

Moody Bible Institute Monthly

MARCH, 1922

EDITORIAL NOTES

"So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun; and behold the tears of such as were oppressed and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power; but they had no comforter."—Ecclesiastes 4:1.

And how can such things be, if indeed the God who rules above is almighty and all-good? Vice and godlessness and violence and wrong are rampant from pant upon every side, and the Loaf yet the heavens above keep silence.

The infidel appeals to the fact in proof that the Christian's God is but a myth. The Christian finds in it a further proof that the God he worships is patient and long-suffering, patient because He is eternal, and long-suffering because He is almighty, for wrath is a last resource with power.—Sir Robert Anderson in *The Coming Prince*.

* * *

Many books on the book of Revelation are being written in these days, and we feel obliged to caution our readers against most of them.

"The Revelation of Jesus Christ" For that reason we call attention to the carefully thought-out article on another page (which is really a review of one of them, though unnamed), from the pen of the Rev. Charles L. Briggs, of the Methodist Episcopal church. The limited space we could afford him necessitated a condensation of his material which taxes the attention of the reader, but the effort will be well repaid as we can testify from a third perusal of it.

Revelation is a very practical book as he shows, and peculiarly adapted to comfort and instruct the saints of God in these troublous times. The relation of the individual to the group and the Christian citizen to the nation of which he is a part, is briefly but impressively set forth, as also that of the material and the spiritual in the divine program.

Mr. Briggs is not open to the charge of extreme premillennialism, hence that which he says of the teaching of the Bible as to our Lord's return will have special weight also, and make its own contribution to the strengthening of faith and the quickening of hope in His coming. What he says harmonizes beautifully with Mr. Max Reich's illuminative comments on Isaiah's prophecies, which our readers will appreciate.

Parents, pastors, Sunday-school superintendents, Christian workers, whatever you miss in your reading of the

"Feed My Lambs" just to the extent of changing its title. He called it simply and beautifully "Feed My Lambs," but we hoped to have more particular attention drawn to it by the heading "Who Makes the Best Sunday-school Teacher"?

In our own pastoral experience we would no more have thought of placing an unconverted man or woman in charge of a Sunday-school class than of asking a blind man to paint the colors of the sky. In the absence of that prerequisite, education and pedagogical acquirement cut no figure and presented no argument.

The best Sunday-school teacher for the young we ever had under our pastoral direction, the one who stands out most markedly from all the rest, was a girl about twenty whose cultural advantages were almost nil; her father was a hostler, her mother took in washing and ironing to eke out the family income, and she herself worked in a shop. But she knew God and His Word, she loved the Saviour, she loved little children, and she understood how to reach their hearts and to lead them out into a true acceptance of Him and confession of His name. Children from homes of wealth and refinement were under her spiritual care, and their parents, when they knew Christ, were earnestly desirous to have it so.

During the past decade circumstances have made it necessary for us to peruse many books on Sunday-school pedagogy. They have been bright, entertaining, sincere, up-to-date according to current educational ideals, but Dr. Hazard's characterization of "obstructive and entangling rubbish" fits them very well, if one remembers that rubbish furnishes the breeding place for poisonous germs.

With the fewest exceptions, indeed none that we can promptly recall, these books started out with the assumption that children were by nature in right relationship to God; the new birth was not named as a necessity; the Bible was treated not very differently from other literature, and as might be expected under such circumstances, Christ saved people, so far as they needed to be saved, by His life and not by His death.

Sunday-school teachers fed on that kind of chaff are not likely to dispense the true wheat to their spiritual charges. But read Dr. Hazard's article.

* * *

Two educational leaders have spoken, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and Dr. Ernest

Breakdown of Modern Education Martin Hopkins, president of Dartmouth College, and the two are agreed. Dr. Butler, in

his annual report, discusses the notion of long standing, that a college is merely a club with incidental facilities for reading and study. Because of this impression, there is going out into American life a substantial group of men "as undisciplined and uneducated, both in mind and morals, as if they had enjoyed no advantages whatever."

Dr. Hopkins carries the idea further, and affirms that this condition of things has existed for many years. The *Chicago Daily News* quotes him as saying in an interview, that "the present generation is suffering from a scarcity of leaders intellectually capable of keeping abreast of the times. In other words, we may be on the brink of another of the 'dark ages' which dragged civilization down in the past."

Whether the colleges can produce leaders able to cope with the situation, he does not know, but higher education, in his opinion, is the best hypothesis. It is the cry of the political reformer, the cure of democracy is more democracy.

On the whole, those who still stand on the declaration of Scripture that God "will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent," have no reason as yet to change their position. The cry about modern scholarship demolishing the traditional view of the Scriptures and the doctrines of the Christian faith is something like a false alarm, thus far, and until the colleges have provided those great leaders which the world is waiting for, the humble preacher and disciple of Christ may with impunity continue the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. (1 Cor. 1:18-21.)

* * *

Some time last winter a Christian worker asked us to name two or three books which he could put in the hands of

of healing. Spiritism has connected with its healings and other signs. So has New Thought, and the ever multiplying physical cults for which new names are constantly coined. Dowieism, that cunning mixture of truth and error, founded by one who claimed to be some great one, claims miracles of healing. But above all, the different Pentecostal sects claim to have wonderful healings, veritable miracles.

So do others, like the Bosworth Brothers. They seem to utilize a certain Labor organ for advertising purposes. Let me read to you what appeared in head lines in a single issue, the claims which are made by these men. And let me add that in Toronto, Detroit, and other places numerous cases have been investigated and it was found that not one was genuine; these men and others have been challenged to bring forth evidences that what is reported is true. I have investigated the supposed miracles of Mrs. McPherson and other healers with the same results. But let me read the sensational claims printed in the "Labor Tribune." All appeared in one issue: "Wholly deaf healed." "Nervous twitching cured." "Specialists said incurable—healed." "Sick 20 years; operated on 14 times; prayed for and healed." "Was deaf but now hears." "Had nervous prostration; had 28 doctors in 21 months; instantly healed." "Ear drum gone; 17 doctors failed; now instantly healed." "Had paralysis; healed by reading the 'Labor Tribune.'"

