down the stream. Luther, Calvin, Knox, Ridley, Wesley, Roger, Williams, John Smith, and many of the great noted men had to leave the religion of their fathers, denouncing it as wrong, and stand up for the truth as they saw it.

There are many to-day who make the argument, we have enough churches in Toronto, why listen to this Latter Day Saint? Why don't you abide in the pew where your mother worshipped, where your grandfather died; that is mere sentiment, neither sensible nor honest. Apply that argument to Abraham, to Moses, to Christ, to Paul, to Luther, to Calvin, to Knox, to Wesley, and where would you be? Your own church flings the lie back upon you and shows that that advice is narrow, contemptible and mean. That's the argument that has been made for hundreds of years, the church that was good enough for my father is good enough for me. Why, if there was anything in that, down goes Protestantism, and every other ism in Protestantism. Suppose we applied that idea to anything else outside of religion, you would then see how silly it was: "The religion of my father is good enough for me."

Religion of Fathers Not Good Enough.

Why don't you apply that on something else? For instance, the illumination of this house. Suppose we apply it on that, say oh, well, our fathers had a pine knot and it furnished all the light they wanted. By and by they had a tallow dip that made a good illumination, and after a while the candle was invented. Later on we got coal oil, then gas, and still further on, and we have electric light. Suppose now I was to make an argument against the electric light people of Toronto, and say keep off my premises, what was good enough for my grandfather was good enough for me. Do you see the point now? Try it on anything else you please; you would have no railroads, no steamboats, no automobiles, no bicycles. Why, you would not even have a buggy to ride in, so that this thought that we must stultify investigation and stand by something that our fathers stood by is not in accord with good judgment and the spirit of development.

I am sometimes accused of being old-fashioned, because I am willing to run back on religion to a certain date. I think it would do us all good if we would read the Bible and agree upon it. My position is as a Latter Day Saint that Jesus Christ, the son of God, was selected by His Father to be a witness, a leader and the commander. You will read this in Isaiah 55, and 4, and I am here to-night to say, as I have been for 30 odd years, that I accept Him as the witness when He testifies on this question of religion. I follow Him as the leader to this question of religion. I obey Him implicitly as commander in this question of religion, and so when He stated, Matt. 16, 18: "I will build my church." I accept the church as established by Him to be absolutely correct in organization, doctrine, principle and promise.

Churches Cannot Interfere.

I take the position that no pope, cardinal, archbishop, synod, conference, or any other gathering of men, or any individual among men, has any right to change one ordinance, obliterate one doctrine or abrogate one sacrament that he inaugurated in the divine system called the everlasting gospel. I believe that if we accept Him as the leader, as the commander,

and as God's special witness that when any man or church arises to deviate from the doctrine or church organization or ordinance established by Jesus Christ that that individual, that church, that congregation, that conference, that synod, that council, is in error.

I may just hurriedly state to-night that as a Latter Day Saint, without reservation or equivocation, I accept the church doctrinally, and as He organized it and the principle of His church, and I unreservedly utter my denunciation and condemnation upon every church that is in conflict with the one organized by Christ. I have long since settled this thought in my mind, that if Christ made a mistake, then He was a false witness and you need not follow Him, and when that is proven down goes Christianity so far as I am concerned. My only hope is in the Father and that Jesus Christ is the son of God, that He is a witness true, His leadership is true, and His commandments essential to salvation. And hence as a Latter Day Saint, I have stood for what He taught and opposed every church under heaven, either Catholic or Protestant, just to the extent that they have deviated from that church, organization, doctrines, ordinance, or sacrament. I have always said, let God be true, though every man be made a liar. Now because I have taken that position, there has been a good many hard things said about me, but I have been made to know that the servant is not above his master, and if they call the Master of the house Beelzebub, what can the servant of the household expect from the same quarter.

Churchianity has always been against Christianity. That is a big statement and all I ask is that you examine the evidence that I have been presenting to you week after week for many years quoting from the church disciplines, prayer books, and confessions of faith of the different churches in the world. I cannot agree with them, for they do not agree among themselves. This is eminently true, and you cannot expend one cent to purchase a Toronto paper, but what you will get the evidence of that right along, all the time.

Apostacy of Christ's Church.

Now my next point is that that church established by Jesus Christ, according to the prophecies, went in to apostacy, and the time came when ordinances were changed, the doctrines were abrogated, organization was altered, and so in the place of having Bible organization as referred to in the New Testament. (See Luke 6:13. Acts 13:1. Heb. 5:1-2. Tim. 4:5. Luke 10:1-17. Titus. 1:5-1. Tim. 3:1. Rev. 5:10. Eph. 4:11-1. Tim. 3:8. 1 Cor. 12) which clearly points out that the executive departments of the church were apostles, prophets, bishops, teachers, priests, deacons, elders, that we have now a human institution and in place of having a prophet divinely commissioned we elect a Pope.

The Election of a Pope.

We are told by history that the manner of electing the Pope is when a Pope dies all the cardinals that can conveniently do so rush to Rome. They go into their little cells all alone, their food is handed in to them, and they remain there until the time comes for voting. Each cardinal writes a name, and if there is a two-thirds vote for one person, he is elected. If not, they have to go back, again, again, again and again, showing that it is a human institution, a human election, and a human position, for nowhere in the Bible does it say that God set a Pope in the church. No where does He say that the prophet shall be taken out and that the human election of a Pope shall be established. Some of those elections have been severely censured, and even the election of the last Pope was a go between to save a fight between two others who were notably superior men and neither one would give in, so a go-between was selected. God was not in

it. Now that is pretty hard on Catholicism. Protestantism is just as bad.

All I have to ask you to do is to look back a few short months ago to the election of a Protestant bishop in this city, and if the proceedings of those meetings have been properly reported by the public press then God was not in it, and it was absolutely disgraceful the conduct and speeches during that time. The ward heelers for aldermen never fussed more than the fusses in Toronto as to who would be bishop. Now I am saying this, knowing it is going into the press, and I am prepared to answer what I am saying, asking no pity at the hands of those who are specially referred to.

How different these things are compared to God's method as we read it in the Bible. When the ministers to represent God in the true church were to be selected even Jesus Christ Himself spent the whole night in prayer upon the mountain top before He made the selection of the apostles.

God Calls His Ministers.

Again the record is teeming with the facts as declared so distinctly in the 5th chapter of Hebrews, speaking of the priesthood: "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron." God is pushed out of it, and the man who has the biggest pull and gets the most votes is elected now, so that it is a human institution.

Now following the human priesthood of course comes the human church, and so we have the church drifting further away as I have pointed out in many of my sermons.

And let me say logically to-night that I would be forced to accept many views of Catholicism discarded now by all Protestant churches rather than to accept many of the claims of the Protestant church as correct. There are a great many points in Catholicism that are both spiritually good and logical, that puts the conglomerated mass of confusion called Protestantism so far in the shade that it is a wonder King Billy ever reached the other shores of the Boyne.

Catholics Forbidden to Read Bible.

They tell me the Catholic church burned the Bible, they did not want anybody to read the Bible. Now there is a statement that is very frequently made that "we must give the devil his due." While it is a fact that the Catholic church for hundreds of years denied the common people the Bible. That's true.

I admit that, and lest it may be denied, I am going to crave your indulgence while I read a proof. "No Bible shall be held or read, except by priests. No Bible shall be sold without a license, except upon the pain and penalties of that mortal sin that is neither to be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come." Council of Trent. "Moreover we confirm and renew the decrees cited above, delivered in former times by apostolic authority, against the publication, distribution, reading and possession of the books of the Holy Scriptures, translated into the vulgar tongue." Pope Gregory XVI. Pope Pius IX. said: "We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device (Bible society) by which the very foundations of religion are undermined. We have deliberated upon the means proper to adopt by our Pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence as far as possible. This defilement of the faith, so imminently dangerous to souls." Romanism and the Republic, p. 106. "There is no remedy for the evil (reading the Bible) but to put the heretics to death." Belarmine.

That our Catholic friends do not wish the Protestant Bible to be read is true. I do not think they can deny that. I will read you just one statement on this line: "You must not read Protestant bibles, for they are adulterated and falsified. They have been changed into a hundred dif-

ferent forms, and the revised edition is nothing but an outrage on Christianity and a book of lies. The Protestant bible is the word of man. In it you will find distruction, and I am sorry to say that there are Catholics who have had the weakness to believe that Protestant bibles are true. Protestants are very sociable and polite with their bibles. They send their agents through the country, such as colporteurs and point-aux-trembles-theologians, renegades and apostates, with tracts and bibles, and now I repeat again, and it must be understood that the church forbids you to read those bibles. If you have any of them in your houses, burn them, and if you do not want to burn them, bring them to me and I will burn them." Montreal Daily Witness, 65th annual meeting of the Montreal Bible Society, report on the Rev. Father Giband's sermon.

Henry VIII. Burns Bible.

I could furnish you many such statements, but is our Catholic friend any worse against the Protestant bible, than some of our Protestant people have been against both Catholic and some translations of the Protestant bible. Oh, no, my dear friends, there is as much said against the Catholic faith by our Protestants as there has been said by the Catholics against the Protestants, and it is not fair to put it all on the one side. Let me read you concerning King Henry VIII., and some acts passed by his parliament on the Bible. "In 1543 the contest as to reading the Scriptures was again renewed. None were to read the Bible aloud, without license. The King or ordinary noblemen and gentlemen might cause the Bible to be read to their families, servants and householders might read it to themselves privately, but all women (except the families of the nobility and gentry), and all artificers, laborers, or servants, with all persons of the lower classes were strictly forbidden or prohibited from perusing the word of God," Act of English Parliament.

We learn from such historians as Collier and Fuller and others, that long before printing was invented, the Bible was written by hand, and bound with gold and silver, and many diamonds and other costly stones adorned the covers, and that during the reformation anything that had the semblance of the Roman Catholic Church upon it was destroyed. Whole libraries were burnt, and costly Bibles were striped of their gold, silver and precious stones and burnt.

Tyndale translated the Bible, Miles Coverdale did the same, and it is admitted that Catholics burned a great many of these Bibles, but they weren't the only ones, who were guilty of burning even these Protestant bibles. Speaking of the act of parliament just referred to, Rev. Graham, in his book called "Where We Got the Bible," says: "The very year before he (Henry VIII.), went to his account (1546), he commanded all copies of the Bible, translated by either Tyndale or Miles Coverdale to be delivered up and burned." (P. 141.) That was one of the last acts of that old rascal's life, after having several wives, killing one to-night and marrying the other to-morrow.

Luther, of blessed memory, accomplished much that was good, yet he was vindictive, he was spiteful, and the works that he did not like, he burned them. John Calvin, the father of Presbyterianism, the books he did not like, he burned them, and he went a little further, he burned the men that wrote them, too, and so the Protestants may tell the truth when they say that Catholics have killed over fifty millions of Protestants.

Must Tell Truth.

But that is not all the truth. You know it is one thing to tell the truth, and quite another to tell all the truth. When you go up before Colonel Denison you do not take an oath to tell the truth, but you take an oath

to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help me God. Very frequently that is not carried into effect. They tell a part of the truth and hide the other part, and that is very unfair, so while we have Catholicism fighting with Protestantism, Protestant books denouncing Catholic books, Protestants murdering Catholics and vice-versa, so long will the Catholic Church and her children, the Protestant Churches, be in a big muss, and, therefore, the teaching and practice of both the Catholic and the Protestant Church has been a withering, blighting, curse to hundreds of thousands, and destroyed faith in thousands of others, and that is the reason why I am in the stand with Christ and not with the man-made creeds. Let me say in honor to them that there is much in the Roman Catholic Church that I love because it is true and it is right.

On the other hand there is much that is denounced by Protestantism, in Roman Catholicism, that I believe with all my soul. Then there is much, in, shall I say every Protestant Church, that I admire, the zeal, the sacrifice, the loving service, the grand work accomplished by both sides charm and thrills my soul with thankfulness to God, and to-night I would not wither a single flower of truth that blooms in the garden of either the Catholic or Protestant Church, but with Jesus I stand, saying "every plant that my Heavenly Father hath not planted must be rooted up," and I am after the weeds occasionally that seem to choke the good plants.

Some people think that I denounce everything only that which is Latter Day Saintism. Now you have some of the reasons why I am not a Roman Catholic and why I do not agree with what is generally called Protestantism. Some people think that I am a great objector because I protest against many things that the Protestants do not protest against in Catholicism.

Original Sin Unscriptural.

For instance, I protest against the doctrine of infant baptism, that stains every soul that is born in this world, and that they are damned in the next forever unless they are baptized before they die. Now that doctrine found its origin in the doctrine of "Birthsin." I denounce it because it is unscriptural. A number of Protestant churches do not protest against it because they brought the article with them when they left Roman Catholicism. There are a host of things that I protest against that I found both in Catholicism and Protestantism, but I stand for this position: Christ and the apostles fortold that the church would go into apostacy, that she would teach for doctrine the commandments of men and would depart from the faith and introduce much that would lead the people astray, and as we read the history how the very Bible has been changed, altered and burnt, and the truth frequently misrepresented, we see the prophecies fulfilled. Looking back through the dark history of the last seventeen hundred years we see the prophecies of the Bible fulfilled in that the Church of Christ went into apostacy.

The Protestant Church is the strongest evidence relative to the apostacy of that church that I would care to present, but notwithstanding that church went down into the maelstrom of apostacy while the New Testament, and the Old Testament for that matter, fortells with no uncertainty that in the latter days, in the hour of God's judgment, just before the harvest time, God would speak again that He would raise up a prophet, that He would call twelve apostles, that all ministers would be called of God, that the ministers in general would be called by revelation, and that the church would be organized just as it was in the former days. I am a Latter Day Saint because I believe that. Because I believe that we are living in the latter days. Let me say that it is unnecessary for me to give

any of my time to this part of the subject to-night, because all the churches, both Roman Catholic and Protestant agree with me on this plan, but said one: What right have you to call yourself a saint; why, gentlemen, that is the name that God gave His people.

He did not call them Roman Catholics, Protestants, Unitarian, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Trinitarians, "saints," they were former day saints, and you will find this name referred to in the New Testament. If the church of Jesus Christ is to be organized again in the latter days, then certainly they will be called Latter Day Saints, for even the word Christian is a nickname.

No Objection to Name.

Now I have no objection to the other churches calling themselves after their several founders, whether it be Lutheran or Knox church, or some other man's church, I am not saying anything against that. If I would build a house they would call it my house, so I am not complaining, but we call this the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints from the fact that God calls His people saints and that we live in the latter days and the church has been reorganized so that so far as the name goes you may hate it, but that is the true Bible name of God's people. Now while we have had a great many translations of the Bible, both Protestant and Catholic Bibles. I believe that God in the latter days has raised up a prophet, and that prophet and the true church is in a position to stand up with the Bible, translated by inspiration: That while the Bible contains the word of God that yet the church existed before there was any New Testament and was in the halo of its glory hundreds of years before that book was compiled, but while I believe the gospel of Jesus Christ was taught in the Bible and that no man should preach that which is contrary to the Bible, yet I believe there is something more than the Bible.

With Paul I can say: "For our gospel came not unto you in word only but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance," and so my friends as a Latter Day Saint I believe that the Holy Spirit comes down upon the men that have faith in God, and repent of their sins and are baptized for the remission of sins, for this is the invulnerable promise of God. He has guaranteed to the obedient the abiding comforter, the gift of the Holy Ghost, that is to take the things of the Father and reveal them unto you. No man is a Christian who denounces the power of the Holy Ghost.

One Reason.

And when the Protestant Churches rise to say that all that God gave to men is revealed in the Bible and the last revelation was given to John, they by that statement convince the Bible reader that the Protestant churches are of human origin, so I am a Latter Day Saint because I believe that the man who will believe the gospel as it is taught in the New Testament may receive the Holy Spirit and under its inspiration the church to-day may enjoy the gift of tongues, an interpretation of tongues, the gift of prophecy, and other spiritual manifestations referred to in the Bible promises. Just in a word, the same cause producing the same effect, the spirit of God working in the Latter Day Saint Church, just as it worked in the Former Day Saint Church.

Another Reason.

I am a Latter Day Saint because I believe that, and I am supported by all the Bible in that position, for "I am the Lord, I change not," is the certificate given by the Almighty in the third chapter of Malachi. If God is an unchangeable being, then we have the right to expect His church as organized in latter days, to be unchangeable. It will have twelve apostles,

prophets, bishops, deacons, elders, etc., ordained under divine appointment, and they will preach the gospel just as it was preached by Christ and the apostles. The Protestant or Catholic Church that denounces any part of this but proves that it is a human institution, for the body without the spirit is dead.

I am a Latter Day Saint because this gospel with all its charming promises reached me when I was a wild, weak, ignorant boy who had never mastered the multiplication table. I received with meekness and faith the simple gospel promises as I read them in the Bible. When I was baptised I was forsaken by most of those who knew me, but I was soon called by God to preach the gospel. I left everything that I ought in this world. I have been mobbed, shot at, ill used and abused, but I certify to you to-night in the name of Jesus Christ, that God has been true to His promises to me. My life has largely been a very lonely one, filled with many sacrifices, but God has been true to me and I know that the man that will obey from his heart the gospel as God sent me to preach it, will not only receive the remission of his sins, but he will be born again from an old existence into a new life and the spirit of God will fill his heart and body, and mind, just as that spirit dominated men in the dear dead years of the past.

Our Church Supported By Bible.