Fake Healings

"Miracles and Wonders at the Bosworth meetings." "Ear drum restored after being removed"!! "Had many diseases; prayed for; cured." "Had eczema 14 years; cured." "Indian fighter and rough rider known as ossified man wins in terrific fight against death." "Foul, revolting cancer healed through prayer." "Tried 20 doctors; instantly healed." "Born paralyzed, now well."(!) "Right leg one and a half inch shorter than left leg; anointed and leg made as long as the other" (!) "Eighty years old; healed of rupture." "Living without kidneys; world's most miraculous case healed" (!) "Lost voice restored." "Lost eyesight restored." "Tumor and asthma; completely healed." "Toes turned up 15 years; pain ended by reading 'Labor Tribune'" (!) "Serious case of neuritis healed." "Double hernia healed." "Instantly healed of astigmatism" (!) "Healed from spinal meningitis." "Suffered 25 years from ingrowing goitre—healed." "Curvature of spine disappears instantly" (!) "Abscess of hip 13 years; now like a newborn babe." "Appendicitis flees," etc., etc.

Just look at it! An ear-drum removed, we suppose by an operation, and then miraculously restored. A woman living without kidneys. It is purely a religious humbug, a lying delusion, abominable falsehoods. As to the "miracle woman," Mrs. McPherson, there have been so many exposures of her "healings" that no further word seems to be needed.

The matter of answered prayer in case of sickness is an entirely different matter. Every believer knows the promise our Lord has given, that if we ask any thing in His name, and if it is in accordance with His will that it shall be done. Into this I cannot enter at this time. Nor can I point out the different passages of Scripture which are misused by these Pentecostal and other healers.

Cessation of Certain Gifts

Let me state a few facts in conclusion. Certain gifts in the body of Christ have disappeared. Miracles and signs were prominent in the beginning of this dispensation for they were needed then. The beginning of the age was Jewish and the Jew "asks for a sign." He wants to see and then believe. As long as the New Testament revelation was not complete these sign gifts, on account of their evidential character, were prevalent even among the Gentile believers, as it was the case in Corinth. But when God had completed His Word and given all He had to reveal to man, then the true character of the age became evident. It became as it is still, the age of Faith, and not the age of sight. The heavens became silent. No more revelation, no more visions, no more prophetic, no more angelic manifestations, no more miracles. Man is to believe, to trust, to walk by faith.

Furthermore these sign gifts, like the gift of miracles, the gift of tongues and the interpretation of tongues are not needed for the completion of the body of Christ, nor for the perfecting of the saints. Please compare here I Corinthians 12:28 with Ephesians 14:11-13. Why are the sign gifts mentioned in the former passage and why are they omitted in the epistle in which the full revelation concerning the church, the body of Christ, is given? For the simple reason that these gifts are useless for the real edification of the body of Christ.

But may we not expect a revival of apostolic power and gifts, a revival of signs and miracles, before the Lord comes? Pentecostalism claims this, but what saith the Scriptures? The age ends not in a restoration of miracles, but it ends in apostasy. Yes, signs and miracles and wonders will appear in the very close of this age, but these will be the miracles and wonders of Satan's masterpiece, the coming man of sin. (2 Thess. 2.)

I wonder if these present day claims and delusions, these most subtle manifestations of demon powers are not the way-preparers of greater delusions? Surely Satan stalks about in the garb of an angel of light. God help His true church to resist him and hold close to the Truth of God.

Second Day's Proceedings

Thursday, February 2

DR. GRAY.—Now we desire that our dear friend and brother, Professor Wilson, shall have every moment of this hour that it is possible to give him. So we will omit all introductions and all notices and announcements.

It is very seldom that a popular conference like this has the opportunity to sit in a Princeton class-room, and we are to have that opportunity and privilege this morning, tomorrow morning, and Saturday morning at least, at this same hour. It gives me very great pleasure to present to you Professor Wilson.

EXTERNAL TESTIMONY TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

By Professor Robert Dick Wilson, D.D.

I am one of those old moss-back Presbyterians. Some people make their charge against us down at Princeton as

if it were a term of reproach, but age is not always something to be considered a matter to apologize for. God is old; the universe is old; and after all, nearly all the great things of human life are old as the everlasting hills. The Word of God is old. We trust it largely because it has stood the test of the ages past. Humanity in all the ages has been very much alike, at least in historic times, and the Book that has met the longings, the aspirations and the necessities of the human race in the ages past is meeting our longings and our necessities today.

It has been charged against my method of defense of the Old Testament that it is harmonistic. I take the term as a word of honor; a word of common-sense; a word of commendation for our rationality.

Necessity of a Controlling Idea

Any man that ever writes a book should have an idea and a purpose. Around that central idea and purpose he should make all his arguments to cluster, make every statement of the book, if possible, to tend toward and terminate in the great purpose of the book. If a man preaches a sermon, he must have one great central idea in the sermon. Everything he says; every illustration that he employs should tend to get that idea into the heads of his hearers. When a man goes to treat a book like the Bible, he should have a purpose in his mind. He must come to it with some theory of God and the universe, of man; and take my word for it and use your own reason and you will agree with me that no man ever, as a matter of fact, does write about the Bible but that he has come to it and writes with some theory in his mind about it. It is not a matter of harmony; it is a matter of a theory that causes the harmony.

The Theory of Harmonization

Now the Christian goes to the Bible with the theory of the universe. He believes that God is the cause of all things; that He made all things that are seen and all things invisible. He made man, placed him on this earth, endowed him with all his capacities. Man believes that there is a purpose and end in the universe; that this end is the glory of God. He believes that this great cause of the universe has this great purpose in His mind and always had it, and that all that has transpired and all things that exist in it are but the means to subserve the great purpose of man in the existence of all things, the glory of God. And with this theory in mind, a man who thus believes comes to the Bible and necessarily in his treatment of it tries to make all that it contains to harmonize with God and the universe and man, with the cause and purpose of all things. Not a reproach, but a defender of the Bible is harmonization.

The Evolutionary Theory of History

I claim also that these very men that made that charge as if it were a reproach come to the Bible also with a theory of the universe. Let us take these modern theorists who discuss the history of man. Take, if you please, Mr. Buttle in his history of the intellectual development of Europe. Mr. Buttle also has a theory, and he tries to harmonize the history of the human race with that theory. His theory is the evolutionary theory of history, and he has three great forces—physical, moral and intellectual, and he claims that the intellectual is the greatest of these three forces; that it controls the

physical advancement of man; that it shapes and molds the moral status of man, and that all ages in advancement in the human race in history are caused by the development of the mind of man.

Mr. Marx, the great Socialist, has a theory of evolution, and he claims that the great force that has molded the human race in history is the necessity of economic conditions; that the physical environment of man in the struggle for existence in this world as it has been in the past has shaped and molded the history of the human race.