I am a Latter Day Saint because there is absolutely nothing in the doctrine of this church that is not supported by the Bible. So far as I have been able to search there is nothing that the Bible teaches that is not inculcated in the doctrine and principle of the Latter Day Saint Church. I know that I could be more popular.

I know that I could have a better time in this world, so far as the world is concerned, but the honor of having heard the voice of God is the biggest salary that any man can receive, to really feel that you are walking in the footsteps of Christ and the apostles, both as to church organization, doctrine, ordinances and hope, is something that builds me up in all the walks of life.

What Shall I Do With Jesus?

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 27th chapter of the gospel as recorded by St. Matthew, and a part of the 22nd verse, where you will read these words: "What shall I do with Jesus?" This important question was propounded by Pilate, who was the judge of Jesus Christ and the one that condemned Him to death. He was surrounded by a howling mob who were thirsty for the blood of the Holy One whose life had been a perpetual benediction to the people.

Pilate Feared the People.

This man, Pilate, was placed in the same condition to a large extent as we frequently are, in this sense; it would seem that he desired to be fair, to be just. Because of what he had seen and heard that day, there is no doubt in my mind but that he inclined to be favorable to Jesus Christ. Not only the serenity that rested like the halo from the unseen world upon the Master of men, not only because of the words that fell from His blistered lips, but because of the dream his wife had not to oppose this just man. The conditions of the environment of this man—whom I believe desired to be just—prevented him from liberating Christ, for he feared the people. He feared the people and he appealed to them, with the hope burning in his breast that they would consent to an acquittal but they cried, "We will not have this man to rule over us, if you let this man go you are no friend to Caesar, and personal ambition, combined with cowardice, and with the fear of the reproach that might be hurled upon him, he gave Christ over to the infuriated mob that He might be crucified.

I have said that to some degree we occupy a similar position to that of Pilate. Down through the ages comes to our hearts and minds to-night that momentous question, "What shall I do with Jesus?" This is a beautiful text, in that it appeals to us individually. You know most of us are prone to shirk duty at times. Ever since Adam blamed it on to the woman, saying "the woman tempted me and I did eat," it seems to be a legacy left by him to his posterity to make excuses and put the blame on someone else. But this question comes to us so direct as individuals that it is impossible to shirk the responsibility that attaches to us. Read it. "What shall I do with Jesus?" Not what does the preacher think about Him, what does the Sunday School teacher say of Him, or what disposition has my parents made of Him, but we have reached the threshold of responsibility, and as we must stand before the judgment seat of Christ there to give an account to Him for the stewardship and for the opportunities accorded us, so we must answer this proposition: "What shall I do with Jesus?"

Many Theories.

The world and the church has given to the world many theories regarding Him, perhaps the one hundredth part of which we may not have time to examine to-night. We have been told that He was God, the very God. We have been told by others that He was but the Son of God, the beginning of the creation of God. Further, we have been instructed by others that He was merely a good man, splendid in character, blameless in life, unselfish in His devotion and unstained in his morals.

This last position is being adopted by many, even of the church, and so a great conference, representing perhaps some of the most brilliant think-

ers of this planet, have endorsed what is known as higher criticism, in which we are told that Christ being limited as a man was ignorant of many things and that where science contradicts Jesus, then we may pity Him for His ignorance, but in the onward march of scientific research Jesus must be pushed aside, rather than that the science of the 19th and 20th centuries should be considered faulty. I am here to say to you that there never was a time when men and women were called on to make answer to this question as they are to-day. It is important, in the midst of the conglomerated mass of confusion that we see exhibited throughout churchianity at large, to reach a sound conclusion with regard to this personage, known as Jesus Christ.

I may say, as briefly as I can, that as I enjoy the Spirit of the Word, and view the truth as I read it in the Word by the light of the spirit that is granted to me from time to time, that I want to be placed on record as believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the first begotten of the Father, that He pre-existed with the Father, and by the instruction of the Father He created man and all other beings that exist on this planet, that He spake ex-cathedra, that is to say, to use His own language, as my Father commanded Me, so I spake. I cannot of Myself do anything, as I hear I judge. He gave Me a command what I should say and what I should speak. I believe that Jesus Christ when He spake gave utterance to the truth as it emanated from the Father of Lights, that where the so-called science conflicts with the words that Jesus spake, that science, so-called, is wrong.

Science Is Wrong.

It may not be considered a great crime for me to declare that which we have called scientific in its character is wrong, from the fact that every scientific work we read is busy contradicting other scientific works. No two of the great scientists, so-called, agree, and when they try to give you a definite date as to the age of man, or as to the age of this planet, one of them will give you the most minute figures, while another will say "it is not so" and prove by just as many figures that the first scientist is wrong in his date by millions of years, but a million or two of years is not much to a scientist. They often differ as to the age of man by tens of thousands of years, and some of the greatest scientists disregard this Bible story of creation from first to last, and they declare by reason of their scientific attainments that man came up from the protoplasm found in the foam of the sea, only some how or other now you will discover that is very clear; two atoms in some way or other came together somehow, sometime, somewhere, and produced life; that is as clear as mud, and that by and bye from the merest smallest atom of life throughout the ages of development by and bye it was a bug or a worm, or an insect, or an animal of some kind, and that continued to develop through the untold ages till finally it got to be grown up man.

It is only a few days since one of the leading papers of this city gave an entire page containing the pictures of a male and female animal covered with hair, with great protruding teeth, and gave us to understand that that is our grandfather and grandmother of many many thousands of years ago. If this modern scientific, evolution theory is true, then the story of the creation of Adam and Eve, the story of the fall, the story of the marriage vow, the story of the atonement of Christ, is a myth, and should not be regarded as true by the learned and scientific minds of the 20th century. Therefore, I repeat that the foundation of Christianity, the foundation of the Bible, rests largely upon the question that He propounded in the language of my text, "What shall I do with Jesus?"

The Doctrines of Evolution.

To me it is the rankest kind of infidelity to claim to be a minister of

Jesus Christ in the Church of Christ and at the same time state the gospel of Christ as He taught it, the doctrine of Christ as He preached it, the law of God as He presented it, must be set aside so that the onward march of so-called science would not be impeded. We have read where the parting of the ways must come between churchianity and Christianity. I cannot illustrate this thought better than to read to you a clipping taken from one of the leading papers, commenting on the efforts now being made to replace the Bible by the doctrine of evolution. It says: "The preparation of the new Bible, which is to be inspired by sweet reasonableness, has not made much advance yet. We lay before our readers the improved version of the first chapter of Genesis:

1. There never was a beginning.
2. And cosmos was homogeneous and undifferentiated, and somehow or other evolution began and molecules appeared.
3. And molecules evolved protoplasm, and rhythmic thrills arose, and then there was light.
4. And a spirit of envy was developed and formed the plastic cell, whence arose the primordial germ.
5. And the primordial germ became protogene somehow shaped eocene; then was the dawn of life.
6. And the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its own kind, whose seed is in itself, developed according to its own fancy.
7. The cattle after his kind, the beast of the field after his kind, and every creeping thing became evolved by heterogeneous segregation and concomitant dissipation of motion.
8. So that by the survival of the fittest there evolved the simiads from the jellyfish and the simiads differentiated themselves into the authropomophitic primordial types.
9. And in due time one lost his tail and became a man, and behold he was the most cunning of all animals.
10. And in process of time, by natural selection and survival of the fittest, scientists, skeptics, infidels and scoffers appeared, and behold it was very good."

The sad part of all this is, that the church from every quarter, in the past, has confronted such trash as I have just read from the paper, but to-day many in the church are endorsing it to a greater or less degree.

There is not as much difference between the church and the world to-day as there is between Christianity and the church, and so there comes to us tonight the grave responsibility as to what disposition we are to make of Jesus Christ. You may present him in contrast with any other individual who has acted his part in the great drama of humanity, and the comparison sets Him at an unlimited space above every other individual that ever lived upon this planet.

Weakness of Great Men.

You can tell us of great men who lived and died for principle, but as I read the other day one of these great wonderful men who had formulated a scheme for the government of man, when talking to his aged friend, complained, and notwithstanding he could not see a flaw in his plan, yet there was something that impeded its progress, and it would not work, and the old philosopher said, I will tell you how you can make it succeed, just preach for two or three years till the people crucify you, and when you are dead two or three days just raise from the dead, that will make your work go fine; and he took the rebuke, and he recognized immediately what a counterfeit of Jesus Christ he really was.

And so it is, my friends, there are other men who have been wonderful in their time, but human selfishness, personal aggrandizement, proved them only to be men, and they fell. Let us look at a few of them, master minds

as they were. Look at Napoleon, that great personification of lust, and personal ambition, that man who sacrificed at the shrine of unholy ambition the lives of hundreds of thousands. He was in a way to dictate to all Europe, he practically had changed the map of Europe. As you follow him from the boyhood days when his school mates derided him for his poverty, you see him rise until he puts down the mobs on the streets of Paris. You follow him all through the battles at Austerlitz, Moscow, Leipsig and Waterloo. You follow him through all his wonderful wars, till at last you see him at St. Helens, a prisoner, looking out, as one has said, upon the sad and solemn sea, the victim of his own unholy ambition. He chased from his heart the only woman that ever loved him, and sacrificed her at the shrine of unholy ambition.