The Rationalism of H. G. Wells

Mr. H. G. Wells, in his history which has been so much talked about lately, also has a theory of evolution, and he attempts to harmonize with that theory the whole history of man, not merely as revealed in documents but as he has endeavored to gather it from the strata of geology and the fragments of archaeology, and of various conjectures as to what may have been or must have been, according to his opinion, before historic times. Mr. Wells (if you will pardon me)—it is very hard to tell what Mr. Wells does believe, for he belongs to that great school of rational thinkers who are fond of calling themselves rationalists; people that reason things out and are casting reproach upon us old-time traditionalists who believe that there were great thinkers of old, some who had revelations given to them, like Isaiah, Moses and Paul. The Son of God Himself came down from the Father to reveal His will to man. Great philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, who investigated the human mind in the history of man, and who have left us their thoughts for us to study. I say Mr. Wells belongs to that vast human throng of thinkers (they are very fond of calling themselves thinkers) who go to bed at night and write as if after ten hours' rest they might waken up the next morning in a grand new system of the universe, ready-made, to be written about and exposed for general acceptance to all the rest of the human race, but with the great reservation that they themselves reserve the right to change their system overnight again and broach an entirely new theory of the universe along the development of man. A brand new system of religion over-night! It puts you in mind of going down the street and seeing a little notice above a cobbler's shop, "Shoes repaired while you wait."

The Unknowable Mr. Wells

Well, now, we can read an ordinary philosopher like Plato or Augustine and find out what they mean, but these modern philosophers of the School of Wells, you read ten pages, like the conclusion of his history, and you will pardon me for not being more exact, it is very difficult to quote Mr. Wells and say he believes this and thus and so, for he varies like a weather-cock. You look up and it is pointing north—no, it is pointing quite south, and you never know exactly where to find it. He is like that little animal which I call the evanescent flea—you think you've got him, but he is not there. Now if you don't agree with me in my estimate of Mr. Wells, you just read that last chapter of his history and see if you don't agree with me. It is hard to find out what he means, but he is an evolutionist all right, and he claims that education is everything; only educate the human race in science, that is the prin-

cipal thing. Only get them to believe that they came out of somehow or another, not very clear how. Somehow they came through, it is not quite clear. There are not enough plastics to make up a skeleton of our existence of olden times. Granting all that, however, that isn't in my argument today, when he comes down to the present he is going to get us out of all our troubles simply by education. Well, there are educations and educations. Of course, the only education that he would suggest would be the education *a la* Wells. He will make the set of education. But how that's going to get us out of our moral difficulties it is not quite clear.

What Made Things Evolve?

You know, I studied in Berlin two years. I know the German method. I lived in the midst of it. Their principle of cult is the development by each man of his own soul, his intellect, his aspects, his optics. Well, I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, so far as I know, but those men never seem to have any motive. Not one of these evolutionary thinkers has any cause back of the universe nor back of man. What made these things evolve; what started the whole creation and life on this line of evolution? What kept it going? What is the force, the energy? There is something back of it all that made it go, and Mr. Wells and the rest of them, Marx and Buttle and all of them, have no place to go to. They have no heaven; they have no hell; they have no future for you or me or the human race. It is a movement from nowhere to nowhere.

The Christian View Rational

Now that may satisfy the minds of some, but I think the Christian system is more rational than any evolutionary system like this I have mentioned of history that has ever been thus far propounded. Because whatever else you may say of this system revealed in the Bible, you must admit that it has perpetuity sufficient to have produced all the effects that are visible or have been visible in the history of the human race. Here is a God, visible, in whom all things consist. Ah, that satisfies my mind, and if you embrace it it will satisfy yours. Just make the God big enough, not some wizened, little creature of your own imagination that you have made and call it God, but a God that fills all space and time, and made the stars and sun and angels and principalities and power and man, with all his genius and all his capacity. A God that has a purpose, whether visible to us or not in its entirety in the creation of all these things. No better term can be found to express this idea than the glory—THE GLORY—of God. Get that thought into your mind. Carry it with you all through your life, that the glory of God is the purpose of all things visible, the manifestation of His wisdom and power and grace and mercy in the salvation of men that satisfies.

Around this central thought it is the duty of every Christian to harmonize and centralize all his own life, life of the whole world now and in the past, and therein we can rest content. Amid all the shifting scenes of this world's history, from the time in the distant past, when human records first were written on the walls of the temples of Egypt or over there on the table of Babylon, down to

the present. With this idea in mind that God is indeed all, then we can harmonize the human history with the central thought.

Importance of the Right Method

I have dwelt upon this because I want you all to understand I have a method in my madness. I have thought of what I am talking about here. I want you to understand that the method is largely the trouble with all our modern thinking people in the discussion of the Bible. If you go to the Bible with a theory that there is no God or that He has never revealed Himself or that He takes no interest in human affairs, of course you will throw the Bible away, for it is full of God as the sparks fly upward. But if you go there with the belief that there is a God, that He has revealed Himself, then the Bible is an easy book. Its miracles and its predictive prophecy are just the thoughts of God expressing themselves a little ahead of time in His prediction, manifesting themselves by the manipulation of forces unknown to us in its miracles, all conspiring together to manifest the one true God to His ignorant sons of men.

The Arrogance of False Scholarship

Now these critics of the Bible—I mean these men (everybody ought to be a critic of the Bible): "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged." I am a critic of the Bible. Critic means simply one that judges of it. We are all critics—we ought to be—but I mean these critics that go to the Bible in order to find fault. They have a most singular way of claiming to themselves all knowledge and all virtue and all love of truth. One of their favorite phrases which you will find in every book they have written in the last twenty-five years in this country is "all scholars believe or agree." I use that in my class down there in Princeton when I get a lot of juniors fresh from college and universities. You know in most of my classes I have nothing but seminary graduates. They are not merely graduates from colleges and universities but seminaries, or they have been ten or fifteen years in the foreign field, and I can't pull the wool over their eyes and dogmatize. I have to show them what I have, how I got it, and there is no chance to escape. I can't run away. They quiz me from A to Z, and chase me from Dan to Beer-sheba. So I have to be, as it were, on the quivive. I have got men there just as bright as any of you. (I'm not hurting anybody's feelings, am I?) And we all try to find out the facts, but sometimes there is a particularly obstreperous junior, just fresh from college, maybe taken a year extra. And it is not merely the ones who have gone through college but the ones who have attended fellowships in Yale, or Chicago University, and they are likely to become a little obstreperous at times. That's when I use that phrase "all scholars agree."

But sometimes one professor knows more than all scholars, whatever they may agree on. Of course they will admit that when it is a matter of Hebrew. I claim one man may know more Hebrew than fifty or perhaps a thousand, or maybe than a million, or perhaps than one hundred million, or probably more than a thousand million people. Yes, it might be possible that one man would know

more Hebrew than all the world. Do you catch the trend of that remark? When a man writes a book and gains a point by saying "all scholars agree," I wish to know who the scholars are, and why they agree. What's back of that? Where do they get their evidence from to start with?

I remember some years ago I was investigating that word which you have seen in your English Bible "Going through the valley of Baca, make there a well." Now you know when people are reading their Bible and they come to a word like that the preachers become very pious, get on that solemn, oratorical tone "Going through the Valley of Baca," just as when they are reading a Psalm they come to "Selah." When a boy, a preacher would read the word "Selah" so solemn it would make shivers run all over you. Well, of course, if he had told us "Selah" was a word as to whose meaning nobody could be certain at present, it would have taken away the mystery, but the word "Selah" seemed very mysterious. So I looked and found in the Hebrew dictionary that there was a traveler named Burkhart who said the word "Baca" meant mulberry tree. That wasn't very enlightening. I could not see how mulberries had anything to do with water. I looked up all the authority of the scholars in Germany and in England since Burkhart's time and found they had quoted Burkhart. Just one scholar back of it.

The Valley of Baca

When I was traveling in the Orient I found we had delicious water here and there. The water sprang up apparently out of the ground in the midst of the desert. I asked my brother, who is a missionary, where this water came from. He said they bring this water from the mountains. It is an underground aqueduct. They cover it over to keep it from evaporating. Now the name of that underground aqueduct was Baca. Now you have a right to your own interpretation, but I thought that that made better sense, so I render that "Going through the valley where there is an underground aqueduct, sink therein a well and draw forth cool water." That means something to me at least; the other didn't.

But my point was that you ought to be able to trace back this agreement of the scholars to the original scholar that propounded the statement, and then find out whether aught that fellow said is true. What was the foundation of his statement?

The Historical Method

Now we will say we come to the second charge that is made against the defense of the Bible. First they say we use the harmonistic method, and secondly we don't use the historical method. I enjoy Higher Criticism. When I want to have a little fun, if you will pardon me for taking amusement out of so serious a matter, I get a work by one of these higher critics, and I can hardly read a page or two without enjoying one of the hardest laughs you could ever imagine an Irishman giving. They charge we don't use the historical method. It almost makes a man think he oughtn't ever open his mouth again in public when a man charges you don't use the historical method. But what is the historical method? Why this would

ordinarily mean that nobody has a right to defend the Scriptures at all by appealing to history; that the only method to be used is the method they use, and to use some other method is wrong. They call theirs the historical method, and try to get a hearing. It catches the boys and the girls nowadays by using a big term like that, saying we defenders of the Bible don't use the historical method, therefore we must be wrong.

Now let us consider that. This is preliminary to my other lectures. I deny that point blank, and if you will pardon me for saying it in this language, I throw it in your teeth. What is the historical method? While the historical method as defined by the best scholars has been met and well met, I am going to appeal to you, and don't intend to take a definition out of the dictionary, and am going to explain to you what a real historical method is. The first man that wrote on this subject in the modern times was a Dane, in German called Nebor, and he applied what is called the modern historical method to the history of ———. He was followed in England by Sir George Arnold Eustice in his *History of the Roman Empire*, who in his two great volumes on that subject lays down the first principle of historical method as pursued by modern investigators. If any of you want to read a good book on that subject, there is one called *The Historical Method*, by Mr. George, a Master of Arts in Oxford University, published about ten years ago, where he treats the whole subject very well. You can read the article on history in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and you will find what I am giving you is omitted of these great writers.

The True Historical Method

I want you to see that the method pursued by your humble servant is correct. The first principle of the historical method is that as far as possible every document must be judged first of all by contemporary evidence. A second principle is that the contemporary evidence must, if possible, be from the locality in which the events transpired. A third principle would be that the man that gave this corroboratory evidence could not well have left out the time the document under investigation was written at or near the place, but he should have had knowledge of the languages spoken at that place, so as to enable him to get first-hand information. And lastly, he must have had honesty enough, been unbiased enough when he had given us this information to have given us the true information.

I wish there were all lawyers here, and Judges of the Supreme Court. You lawyers or those that have studied the law of evidence will see that I am just giving the law of evidence. A first-class witness must have lived at the time that the thing occurred and have been there, and must have had eyes to see if he says he saw, and ears to hear if he says he heard. And he must have had intelligence enough to judge of what he saw and heard and to repeat it—a good memory, if possible, and then honesty not to perjure himself.

Now this method, you see, is merely an application to historic documents of what would apply to an ordinary witness in a court of law. Now then that's a method that I pursue in all my works.

But now you know, if there are any lawyers here they can stand by me, at any rate I can give my own testimony for this. When there is a trial in court, say a case of insanity, and they are going to test the sanity of some person, a witness is called in, a physician. Now either side may challenge the ability of that witness to testify. I knew a case where a man was called by the prosecution physician, and as he began to testify for the defense the prosecution tried to have him turned out as non-expert because he was testifying against him, but the court ruled, as it was their own witness, he couldn't do that. But if a man is called as an expert, the first thing that has to be done is to establish the fact that he is an expert. You will find this treated very fully in Stephens great work on *The Law of Evidence*. That's the part of law I studied, because it has to do with my subject.

Value of Expert Testimony

Now somebody's got to establish the fact that a certain witness is an expert. One expert may be worth more than a million others that are not experts. Catch that? Well, don't you see? Suppose I study and can read Babylonian to some extent. I might know more Babylonian than this whole audience; at any rate if I could write any and you could write none I would be more expert than you. Now listen to this: Before a man has a right to speak about the Old Testament history and language and paleography I think it is about time for the Christian Church to demand that such a man shall establish his right to speak as an expert upon this question.

Brilliance Is Not Scholarship

I say here that it is my opinion that no man under fifty has any right to discuss the great questions concerning the origin and the transmission of the Old Testament books, and if you will look into the history of the church in the last one hundred fifty years you will find that most of these assaults on the Bible have been made by young men of between thirty and forty years of age. This is true today. Eloquent preachers, rhetoricians, fine appeals made, exaltation of alleged scholarship. You mark my word. There is no man or woman living that can know enough by forty to write anything worth reading, at least to me. You may read it if you want, but I won't, about the Old Testament. It can't be done. One of the first things I try to impress upon my men down at Princeton is that there are many things that can not be determined by native brilliancy. Facts in evidence don't depend on brilliancy. A brilliant man that wasn't there can't serve as a witness where a clodhopper who saw the deed would make a first-class witness. And I have just to keep at that. I get it into those students eventually. Like the Rabbi who repeated one hundred forty-four times, repeated one hundred forty-four more and they didn't know it yet. Then he repeated it one hundred forty-four times more, and at the end of that time, the story goes, they all understood. But one of the first things you want to get into the head of young people today, and the young women (they are just as good as the young men at putting forth the idea that they stood first in college and their brilliancy enables them to speak upon the facts of ancient history, just as Mr. Wells and the rest of them.)