We leave France and cross the channel to England, and, perhaps, in introducing to you Horatio Nelson, I give to you the grandest warrior that England ever claimed. I believe he was entitled to the name they gave him, "England's darling"; watch him. I see him at the Nile. I listen to him giving orders at Copenhagen; I watch him die amid the thunders of the sea and the roarings of the cannon at the battle of Trafalgar. Oh, he was wonderful, wonderful and grand, but how great his weakness. In his death agonies he confessed to be a slave to the lowest passion. The name of his wife that loved him as true as life could love was not mentioned by him, but while his heart's blood was ebbing away and the cold icy hand of death was throttling his throat he gurgled out between his frozen lips, give this lock of hair to Lady Hamilton, Lady Hamilton, the woman whom he had stolen from her own husband; the man who had been his dearest and truest friend, who befriended him at all times; and he took advantage of his love and confidence and destroyed his wife; and he not only destroyed her, but broke the heart of his own wife. But strange as it may seem, he did not kill her love, and so we read of Lady Nelson, that she died looking at Lord Nelson's picture, and among her last words, as the tears fell from her eyes, and looking at her husband's picture, she whispered, my Horatio. Surely woman's love is as beautiful as the aroma of the rose, as incapable of description as the perfume of the lily; it is as sacred as Heaven itself. Poor Nelson, grand and good, but a victim to his own personal selfishness.

We come nearer home, one of the greatest men, indeed, one who is known as the father of his country, George Washington, that man so wonderful, so gifted, almost reaching the sublime in many respects, yet his name is tarnished from the fact that he bought and sold human flesh; he dealt in slavery. Grant, the man whose bulldog persistency saved the nation by his sword, gave birth to a republic, the most glorious beneath the stars, yet a five-cent cigar was his master, and he whined out, like the most degraded slave, "I would like to quit the use of tobacco; I know it is killing me, but I cannot." Just imagine a man that could give orders to six hundred thousand armored men, a man who could laugh in the face of a thundering cannon, who knew no fear, bowed in abject slavery to a plug of tobacco. How great, and yet how infinitely small, giving up this life as he worshipped at the shrine of the cigar, for, according to my reading, it was that which hurried him to the grave, but he was warned, yet he cried out I cannot stop the habit.

Personal Selfishness.

Go from the field of war to the field of poetry, and in my hurried address I must introduce to you but one character, Scotland's brightest genius, the poet of the human heart, the man that gave to us the heart's loudest throbbing, and found the lost chord of human affection. I refer to Robert Burns. He was hardly known till after he was dead. Notwithstanding that great mind, which seemed to be fired with the inspiration of Heaven, while

he gave to us such satires upon churchianity as "Holy Willie's Prayer," and when he gave to us that grand exhibition of true worship, as we read nowhere else as we do in the Cotters' Saturday Night, yet he was low and degraded, and even going so far as to write poetry concerning his illegitimate children.

In one of his drunken brawls he went to sleep on a doorstep and took cold, from which he never recovered, and that brilliant genius was dimmed, and that wonderful, wonderful man went down to a premature grave, the result of personal selfishness.

Christ Pleased Not Himself.

You might go through the character and life of every man you know, and you would reach similar conclusions along the same line, but Jesus Christ stands as the unique figure of the world. Yes, stands without a shadow in all the universe. His life was a perpetual benediction to the race, His words throbbed with goodness, flowed with kindness, and were laden with instruction.

Surely it was truly said of Him he spake as never man spake, and as another said, he spake as one having authority and not as the Scribes. What made Him so great. Perhaps the little secret may be discovered in Romans 15:3, and 9, where it is said of Him: "Christ pleased not Himself." Oh, what a sentence. It is voiced in that other language, "I came not to do my own will, but the will of Him that sent me." Again: "I do always those things that pleased my Father." Therein lies the secret of his wonderful power; he was unselfish in every word he uttered, in every thought he gave birth to, in every act that he performed, it was a living, blossoming, perpetual benediction to the race, and that cannot be said of any other individual that lived.

You Must Imitate Jesus.

Now, if you would be with Him in his life, you must learn to think like He thought; you must learn to speak like He spoke; you must learn to act like He acted, and that will bring you to the garden of Gethsemane. You cannot escape the sorrows and the darknesses of the garden. You must learn to be betrayed by your own friends. You must learn to have those for whom you have suffered and labored, antagonize you. You must at times feel that you stand alone. You must kneel with breaking hearts and tear-stained faces in the lonely hours in the sad gloaming of Gethsemane. This is but a station on the road; next you must enter the judgment hall and there be disrobed of every personal form of selfishness and be derided and forsaken.

You, too, must carry your cross up the thorn-clad path to Calvary, and there on Golgotha's brow you must crucify the old man with his deeds. All the selfish will in you, all that is sinful in you, must die. You must be buried with Christ, baptized not only in water but baptized into his death, that like, as He rose from the dead, so you have died, having crucified the lust of the flesh you may go on your way to the tomb and there be sanctified by angel touch until the sorrow, trouble and human opposition shall roll from before you, and then you pass on your way to Bethany, where the ascension takes place. If you would rise with Him, you must suffer with Him.

This, to my mind, is the best conception of Jesus Christ that I can refer. I always feel a weakness, a trembling, as I attempt to draw a picture of the life of Jesus Christ. Oh, may we be more like Him as brothers and sisters, until finally we may reach the climax and ascend to the zenith and be like Him, indeed, that we may rise with Him is my prayer.

Come Unto Me

PERMIT me to draw to your attention to the gospel as recorded by St. Matthew 11th chapter, 28th, 29th and 30th verses, where you will read these words: "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me for I am meek and lowly in heart and ye shall find rest unto your souls, for My yoke is easy and My burden is light."

This pleading invitation to a sin cursed world fell from the lips of the Master of men, He of whom it is written that He knew how to succor those that are tempted, being Himself tempted in all points. In the wisdom of His Father He was called upon and willingly laid aside the glory that He had in the pre-existent splendors of the heavenly kingdom, and came down upon this sin-cursed planet to suffer, to bleed and to die that we might not only be redeemed but that we might see in Him the wonderful possibilities of humanity. Gazing out over the agonizing world, burdened with a thousand ills, He who alone had power, extended the most full and complete invitation to the children of men that has ever been presented for their consideration, Come unto Me.

Given to All Mankind.

This invitation is a personal one. It embraces all ranks and conditions of men, the king upon his throne environed by the royal splendors of state and the lowliest peasant in his cot surrounded by the most abject conditions of sorrow and poverty. To those and all between them comes this kind and loving invitation, Come unto Me. When we think of the history of this wonderful unique character of how that He was the first begotten of God, surrounded by the angelic hosts, yet He laid aside the glory that He had with the Father before the world was. When you stop to think of that wondrous glory, that indescribable splendor of royalty of the king of heaven, that He willingly laid all this aside and takes upon Himself our human nature, a body of flesh and bone, is born in a stable, cradled in a manger, born under the suspicion of crime, environed by unspeakable poverty, and thus He walked the thorn-clad path of human experience from the cradle to the grave, hungry at times, cold in the pitiless storm, as He said Himself: the foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath nowhere to lay His head.

When you stop to think of the agonies that He endured, of the sorrows through which He passed, of the incomparable sacrifices He made in order to be your saviour, your redeemer, is it not, I say, encumbent upon you, every individual present, is it not encumbent upon you that you give due respect to this invitation, or will you leave this place pushing it aside? Could there be come from any more royal potentate an invitation like this, could there be extended to you from any quarter of the universe a more inviting recognition, Come unto Me?

Have You a Reason?

Can you to-night stop long enough to examine this question and give answer to it? What reason have I got to refuse this invitation? Why I know men and women who would be willing almost to spend their last cent

to get a dress suit and to appear in full dress, whether it was only half there or not, to meet the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, but with all due respect to earthly royalty, with all due respect to the invitations extended for us to go and gaze upon the Duke and Duchess, I appreciate very much the respect that was paid me when they extended an invitation that I should go and see them, that is the authorities of the city extended it and I took it as quite a compliment, but compare it if you will, have all the royalties of this world in one grand palatial residence and let them combine and extend an invitation for you to come to them, what would that amount to compared to this invitation?

Why if you came to the foot of King George's throne and his heart was set to confer upon you the greatest favor within his power, there is no assurance he would live long enough for you to get into the room in time. He is but a man liable to die at any moment, in imminent danger of the assassin's knife hourly; surrounded by human weaknesses, subject to all the diseases and the pains, and to the death toward which you are travelling; but when you think that this royal potentate of the universe stoops to extend an invitation to you, saying, Come unto Me, you may approach Him through faith, no putting on style there; humble, meek, lowly, tender, gentle, kindness personified, extending the hand of fellowship out over the great sin-cursed world, with a voice filled with the divine harmony of heaven, saying, Come unto Me. Can you spurn the invitation?