Inconsistency of False Scholarship

You know they can tell you what a man must have written, said and done one hundred twenty-five years ago. But you have noticed that many of these men that declare they don't believe in a revelation from God or an inspiration, can set it down in their system. They will tell you Isaiah never could have thought of a resurrection back there 700 B. C., but somebody thought of it back there 2,400 years ago. Here's an evolutionist that says it took 500,000 years for me to be produced from my primitive ancestor, and he will talk about ten or twenty thousand years as if it were nothing in the evolution of the human race. And here is a professor who has got it down so fine he will tell you that the idea of resurrection couldn't have been evolved by 2600 years ago. There are only 2,500,000 years among us, 2,600 or 2,400 years ago, yes. I can see it could have taken just 497,600 years to develop the idea of a resurrection, but it couldn't have taken 497,400. What is 200 years in the doctrine of a resurrection? Brilliance won't do it.

Anything I may say to you will do you no good. I am here for a purpose. I used to be an evangelist. I do my work as a professor in Princeton Seminary just as seriously as I ever did my work as an evangelist. I get after the souls of my men, and I don't care so much whether they fill their heads with a lot of dates, as long as they get what I am getting after, that is, regarding God, so they will never lose their belief as long as they live.

In my lectures I am going to give you after discussing my method, I will give you the reasons why I have reason to speak upon this subject as an expert witness. Just as an expert is called before the court of law to tell why he has a right to speak, I am going to show you why I have a right to speak. How the Lord has given me the education necessary. Now I am not going to enlarge upon it. I am giving it in general today. Tomorrow I will tell you how the Lord has given me the time and the opportunity to devote myself now for forty-five years continuously since I left college to the one great study of the Old Testament in all its languages, and in all its archaeology, in all its translations, and as far as possible everything bearing upon its text and upon its history. And I am going to tell you this so that you will be able to see why I can speak and do speak as an expert and as a bi-product. I hope that the young men and young women that I am addressing will perhaps be able to see that a plan in life may sometimes be carried out to a conclusion, and if you want to accomplish all that is possible to do for God in this world, have big plans, plans that require time or health, probable success or failure, but determine you are going to take your talents and employ them to the very best and work as hard as in you lies, and determine as a Christian that you will be ready to defend, as far as possible, that system of doctrine and that Word of God to which you have consecrated yourself.

Defense Instead of Apology

I am tired of these ministers of the Gospel that are always apologizing for the remnants of faith that they now possess. Why should a man that professes to believe the Bible and in Jesus

Christ always be going around searching, as it were, for further evidence against that book? Why shouldn't he be determined to stand by his colors and defend the faith until it shall be absolutely certain that there is no possibility of standing longer? The result of all my forty-five years of study of Bible has led me all the time to a firmer faith that in the old Testament we have a true historical account of the history of the Israelite people, and I have a right to commend this to some of these bright men and women that think they can laugh and smile at the old-time Christian and believer in the Word of God. The most critical, radical review in Germany had an article by a professor twelve years ago, in which he said over his own signature that no man today has a right to deny the possibility of Israelite history as recorded in the Old Testament. Just want you to know I do not stand alone. That's the position of a radical. The trend of things today is to a belief in the veracity of the history of the Old Testament.

THE UNITY OF THE SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE LORD JESUS

By Dr. Arno C. Gaebelien

(Scripture read: John 5:36-47)

"Search the scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." The Scriptures—they are they which testify of Me. We are all familiar with the story of the fifth chapter in the Gospel of John. After our blessed Lord had healed the lame man on the Sabbath day, the Jews wanted to kill Him, and when He spoke to them He gave one of the most wonderful witnesses concerning Himself, which we have in Scripture, starting with that significant sentence, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" and then the Jews sought to kill Him. Three times this is recorded in the Gospel of John, that they tried to stone the Lord of Glory, and each time because He witnessed to His own wonderful personality.

If the Lord Jesus had said "Our Father worketh hitherto, and I work," not a single Jew would have reached down to pick up a stone, but when He said "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," every Jew with his shrewd mind and keen discernment at once realized that this Man made Himself equal with God.

I have sometimes met Unitarians in Boston and elsewhere who said they could not understand why Christians should believe in the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. That according to their point of view there was nothing in the Gospels to warrant such a belief. I think this speaks very badly for the Bostonian intellect of the present century, when nineteen hundred years ago those Jews at once knew when He said, "My Father," that He claimed equality with God.

The Claims of Jesus Christ

After this, He speaks of Himself as doing the same works that the Father doeth, that He has the same power which the Father has to raise the dead, that judgment is committed into His hands, and that honor and worship belong to Him as much as they belong to the Father. Then after that precious portion in this chapter in which the Lord Jesus speaks more particularly on life eternal and the gift of that life, and the power

of resurrection which belongs to Him, He once more speaks of the witness concerning Himself, and then finally He refers to the Scriptures, "Search the scriptures . . . they are they which testify of me."

Our Lord in speaking to the Jews could only mean the Old Testament because the New Testament was not yet in existence. Certainly the New Testament testifies of Him in harmony with the Old Testament Scriptures, but it is the Old Testament, that portion of God's Holy Word which is so much slandered and belittled today, which the Lord Jesus has in mind, telling the Jews and telling us that He Himself is the theme of the Old Testament Scriptures. And the marvellous thing of this Old Testament is that there were different men, holy men of God, chosen instruments who wrote the different books, who wrote at different times, and in different circumstances, most of them unknown save through their names, and yet when we study that which was penned by them, we find the most wonderful unity in their testimony concerning the one Person, the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ. This unity of Scripture testimony in the Old Testament points to one Author, and that Author who directed every pen and who gave every word is none other but the Holy Spirit.

In the first Epistle of Peter we find in the first chapter a very blessed statement which gives us the key to the testimony of Scripture concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.

"Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." (1 Peter 1:9-11.)

The Unity of Scripture Testimony

Now, according to this Divine statement, the Old Testament Scriptures in testifying concerning Christ must be found to testify of two things: the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. This is indeed the case. Whenever we turn to our Old Testament Scriptures to read them, from Genesis to Malachi, let us bear in mind, here is found the testimony of the Spirit of God concerning one Person and concerning that Person's sufferings and glory.