Can you search out any reason that would be legitimate in its character for your refusing to come? Second thought is you may figure that it might not mean you, that it might just mean the great ones of earth, the royalty, the rich, but listen, Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, is that you? The man who is working, toiling day and night almost, to keep body and soul together, envired by conditions that are very discouraging, almost hopeless, despairing of ever achieving victory, burdened with one thousand cares, perhaps a body that is weak and diseased, may be a brain that is not overly strong, struggling against the tide for an existence here, laboring for the bread that periseth, until you might say I have not the time to devote to this question, but it is to you the invitation is given, all ye that labor and are heavy burdened.

Is Not a Hard Task.

Oh when you stop to think, if you thought along legitimate channels, you would give up that erroneous idea that to follow Jesus Christ is a task. That is not true. The burden you are carrying because of your indulgence in sin and folly and the bad habits, the evil of fashion, when you stop to sum it all up, we are a burdened and a heavy laden people, because of the conditions that sin imposes upon us. In the first place the man or woman, especially the woman, that tries to keep up with the style and the fashion of this world is burdened and is heavy laden. When you take into consideration the big hats, five times larger than they ought to be, yet style compels them to carry them and the shoes with heels four times higher than they ought to be, make work for the undertakers and the doctors, and when you take into consideration a number of other styles and fashions that bring agony, absolute agony and deformity to the body, that is one thing you might be relieved of if you came into Christ, and live just as He would have you live.

Again if you take into consideration the burdens that sin imposes; I was talking to a man just the other night, who was contemplating a change of business, who said I am working hard 13 to 15 hours a day and I can hardly scrap together \$10 per week. Before he got through he told me that he had chewed two 10c plugs of tobacco in the last twenty-four hours. I do not know how many cigars he had, but he had a pipe on the table

there; well I liked to look the other way when I got the aroma from it. It was strong enough to stop a clock. Here was a sin-burdened soul, and he thought by coming into Christ he would be bound in some way, that he would be expected to at least give up that. What was it? Why nothing less than a great burden. I met another man burdened with the sin of strong drink. I have seen liquor run to such an extent that the carpets were taken from the floors, the pictures from the walls, the furniture out of the rooms and the wedding ring from the wife's finger was pawned for drink.

Think of the agony, burden, the heavy-laden creatures of that home, both the man and the woman were heavy laden, and the burden fell in part upon their offspring. I have seen such accept the invitation to "Come unto Me," and I have seen the carpets go back on the floor and the pictures on the wall and the wedding ring back on the finger.

Freedom and Rest.

They thought they were having freedom in the world but they were maze bound slaves. Freedom comes to the man that embraces the invitation "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Oh how sweet that rest would be to those who have known so little of it here. Rest! why, we are always working, we are always hurrying, going from one folly into another, jumping from one extreme to the other, from one burden to the other, trying to satisfy an unsatisfied selfishness; the rich trying to get richer; the poor trying to take their own part, and many of them trying to take more than they can get honestly, and so it is from one step to another, we have no rest in the world of wickedness, go where you will, and it is said, uneasy is the head that wears a crown.

There are people hungry for wealth, for pomp, for power, for fashion, and it is this unsatisfied hunger of selfishness that is everlastingly dragging us down, trying to get more. No matter how much you have, there is no rest, you still want more. I remark here there is nothing outside of Christianity that satisfies; absolutely nothing. The millionaire is not satisfied. If he is worth his many millions, he is not satisfied, he has no rest. Once you begin to get very wealthy it is time you had a steel jacket under your vest, to avoid someone killing you, because you have not got your money honestly. It is an extremely hard thing for a man to start up business with nothing and in a few years have a number of millions which he calls his. It is a hard thing to accomplish that I say and to have remained absolutely honest all the time. The man who has become a millionaire unusually becomes so honestly, but he has been placed in a position by which he can take advantage of his fellows. He may have been able to do it legally, but has it been honest to do it, and so my dear friends wealth does not give us rest, earthly power does not give us rest.

Why, I can go down the street without a gun or a knife in my pocket or a guard around me. The King cannot do that. Why, just as soon as you get into power somebody wants to kill you, and they do so unless you have a lot of armed soldiers around you. You had evidence of that when the Duke and Duchess were here.

Needs No Guard.

I happened to be down town one night when they were here, to pay my rent for this theatre, and as I was passing the Government House I saw fifty or a hundred horsemen, dazzling in splendor, standing there in the pouring rain, doing honor to the folks inside, who, I suppose, had forgotten they were there at all. They were acting as guards, but I do not need any guard. The more you think of this world in any single depart-

ment, the more you will discover that it is divested of the rest that Christ promised to impart to those that come unto Him. "Take My yoke upon you." What does that mean? Now, most of us know what a yoke is, probably having heard of a yoke of oxen. It is a fact that if you take a pair of oxen and put the yoke round each of their necks they together will pull a very heavy load and they both work well together.

Do you notice that Christ does not profess to make a yoke for you, He says, "Take My yoke upon you." His yoke. He is going to be in one side of the yoke while you are in the other, and if you do not get divine influence to help you pull the load, you are going to have a hard time. I once stood on the banks of the Niagara River, hungry and cold, without a postage stamp with which to post a letter home to my wife in London. I had one friend by me, Brother A. E. Mortimer, and I believe Brother Gregory was with us. We would have left Niagara Falls, but we were in the condition as the saying goes, "Between the devil and the deep blue sea." We did not know what we were going to remain there for, or how we were going to get away. We walked up and gazed upon that everlasting splendor. We saw the rainbow with its thousand views of beauty. We saw the great wild, mad leap of the thundering waters and we heard the mighty roar and gazed upon the spray as it ascended heavenward like so much incense.

We saw the indescribable splendor, the unspeakable beauty of this great cataract, and as we gazed and fed our eyes upon that divine display of power, and thought of ourselves in our poverty, I looked up to Brother Mortimer and said, "Mort., our Father controls that, and He has promised to take care of us, so cheer up." It was only a few hours after that until we were invited to the first warm meal in weeks and I baptized some of the finest people in Niagara Falls in the white spray of that wondrous water. Now we have a brick church on both sides of the river.

Cannot Carry Both.

The man that works with Jesus Christ, or, as Paul says, "We are workers together with God and will recognize that the yoke is easy and the burden is light." What is it that makes the Christian's walk a hard one? Is it Christianity? No. It is because, shall I say, many of us want to carry Christianity in one hand and the world in the other, and the two make it a great and heavy burden. If we profess Christianity and really do not possess it, our profession being empty, our possession being so limited that the benefits amount to nothing, we get the snubs and the slurs on the one hand without the blessing of God to assist us and we do not have the same pleasures out of the things of the world that we would have if we did not know as much about Christianity as we do, and I will say right now that I know by experience that trying to hold on to both is a hard thing. I tried that.

I got into a condition about 29 years ago that I would like to have left the church, if I could. Indeed, I did not go to church for nearly a year. I tried to forget it. I have smiled when my heart was breaking. I have made large audiences laugh and giggle when I wanted to weep myself. Under the providential kindness of God I was rescued from that year and a half of agony and I know the meaning of the story of the Prodigal Son, from experience. And I know the heaviest burden that any man ever carried is when he is in the church and not living up to his religion. As a boy said one time when asked the question, "What is your father?" "Oh, he is a Methodist by trade, but he is not working at it now." That's the heaviest burden in this world, but when that man embraces the promises of God he is the most secure man in existence. He has faith in the promises of God. He feels his faith and trust in God to be his rejuvenator and

uplifter, and his sorrows are few, his troubles practically are over. He feels that God doth the work, and if he can get so close to the warm, throbbing heart of Jesus Christ, he will recognize that the yoke is easy and the burden is light.

No matter what the storms of persecution may be on the outside, within he sails upon the placid waters of God's white calm. Now, in this point, "Take My yoke upon you," I believe that Jesus meant by that, come, embrace my religion. Obey the system that I have inaugurated. Comply with the conditions that I have imposed. Obey the gospel. Be subject to the conditions and the laws that I have established. That's the yoke, and when you compare the simple gospel of Jesus Christ with its ordinances and commandments, with the heathen rites of every other religious denomination, even with the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic laws, or of some of the creeds of churchianity, surely we can testify His yoke is easy and His burden is light.

Give Up Sin.

But, of course, the yoke means that we should have that restraint of gospel law imposed upon us, the giving up of all that is sinful, all that is evil, but notice right here it is not required of you to give up anything that is worth keeping. Of course, you must abandon profanity. That's a pretty hard thing. You may want me to give up something to eat or drink; such as tobacco or whisky. What good have they ever done anyone? You require a fellow to be honorable. What good has any act that you have performed dishonestly ever brought you, any peace, and joy, and real comfort? You may talk about the great joys, the gay times, the froth and foam of the wild life, but stop and look it over a moment. A man works hard all week and earns say \$10 or \$15 per week, and in place of going home and paying his rent and fixing up for the week he drops into some saloon and you see him at about 10 or 11 o'clock on that night with probably a man on either side of him helping him along.