As long as time permits, in a very brief way, I want to carry you through the body of the Old Testament Scriptures, and point out which I am sure must be very familiar to you, but oh, how it is needed today to give out that which is so very simple to bear witness to this matchless Book, and its matchless and unspeakable theme, the Person of our Lord.

Why the Attack Upon Genesis?

Genesis is the seed plot of the whole Bible. It is the entire Bible in miniature. In this beginning of the Word of God, everything must be of necessity prophetic, looking on toward the future. Even in the creation account, and in the second chapter which is not another account, but the supplementary account of the relationships in this creation, there are the blessed types of our Lord. But when you come to the third chapter you

evidently doesn't like it, because like a pistol shot she says, "I have no husband." That is what we call in the Latin, the suppression of the true and the suggestion of the false.

Arousing the Conscience

But you see what the Lord has done. He has begun the *third* step, the step of arousing her conscience. There was something wrong in her life and until that something had been put right, the living water for which she asked could not be hers. So she doesn't like this appeal to her conscience, but the Lord is not willing to let her alone and goes on to tell her of her past life, quoting a number of things, and all the while the woman's conscience is being probed by this stranger who knows her through and through. That is the point to our preaching and teaching that I fancy we need to emphasize today more than ever. It is not difficult to attract the heart, but the hard thing is to tell people of their own sins. Preach to the conscience. Men like to be popular, but people who preach to the conscience as a rule are not likely to be very popular. If people call a spade a spade and not an instrument of husbandry they will perhaps be boycotted, and yet we have got to preach to the conscience.

Story of the Pet Lamb

You will remember a story of two men. One sent to tell another man of a rich man who had a large number of sheep and lambs, and of another poor man who had one pet lamb that was almost like a child, and when a stranger came he spared to take of his own flocks and herds, but took the little pet lamb of the poor man. As the man heard this story his feelings were stirred and he began to be angry and said, "As the Lord liveth the man that hath done this thing shall surely die." Then later the assertion, "Thou art the man," touched his conscience after it had stirred his feelings. Thus you and I can stir the feelings, but what about the conscience. "Thou art the man."

Fencing With Conscience

You will notice this woman, how she fenced with it. When she found the Lord touching on these things she tried to avoid it by talking about religion. That is how the unconverted one will show his attitude. Nothing is more interesting to the unconverted man than to talk about religion. He tells you all about the Jews and Samaritans of the present time, whoever they may be, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, or the Episcopalians. Anything so long as you keep away from his conscience. You and I know in our pastoral visits how people will discuss these matters, so long as we keep away from their own personal concerns. But the Lord was not to be set aside, even by that discussion and kept the woman closely tied up, so to speak, with that great thought of her own sin in the sight of God. Now, it is no longer a question of Jew or Samaritan. Not a question of place or conditions. Not a question of where, but a question of how. The Father asks all spiritual worshippers to worship Him.

Assuring the Soul

Then I fancy the Samaritan woman seems to realize that it was no use discussing the matter further or else—I don't know which it was—she made a

final attempt to put the matter off altogether: "I know that (in some far off future time) Christ cometh, and when he is come we shall know whether the Jews or Samaritans are right." Then Jesus said unto her: "You need not wait for that far off time, I am he." And He revealed Himself to her, as He refused to reveal Himself to the Jews, and that is the *fourth* step. The step of assuring the soul. He revealed Himself to her as a personal present Saviour. "I that speak unto thee am he," and that is the last thing and the greatest thing you and I have to do, to reveal to our people the present, personal Saviour.

Urging Immediate Acceptance

It is just about fifty years ago last fall that D. L. Moody was preaching in Farwell Hall, Chicago, according to the old story, and at the close of the Sunday evening service he told the people to go home and think about what he had been saying and then he would speak to them again on the following Sunday night. He had hardly dismissed the assembly when the fire bell rang out and it was not long before Chicago was in ashes. After that, Mr. Moody said, "I never tell the people to go home and think about it. I offer them Christ for their immediate acceptance." And that is what the Lord did with that woman. It is what I want to do tonight. In view of what we have heard, with all these sermons concerning God, Christ, and the future, and His coming again, may He become part and parcel of our life in the revelation of a personal Saviour. We may have come into this church tonight unsaved. We may go out saved. We may have come into this church without Christ. We may go home resting in Him.

And so the Lord gave this woman a four-fold revelation. The revelation of love for the heart. The revelation of truth for the mind. The revelation of sin for the conscience, and the revelation of grace for the soul. That is the gospel of the grace of God which we preach, and in which we glory, and when people receive this into their hearts, a living, personal, present Christ, then they know in whom they have believed and they are persuaded that He is able to keep their deposit until the day of His appearing.

May we glory in this gospel for the heart, and the mind, and the conscience and the soul, and in our preaching and teaching may we never leave out one of these elements but declare to everybody who comes the whole gospel of God.

Third Day's Proceedings

Friday, February 3

DR. RALSTON—Some years ago (a good many of them), about twenty-five young men entered the Junior Class in Western Theological Seminary, at Pittsburgh. The elder Melancthon W. Jacobus was still there, and we had Dr. Archibald Alexander Hodge and we had one who served longer as a great theological professor, Benjamin B. Warfield, who as you know was recently called home, and of course was a fellow professor with our Dr. Wilson, who will speak to us this morning. There was also that great Bible scholar, Samuel H. Kellogg, to some of us the greatest Bible teacher

we ever knew, and who by his writings has influenced much thought of the Word. Those were days of giants in that institution. There were seven people in the seminary at that time of the same name—Wilson. There are more Wilsons there at the present time.

From Princeton came two of those students. Their names were Wilson. One of them was converted under the ministry of Dwight L. Moody, when Moody had that great meeting at Princeton University, and he turned from the expectation to be a lawyer to be a minister of the gospel. He became one of the greatest missionaries of the Presbyterian church, known practically all over the world for the great work he did in Persia. His brother is with us this morning. We will hear again from him on the theme upon the program.

EXTERNAL TESTIMONY TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. II.

By Professor Robert Dick Wilson, D. D.

It is the custom nowadays to distinguish between the law of evidence as used in courts and in science and in history. There is a distinction here which many fail to observe. And yet it is necessary for all real clear discussion of matters of history. It is not fair for anybody to demand a scientific demonstration of historic fact. Strictly speaking, we know nothing except what we can investigate and test for ourselves.

You may have studied chemistry and heard lectures and have been told that certain combinations of hydrogen and oxygen will make water, or that you can dissolve water into hydrogen and oxygen certain parts, and you believe it because the professor says so. But a professor performs in your sight and as you perform the experiment for yourself and you see with your own eyes that you can take water apart and make it into two gases, and call it whatever you please, (You do call it hydrogen and oxygen,) and you will see you can take those two parts and put them together into water. You see that and you know it, and this is said to have been demonstrated by evidence such as enables you to say, "I know."

Now when it comes to law, the purpose of a case in law is to make a decision as between two parties to a case, and the laws of evidence in a court of law are determined by precedent and experience, so that only certain kinds of evidence are admitted. Hearsay-evidence and second-hand evidence may be excluded. This is partly as a convenience, as the case may drag on for years and years and the very purpose of going to law would be done away with. So they have limited the kinds of evidence in courts of law. But a decision, when made, is made on the ground of probability. You cannot get to a scientific demonstration. If a man has been killed once, he is dead. You cannot resurrect him and have him killed over again in order to know how it was done, and so you can only take the testimony of witnesses,—if eye-witnesses, so much the better. A jury of twelve persons must come to a decision or be dismissed, but the purpose is a decision on the merits of the case.

Probability as a Ground of Decision

When we come to historical questions, however, it is not necessary to come to a

decision. Matters are to be decided on the ground of probability. Probability in one man's mind may be different from the probability in another man's mind. It is not necessary, however, always to come to any decision in your own mind at all. It may not be important enough. But whenever you do come to a decision you come to a decision on the ground of belief that there is preponderate evidence in favor of a certain decision. Now all historic questions are decided upon that ground. Strictly speaking, you never can know how the world was made. You can believe what the Word of God says about it. You may know by reading that the Word of God says a certain thing, and on the ground of that knowledge you have the belief that what it says is true. No scientist today has a right to speak scientifically as to the creation of the world. No scientist, more than you, can speak scientifically of the creation of the world, for he was not there and he can not test creation. He can believe. You may believe; he may believe that the world was made in a certain way, but he can not prove it, and he can not test it and he can not say "I know."

Theories of Historic Evidence

Now the law of evidence in historic matters has been lately discussed quite specifically in different authors. There are two schools, or two opinions, with regard to the use of evidence in historic matters. There is one represented by a Frenchman, Seignobos, that nothing in any historic record is to be believed in a single sentence unless you can produce corroborative evidence in proof of it. You may be able to prove every other sentence or statement in a document, but according to this school you could not believe the intervening statements unless you were able to bring corroborating evidence for them. That is an opinion which prevails largely among those who have never studied history very much. If you take that position, there is scarcely anything recorded in the history of the world that can be believed.

There is a saner view, as I think, which has been very well put forward in a work by Mr. George, of Oxford University, England, called "Historical Evidence." I would recommend that book to every student for the ministry or Sunday-school teacher, or everybody that is troubled about historic evidence. For he here lays down very clearly the law of evidence as it affects historic documents, and he maintains what I think to be the correct view, that if you take any historic document and can test it at certain points as to the statements made in it and you find it stands the test that can be made, you are safe in presuming that where the documents cannot be tested they are true also. That is the only way in which we can treat the history of the past. It is coming to be the prevalent view, and it is the view upon which I proceed.

Stephens' Laws of Evidence

Now the law of evidence in general is the same in courts of law as with reference to historic documents. You will find that in a case at law when there is something beyond the range of ordinary comprehension and knowledge, the court will summons experts, and I am going to read, preliminary to my further lecture, the laws of evidence as given in

Sir James Stephens' great work on the *Digest of Law of Evidence*. He is the highest authority about it in England, and he is the man that made the code of law for India for the British Government. I shall read a sentence or two from him, justifying me in my method of procedure. I want to forestall any criticisms of the way I proceed and throw the burden of personal assault on to Sir James Stephens.

"The testimony of experts as to what the evidence really is, is especially necessary as to all subjects requiring special study or experience, such as all matters of science and art. It is a general rule of evidence that witnesses must give evidence of facts, not opinions."

(You know I know there are a great many students of the Bible here, and I am addressing them especially—the rest of you simply come in as curiosity hunters. I have a purpose here. I want to start these young men right in their study of the Bible. When you read a book like Dr. Driver's on the *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, you will find that these critics are always citing their own opinions, or the opinions of ones they call authority. I want you to observe I call no man authority in my studies, whether a German professor, an English professor or an American professor. The only authorities I recognize are the original texts, and those which I cite in testimony.)

An expert may experiment for the purpose of forming his opinion, just as the scientist might experiment in making gases out of something, so you can all see. I am going to show you how I did it. I claim that right.

Dr. Wilson's Claim to Be an Expert

Now then, have I a right to be called an expert? I am before the jury in the court. I am going to give a little account of my life. I am what I am today because of what I have been in the past, and I am going to demonstrate if possible my right to speak upon this subject of Old Testament text and history. I think I have a faculty for language. I hope the gentleman that was speaking here the other night on the "Gift of Tongues" and the interpretation of tongues will pardon me for making a slight claim in that direction. Whether it is a hysterical claim or not, I am not going to say. Some people are born with the gift of tongues, some talk at nine months and some don't talk for nearly two years, and I think I must have had a little gift, for I remember that I was exhibited at five years of age as an infant phenomenon, having learned to read at four. I was exhibited as a specialty down there in the public schools. I started early on the line of historical and linguistic research. When I was nine, I went with my father to Philadelphia, and we went into a big book store, and he told the man there that my brother and I would like to get some books. When he came back, in an hour or two, we had the counter covered with all the works on history we could find there, poetry and everything we could gather, and my father was so pleased at what he considered our good sense that he bought the whole counter full for us, and so we had fine intellectual grazing for the next few years. At twelve I took up the study of Latin and at thirteen got to Greek, and then I had to spend three years out of school because I had a head-

ache, so I spent my time reading Greek grammars and learning French.

Somebody asked me yesterday, in view of the coming examination she is going to have, if I had sympathy for the students going into the examinations. Well, I have and I haven't. When students say they never had a good teacher, I can remember that I studied French and took 100 on my entrance to Princeton University, and linguistically speaking, I had no trouble. In Hebrew I took a grammar and dictionary and learned Hebrew myself. And so the Lord was preparing me, though I didn't know it. I learned languages without any trouble, so that when I was in the seminary I used to read my New Testament, just for amusement, in nine different languages, one after the other, in fifteen weeks, a different language every fifteen weeks. And I learned my Hebrew by heart so I could recite it without the intermission of a single syllable, and the same of David and Isaiah and other parts. That is a very good way of learning a language.