He thinks that is having a good time. He will tell you next week what a fine time he had, or it was glorious. I tell you my brother, you who think you would have a great sacrifice to make were you to take the yoke of the Lord upon you, that you are greatly mistaken, for with that yoke comes peace, comes rest, comes the freedom that nothing else can give you; no power can impart the freedom that trust and obedience in Jesus Christ can give. Tried before the tribunal of your own conscience and found guilty is a burden that the sinner perpetually lugs along the hard road to travel. I now quote on this subject from Mark 8:34, which is perhaps a little more explicit: "Whosoever will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." That's it. He must deny himself. He must forsake the evils of the world, the sin of youth and age, the follies of an abnormal mind and turn in with the virtuous, the righteous, and sacrifice that which tends to his selfishness, and covenant before God that he will deny himself.

And it really means death. Death in the highest and best sense, and so we continue in the reading: "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, but whosoever shall lose his life for My sake and the gospels, the same shall save it." That's mighty funny, I do not understand it, some may say, whosoever shall save his life will lose it. Let me show you.

Means Separation.

If you want to continue in this life of sin, you will be separated from God, for the meaning of the word death is separation. You will be separated from God in this life until you come unto Him, so that when you are seeking to save your life, in that you refuse to deny yourself of these sinful pleasures, you are losing your life in the highest possible sense of the

word. Now, you will notice, "lose his life for My sake and the gospels." That means that when you obey the gospel, taking the yoke upon you, you will comply with the conditions that will really represent death and will bring you to the highest representation of new life, and if I do not prove that it will be because the rain which is falling outside will come through the roof.

John 8th chapter, 31st to 36th verses, gives us a thought worthy of consideration: "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, if ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed." That is the man who wants his own way and does not comply with the conditions in the gospel then he is not a disciple of Christ. "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Think of it, the truth shall make you free. "They answered him, we be Abraham's seed and were never in bondage to any man, how sayest thou ye shall be made free?" Jesus answered them: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin, and the servant abideth not in the house forever, but the son abideth forever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Now in taking the yoke of Christ, in obeying the gospel, in complying with the condition imposed by the gospel ordinance, you are made free from sin; you die to the old life, you are born again into the new life. You lose your life in the highest sense of the term, but you find it by being born again. Let us follow this up.

I draw your attention to the 6th chapter of Paul's letter to the Church at Rome: "What shall we say then, shall we continue in sin that grace may abound. God forbid, how shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" That's how shall we who have been separated from our sins still be in them? "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Here is the man who by taking the yoke upon him, learns of Him, obeys the gospel, has faith in the Father, Son and Spirit, repents of his sins, is baptized for remission of his sins, and he is then made free from sin. "Therefore, we are buried with Him by baptism into death." There is the man losing his own sinful life and baptized into Christ: "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin."

A Translation.

Now a better translation of that last sentence says he that is dead to sin is freed from sin. Here is where the freedom comes; you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free, and as you die from sin you emblemize your death to sin by being buried with Christ by baptism into death, and as you raise from a watery grave you signify His resurrection into the new life and you are born of water and of the spirit, born from the kingdom of darkness wherein you are in the bondage of sin into the glorious liberty of the kingdom of God's dear Son.

Here is baptism by immersion for the remission of sin to be buried with Christ, no room for pouring or sprinkling there. A little further: "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness." Now I want to keep this matter prominent before you, showing you that it has reference to baptism in water for the remission of sins. We continue to read: "But God he thanketh, that ye were; a better translation says: "Are not the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed

from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Some people say baptism is not essential to salvation. It is only a form. Yes, it is a form, but by the obedience to "that form of doctrine." They were made "free from sin." In a word it is the obedience to Christ, the taking on of His yoke.

In taking Christ's yoke upon you, you deny yourselves, you are separated from the world by your profession of faith and your repentance. Now you come to the baptismal fount and there you enter the watery grave, evidencing that you desire to die to sin. Now you are dead and buried, and now Jesus says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man is born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." John 3, 5. Now you are dead and buried, but coming from the womb of water into the element of air represents the birth into the new life. If you have been raised from your baptismal grave in the likeness of Christ's resurrection, which shows, as James said, "Show me your faith without your works and I will show you My faith by My works." What did He mean? Why, he had faith in the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. He proves it by his works, showing by his works his faith in the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, by dying to sin, being buried with Christ by baptism, that is being immersed, then raising from the watery grave, showing his faith in the death, burying and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Gospel Buried With Christ.

Here, then, is the complete story of the gospel being buried with Christ in baptism unto death, dead to sin, that is, we were given our freedom. Now, He follows in this text: "Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me." Thus, when we are born from our old life into the new one the truth of God comes to us and we learn the things of God. Our new way of thinking changes our thoughts, our desires. We have reached the stage that God intended us to arrive at, thoughts filled with tenderness, with pity, with love, with kindness, with purity, deeds freighted with goodness to our fellowman and our obedience to our God. I want to know if there is any life that we can live that will bring the freedom that is tended here. "Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart and ye shall find rest unto your soul." Rest! Rest to your soul. Do we need it to-day? "For My yoke is easy and My burden is light."

When you stop to consider the promise. "He careth for you." Surely that promise is one of value to know that He watches every step you take, and He says the very hairs of your head are numbered, and a sparrow that is only worth perhaps a quarter of a cent. cannot fall to the ground without our father's notice, yet He says ye are more valuable than many sparrows. When you stop to think that in the garden of life that you are walking with God, in the dawning of the morning when your eyes are first opened, commit your ways unto the Lord.

Make a Resolution.

Start to-morrow morning by saying "I covenant with Thee oh God, if strength to me Thou wilt impart, no unkind word shall fall from my lips to-day. No cruel, harsh or false deed shall be performed by me toward my fellowman nor any animal that lives. I will seek to-day to be sweet in disposition, truthful in my statements, honest in my dealings, pure and chaste in my actions." Try it to-morrow and see if it will not bring more joy, more peace, more rest, more happiness, than if by figuring dishonestly you made a million dollars. Brethren and friends, we are all tending toward the grave. It is only a matter of a few years when there will not be a soul

present here to-night but what will be in their graves. Is it not time for us to change our way and turn in with the overtures of mercy and embrace the gospel, accepting the invitation extended by the Master wherein He says: "Come unto Me?"

I remember but a few short years ago I started to work in this city with but a handful to help me. Hundreds of young men and women came to my theatre meetings who were disgusted with the churches, and some of them had not given the Saviour a thought, but came in probably to escape the cold and to hear what I had to say, but they heard the voice of the Good Shepherd and they turned in with the overtures of mercy, and now I count by the hundreds my brothers and sisters in this city. I count my old fathers and mothers in Israel by the hundred.

Accept the Invitation.

Perhaps the happiest throng in Toronto meets at my church on Soho Street every Wednesday night and Sunday morning for prayer meeting, and if you could hear these brothers and sisters of mine testify of how, having found the way and walking with God in the great peace, the joy and the consolation that has come as a result of this knowledge, this power and freedom of knowing and trusting in Jesus, you would not procrastinate the day when you too would raise, denying yourself the pleasure of this world, accepting the invitation extended by the Master of Men and render obedience to the gospel, and thus, in the highest sense you would comply with the request and accept the invitation, "Come Unto Me."

Where is Heaven?

The Bible Teaches That It Is to Be On Earth.

PERMIT me to draw your attention to the 50th Psalm and 5th verse, where you will read these words: "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice."

In the discussion of this subject our effort will be to show you where the people of God will spend eternity. Just a word first, as regards who shall be gathered. A number of papers have reached us finding fault because we claimed the name saint. The writers allege that the word saint means somebody that has been canonized, somebody that is dead, and that it is not a proper name to bestow upon the living; that when we call ourselves Latter Day Saints we are not using the scriptural name for God's people. Let me say that it is the only name of all the Christian churches that is supported by the Bible. I will go further than that—the man-made churches are not according to the Bible—no; not even as to the name. Who ever heard tell of the Roman Catholic Church, the Episcopalian Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, the Shakers, the Quakers, the Unitarians, the Trinitarians, in the Bible? I am not objecting to the names; I am just replying, kind of taking my own part, you know. These names are man-made, and are very properly attached to the organizations that have been organized by men. Not even the name Christian was endorsed either by God or Christ in the Bible; that is only a nick-name, and was used as a slur in the first age of the church. The heathen world during its persecutions upon the church referred to the saints or followers of Christ, as Christ-ins, or as we say, Christians; it was a nick-name on the followers of the lowly Nazarene. Your names cannot be supported by the Bible; our name can. Ninety-six times the people of God are called saints in the Bible; never did God call them Presbyterians, Methodists, or even Christians, we are ninety-six times ahead of you, so far as the name goes.

God's People Called Saints.

The word Christian is found three times in the Bible. First, Acts 11:26: "The Disciples were first called Christians at Antioch"—this was a heathen city, and they in derision called the followers of the Nazarene Christ-ins; second, Acts 26:28, Paul was taken before King Agrippa; the old king admired Paul for his knowledge and faith, though he stood before him a prisoner, chained and without a weapon, surrounded by the armour-bearers of the king, he challenged the admiration of that potentate who, bowing before him, said: "Almost thou persuadest to be a Christian;" third, 1st Peter 4:16, when some of the saints were suffering, Peter wrote something in this strain: "Now, if any of you suffer as a Christian, be not ashamed." In a word, he meant, as we used to say in school days, "sticks and stones may break your bones, but names will never hurt you." If you are in touch with divinity it does not matter what men may say; character is what tells, and not reputation. These are the only places in the entire Bible where the word Christian is used, so, in place of it saying "Gather my Presbyterians, my Shakers, or my Quakers unto me," God says "Gather my saints unto me." One may ask, how do you get the

term Latter Day Saint. I only need to say in reply to this question that there is not a church inside the whole religious arena but will admit that we are in the latter days. Therefore, if we are saints at all we are certainly not former day saints, but Latter Day Saints, so you see we are just about right so far as the name goes. "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." It was then, it is now, a sacrifice to be a saint.

There Are Living Saints.

I know dozens of people in this audience that would like to be true Later Day Saints, but they lack the courage, they fear the persecution of the world. Hundreds of you believe that I am preaching the gospel, but you don't like to be called a Latter Day Saint. Thank God many of you have obeyed the gospel, and I am looking for the rest of you to come. There is a prevalent idea abroad that one should not be called a saint until after he is dead. My position is, that if he is not fit to be a saint while he is alive, lying in the ground a few weeks, months, or years, will not make him any better. This old idea of burning people at the stake to-day and cannonizing them three hundred years hence is played out. Dying does not make a man any better. A number of years ago I was preaching in a Canadian city when one of the papers took occasion to abuse Sir John A. Macdonald. He was described as a man guilty of almost everything that was bad. A few days later, Sir John A. died, and that same editor's page was crowded with good things, John A. being made to appear as one of the best of men. I met the editor one day, and in a chat I chanced to make this remark; I was not personally acquainted with Sir John A. Macdonald, but I know this—either you were a liar last week or you are this week. The idea of abusing people when they are alive and then saying good things about them when they are dead is absolutely disgusting. This world is cold and cruel enough without our adding to the measure, and it will not hurt us to be good to people while they are living. There is sorrow and misery enough in this world without our adding to it by an unkind word or an unkind act that we cannot recall. The old idea that you must wait until the coffin lid is closed to show your appreciation of a person should be relegated to the past. In the language of another, let me say:

Spare not your kisses for my dead cold brow,
The way is lonely, let me feel them now.
When dreamless rest is mine, I shall not need
The tenderness for which I sigh to-night.

I confess to you to-night that under this little picture I have drawn I feel ashamed of all the unkind words I have spoken, and would like to recall them. No man who spoke an unkind word a year ago, if he would acknowledge the promptings of his better self to-night, but would own up that he was sorry for it, no matter what satisfaction it gave him at the time; no matter what provocation on the part of the other person, in his better self he is sorry to-night for all past unkindness.

Reunion Beyond the Grave.

Now to my text: "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Where are the saints to be gathered. We don't have to go to the Bible for the hope of immortality, it has ebbed and flowed in the human soul ever since the lips of love have kissed the pulseless form of a loved one gone. You go to the red man of the forest. He believes in a happy hunting ground, where he will meet with his fathers, where the pale face shall neither mar nor make

afraid. The heathen philosopher once approached by his wife, was asked the important question: "Shall we meet again?" Oh, how many have propounded that burning question, from the lips that were fast freezing under the frosts of death. The heathen philosopher answered her as follows: "I have asked that question from the hills that look eternal, from the gurgling streams and the prattling brooks, but all are dumb, but as I look into thy living face, there is an intuition that tells me, Clamantha, we shall meet again." So, I remark that this subject of meeting again is as old as the hope of immortality that has budded, blossomed, and bloomed in the breast of every man from Adam to the present. Even the most hardened agnostic declared that he would not cause to wither a single flower of hope that bloomed in the Garden of Faith; he would not say there was no hereafter, that there was no God, he merely said he didn't know, that is what the word "agnostic" means—"know nothing." Agnosticism means "I don't know;" it is not a denial, it is merely an admission of ignorance.

Is Heaven Far Away?

The religious churches believe that there is a gathering place, and they have located it. I do not believe that they are correct in the location; they have located it in a place called Heaven, but I will let them speak for themselves. Here is a stanza from one of their popular hymns:

Beyond the bounds of time and space,
Look forward to that Heavenly place,
The Saints' secure abode.

Let us analyze this a little. Beyond the bounds of time and space. If you go at the velocity of millions of miles a second you may travel for many years but you will not reach your destination. Astrologers have located stars that are said to be millions of miles away from us, and some of them have stated that if a ray of light left some of these stars before Christ was born in Bethlehem, it would not have arrived to this earth yet, though travelling at an enormous speed. They are within the bounds of time and space, but the Heaven of the Creeds is beyond them. Now, I don't believe that. Has anybody died and gone to Heaven? This great big place? I don't know why it should be so big, if the churches are true in their teaching that there are only a few that will get there. It seems to me the few good folks will die from loneliness, there will be so few there.

The Bible Answer.

I want to go to the Bible to show you that when we depart from this life, we do not go immediately to Heaven. Jesus Christ ought to know about as much about that as anybody you ever heard of. In speaking about this place, He says: "And no man hath ascended up to Heaven." John 3:13. Almost every funeral sermon you have ever heard has carried somebody up there, if he believed well and was a good church member. Remember it is not I who make this statement, and when you refuse to believe it you throw no reflection upon me—you are rejecting God's true witness, our Saviour. You may say, well, Brother Evans, don't you think that David, and such good men as he, went to heaven? I will let the Bible answer your question: "For David is not ascended into the heavens," Acts 2:34. Now, David, at this time, had been dead fourteen hundred and forty-eight years. If he was ever going to reach heaven one would think he would have landed by that time. The above apostolic statement regarding David not going to heaven is as if one should say: Brother Evans has not gone to Montreal. You cannot make it mean anything else. "David is not ascended into the heavens."

Christ Went to Heaven.

The Bible just as clearly states that Jesus Christ went to a place called heaven, not to abide forever, however, but to perform a mission when He would return to the earth, to be glorified in the midst of His saints when they crowned Him "Lord of All." He clearly shows two things: First, that He will come again; and second, that His people would not go to Heaven. But we will let Him speak for Himself. "Ye shall seek Me and shall not find Me; and where I am thither ye cannot come," (John 7:34). He was then speaking to the wicked Jews, and He repeated it in effect in the 8th chapter and 21st verse, saying: "Ye shall seek Me and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come." You may say in reply to this: That may be all true, because they were wicked people and were going the other way; it just means that He was going to heaven and they could not get there. Well, let us see. He speaks again on this question of not going to heaven in the 13th chapter of John and 33rd verse. This time He is speaking to the twelve apostles: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you, ye shall seek me, and, as I said unto the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come, so now I say to you." To show that He did go to heaven, I quote the following: "And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as He went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said: Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." Three things are here stated clearly: First, that Christ went to heaven; second, that His children could not go to heaven; and third, that He would not remain in heaven, but would return to earth.

Spirit and Body Separate at Death.

Now, answer me; in the face of all this, what are you going to do with all these funeral sermons that send the church folks direct to heaven, up far away beyond the bounds of time and space? Now, you may ask, Where do they go? I shall not spend a great deal of time on this question because I have already spoken to you on the intermediate conditions of both the good and the bad in the spirit abode. I shall content myself by merely stating what I have already proved; namely:—That at death the body of both saint and sinner goes to the grave, while the spirit of the good man or the saint, as we may call him, goes to a place described in the Bible under three names—Paradise, Abraham's Bosom, Under the Altar—there those spirits rest in peace awaiting the morn of the first resurrection, when the spirit shall enter the body, and so shall they ever be with the Lord, upon a glorified earth, while the spirit of the wicked, losing the first resurrection, shall come forth from a place called by three names in the Bible; namely:—Hell, Pit, Prison House. But this shall not take place for a thousand years after the righteous have come forth. Thus the Bible defines that a space of a thousand years at least will transpire between the resurrection of the saint and the resurrection of the sinner. This is clearly taught in the Bible, and I believe and teach it; yet some folks are everlastingly accusing me of not believing in hell. I have always claimed that hell was not a place where the wicked would burn forever, suffering perpetual torture in literal fire and brimstone.

Paradise and Heaven Not Identical.

You may ask the question: Did Jesus go direct to heaven after His crucifixion? The scriptures indicate that He did not. Upon the cross He said to the thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Luke 23:43. Let us examine this statement. They both hung upon the cross part of Friday, when they were taken down, and according to this promise,

met in paradise; that is, their bodies were buried, but their spirits, or the inner-man, as it is called in the Bible, met in paradise. Some may say paradise is heaven. Well, it may mean heaven in the sense of being a place of happiness, but it is not the heaven where God dwells; not the eternal home of the saints; not the place where Christ will reign with His people. Jesus Christ was in the grave Friday night, all day Saturday and Saturday night; and very early Sunday morning, while it was yet dark, the angels rolled the rock away; Christ arose from the dead, leaving the tomb, so that Mary and the other Mary saw the stone was rolled away and that Jesus was gone. Starting homeward, the two women, disappointed and sad, met a man in the dim twilight of the morning hour, while they were yet in the garden. The Bible says, they supposed Him to be the gardener, and approached Him, they said: "Wilt thou not tell us where thou hast laid Him." Jesus answered, for it was He they had met, calling her "Mary," and she recognized Him, and would have embraced Him, when He said: "Touch Me not, Mary, for I have not yet ascended to My Father and your Father, to my God and your God; but go, tell My brethren that I will meet them in Galilee." Here, if Jesus told the truth, they have not yet reached heaven, that is, the heaven where God dwells, though on Friday last He said to the thief: "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise." The paradise referred to is an intermediate state between death and the resurrection, while the Bible states in many places: "God dwells in Heaven." Stephen looked up, when he was dying under the cruel blows of the assassins and said: "I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." (Acts 7-56.)

No Saint Yet in Heaven.

In all the Bible you cannot produce the name of a person who died and went to heaven outside of Jesus Christ, and He did not go to heaven at death, but went to paradise and returned by way of the resurrection, and went to heaven afterwards on a special mission. But He has promised to return to earth to reign with His saints. That He will come to earth again is a promise made very many times yea, even the last word He is said to have uttered in Bible times referred to this promise, saying: "Behold, I come quickly."

The popular doctrine has been that we were going to Him, and the scriptures are frequently mis-quoted in support of that false theory. I give you a case in point. In the fourteenth chapter of the gospel according to St. John, Christ had been foretelling His death to His disciples. Their hearts were sad, and He tried to comfort them with these words: "Let not your hearts be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am there ye may be also." Oh, says one, I have heard that in almost every funeral sermon; but it may surprise you when I say, while you may have heard it that way many times, that is not how it reads in the Bible. If it read that way, then it would mean that Jesus is going to heaven—going to prepare a place in heaven—and when you get ready to go, or when He wants you, then you go to Him. Now, if you read it as it is written, without your sectarian spectacles on, you will discover that it reads and means the direct opposite of the above. Let us read it: "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions, if it were not so, I would have told you; I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto Myself, that where I am there ye may be also." Now, did you notice what is left out: "And if I go away, I will come again. He is coming again, when He comes He is going to receive them. They are not going to heaven.

But he is coming from heaven to earth, and they are going to see Him and be with Him—that is the Bible doctrine.

The Bible says: "The trumpet shall sound, the dead in Christ shall rise first." It also says: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye:" and the living are to pass through a change equivalent to death, and those who are alive shall not hinder those who are asleep, and the promise is, that they are to be caught up to meet Him as He comes to be crowned by His saints. The Bible teaches that when Jesus comes He is going to put His feet upon the Mount of Olives (showing it is to be a literal coming), and the Bible states: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, and they shall be priests and kings unto God and shall reign with Him a thousand years upon the earth." (See 1st Thess., 4:13-18 and Rev. 5:10.)

Earth Will Be Heaven.

In the face of all this, and much more if we had time to present it, along this line, we are continually being told that Jesus has gone to heaven and a few of earth's children are going up there at death to stay with Him forever, and be happy in the thought that the great majority has gone down to a burning hell forever. Oh, my friends, this is so far from the plan of God that one can hardly imagine men with the Bible in their hands could have gone so far astray. In the 37th Psalm I read seven clear-cut statements that show that the meek shall inherit the earth and shall dwell therein forever. Christ repeats this promise in the fifth chapter of Matthew and fifth verse: "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." Again he teaches them to pray: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done as in heaven, so in earth." A careful student of the scriptures will read these promises concerning the saints dwelling upon the earth: "The sower shall overtake the reaper, they shall sit under their own vine and fig tree; nothing shall hurt or destroy in all My holy mountain. From one new moon to another shall all flesh come up upon the earth to worship the Lord." There will be perpetual felicity, endless joy and everlasting happiness, and eternal residence with God and Christ upon the earth.

Burning Hell Theory a Slander on God.

They tell us that the earth is under a curse. That is true, friends; that was the result of sin, but Christ is made manifest, we are distinctly told to destroy the works of the devil and to redeem and restore man. But your creeds give Satan and everlasting situation as the king of hell, the eternal stoker of an endless fire-place. If this were true, Christ has failed to destroy the works of the devil. 1 John 3:8. Some men say you should not talk about sacred things like that; I don't consider that sacred for a man that slanders my Heavenly Father, I will get after him also, whether he does it in the pulpit or elsewhere. I say the doctrine of a burning literal hell is a slander upon God, and any parson that teaches it is a slanderer. The work of Christ is to bring about a perfect redemption. Not only will sin be destroyed, but the consequences of sin upon this earth will be abolished, so that the earth will be restored to its Eden condition; and the Lord having redeemed His people will restore to them one pure language. (See Zep. 3:9.) We read that the Spirit of the Lord is to be poured out upon all flesh. When this occurs not only will the human kind be affected, but the animals, created for a wise purpose, shall become docile. Then shall the prophecies be fulfilled. "And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand upon the cockatrice's den; they shall not hurt or destroy in all my

holy mountain, for the earth (not heaven; we are not talking about heaven), shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the seas; and you shall not have to say to your neighbor: 'Know ye the Lord, but all shall know Him from the least to the greatest.' (Isa. 11:6-9; Isa. 40:4; Isa. 65:21-25; and Amos 9:13.)

A Transformed Earth.

I remember having a discussion with a revered gentleman several years ago. I chanced to quote Isaiah 11:6-7: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling, together; and a little child shall lead them, and the cow and the bear shall feed and their young ones shall lie down together and the lion shall eat straw like the ox." He pitied me for my ignorance and said: "Ladies and gentlemen, that is not to be literalized; that is descriptive of the spiritual ecstasies that shall be enjoyed by the converted. To illustrate, he said: Now we come to a revival meeting, the husband takes a seat in the rear of the church, commonly called the "sinners corner." During the meeting the wife finds the Lord, or in other words, is converted. She repents of her sins, she is filled with a lamb-like spirit; but the man is not converted, the meeting closes, husband and wife go home together; they only have one bedroom, and hence the lamb and the lion lie down together." Now, don't let anybody in this audience think that I am ridiculing the Bible; I am merely ridiculing the nonsensical interpretation the preacher put upon it. I meekly replied, perhaps that is so, but the Bible says: "The lion shall eat straw like the ox." Will that make the poor husband chew straw? The facts are, the spirit of God is going to be poured out upon all flesh and will bring back to Eden conditions, whether we be man, lamb or lion. When God's power came upon the lions they became pretty good friends with Daniel. Another says: Since the curse the earth is filled with valleys and hills and mountains. True, my friends, but the Bible says every valley shall be brought up, the mountains brought down; in a word, every curse is to be removed. Do we not read: "There shall be no more curse?" While in the face of this we are told the curse is to continue eternally.

Heaven Comes Down to Earth.

We have been taught to believe that at death we would go to heaven, enter the Holy City, the New Jerusalem. Now, just notice, the New Jerusalem is described in the 21st chapter of Revelation. It is fifteen hundred miles square, or in Bible terms, twelve thousand furlongs. I believe I learned at school eight furlongs made a mile. It is to have twelve gates, the walls are of jasper, the gates of pearl, the streets of gold, and the blessed of the Lord are to live in the city. John says: "I saw the Holy City, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven." Some might say, Mr. Evans, you don't understand Greek and Hebrew. Perhaps not, but you cannot make me believe that coming down in Greek means going up in English. Paul speaks of the hope of Abraham and the faithful, as follows: "And Abraham looked for a city, which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." (Heb. 11:10.) Here is a solid city, not a fancy, not a dream, but something with solidity about it, and so the faith of the Former Day Saints and the Latter Day Saints is fully supported by the Bible. The earth will be redeemed, Christ will return; a complete reconciliation between God and man will result, death shall pass away, there shall be no more sorrow, nor crying, nor pain; but every creature will join in the song of redemption, singing blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. May we be enabled to join in this holy chorus is my earnest prayer.