Goes to Germany

As soon as I graduated from the seminary, I became a teacher of Hebrew for a year, and then I went to Germany. Now I am going to tell you something. I hope it will be of value to some of the young people here. I had been trained to be a minister, and I had good success for a young man in that line. In fact, my father always thought I made a mistake in choosing scholarship instead of evangelism. I started out under Mr. Moody, and following in his foot-steps I had a measure of success. When I got to Heidelberg I concluded that a man couldn't be a preacher and a teacher both—there wasn't enough time, at least I couldn't see enough time in my life to take the time to write sermons and preach and also to do all the work which I saw before me if I were to be a master of the Old Testament. I never was satisfied with what I got in the seminary on the Old Testament. It seemed to me the old conservative way of dogmatizing and telling us boys this was thus and so because the professor said it, was not satisfactory; and I had a great many doubts as to the historicity of the Old Testament, not enough to hurt my faith in the Lord, but to make me want to settle this question for myself and others.

The Great Decision

When I got to Heidelberg I made a decision. If I were going to preach I would go home and take a church. If I were going to teach, I was going to master the subject matter necessary to enable me to investigate the Old Testament from A to Z. So I decided I would give up preaching (and I did it with prayer) and consecrate my life to a study of the Old Testament. I was twenty-five then, and I judged from the life of my ancestors (they were rather long in life) that I would live to be seventy, so I would have forty-five years to work. I divided the period in three parts. The first fifteen I would devote myself to a study of the languages necessary. For the second fifteen I was going to devote myself to the study of the text of the Old Testament, and I reserved the last fifteen years for the work of writing out the results of my previous studies and investigations so as to give these results

to the world. As I look back on it, that was a pretty big proposition for a young man to make, and of course I might have died any time in those forty-five years without ever having accomplished anything. I suppose my life would have been considered a failure in a way. But I just want to say that the Lord has enabled me to carry out that plan almost absolutely to a year.

Independent Method of Study

I went to Berlin, and I pursued a different method from what most of our young men do when they go abroad. Most of our students from Princeton, Union, Harvard used to go to Berlin and they went into the lecture room and they heard the professors give lectures which were the results of their own labors. They got everything second-hand. They took everything because the professor said it. That wasn't what I went to Germany for. I could get plenty of that in America. You can get all kinds of opinions in our Universities and Theological Seminaries. I went there to study so that there would be no professor on earth that could lay down the law for me or say anything without my being able to investigate the evidence on the ground of which he said it.

Now I considered then and I consider now that what was necessary in order to investigate the evidence was, first of all, to know the languages in which the evidence is given. And so I went to Berlin and studied under those greatest of all professors. For you know at Berlin they pay the largest salaries, and they get nearly all the best professors on nearly every line in Germany. It takes two years longer to get a degree than most Universities and a year longer than in Leipsic, and so on. I had the greatest men in the world to teach me, Dillmann, Schrader, Sachau, Brugsch and others.

I devoted myself almost entirely to the study of the languages bearing upon the Bible, and I determined that I would learn all the languages which threw light upon the Hebrew, all the cognate languages, and also all the languages like Persian which threw light upon history, and all languages into which the Bible had been translated down to 600 A. D., so that I could investigate the text of the Old Testament for myself. I determined that no man on earth should ever make a charge against the Old Testament based upon any item of evidence that I should not be able to investigate for myself. That involved a great many years of labor, but you know you could do that for yourself, some of you at least, if you determined to do it. If you will be an Old Testament critic, prepare to be one. But don't imagine for a moment that you are going to be an Old Testament critic by reading other people's books on it, or that you have a right to speak upon it because you have read a lot of books in English, and perhaps even in German, or maybe gone through Berlin.

Preparation Needed

What we need in the church today are more men that are able to follow the critics up to their lair, slaughter them in their den. It makes me sad to hear these old ministers of the gospel and Christians lament all the time about the attacks being made here and there upon the Bible, and they never do one thing to train the men to fight their battles

for them, and you know perfectly well that you can not defend the Old Testament Scriptures unless you have made the preparation.

I never bothered myself about getting a place when I got back from Germany. I studied ten hours a day. I never could study twelve, that was too much for me. But excepting Sundays, and for the past forty years, about ten hours a day has been my regulation. I devoted three hundred and twenty days a year to this one subject.

I claim to be an expert. I defy any man in Chicago to make an attack upon the Old Testament on the ground of evidence that I cannot investigate. I can get at the facts if it is linguistic. If you know any language that I don't know, I will learn it. It doesn't take long to learn a language when you are used to it, you know.

An Expert Critic

Now then, I am going to show you some of the results. As soon as I got back home, as I say, I found that the day I sailed a Professor in my Alma Mater had died, and that I was elected the day I got into New York, as I heard when I got to Philadelphia. So I went into a professor's chair, the Lord providing my salary. People thought I was doing nothing, because I was not appearing on platforms all the time. I was attending to my business. My business, gentlemen, is a critic. I am an expert. You may not like it, but that is what I am.

Work of Investigation

So after I had learned the languages I got to work on investigation of every consonant in the Old Testament in Hebrew. You know the Old Testament was written in consonants; there were no vowels. (There are some vowels in our present Hebrew Old Testaments. Of course I investigated them. They were put in there some 500 or 600 years after Christ. The real Old Testament has nothing but consonants.) There are about one million and a quarter of consonants, and it took me a great many years to read the Old Testament, through and look at every consonant in it, and gather the variations found in the Old Testament text as far as found in manuscripts, or in the notes of the Masorites or in the versions, or in the parallel passages, or in the conjectural emendations of critics, and classify them and put them in form for use. I prize this textual criticism very highly.

If you ask me a question, as the boys do, "Professor, has this change taken place, does this change take place, etc." I do not answer questions from memory. My plan, as you see, has been to reduce the Old Testament criticism to an absolutely objective basis, on the ground of evidence and not opinion. I scarcely ever express an opinion based on my own subjective belief. I try to drive everything from subjectivity to objectivity, from my own personal view or opinion to the real facts and evidence in the documents. And so if you would ask me "Does this letter ever change," I take my little concordance and say, "This letter changes here and there and elsewhere." Purely objective.

Now you see I am not afraid of any man on earth. He does not butt up against me. I am not in it. I am just hiding behind the gun. I do not want anybody here in Chicago to attack me

on subjective reasons. They would never hit me at all. He will hit through me; and hit an iron wall of fact!

In order to carry out that textual criticism, anybody that goes into it will have to be a master of the science of palaeography and of philology, he will have to be the master of a dozen languages, so that every word may be thoroughly investigated.

Results of Investigation

But I am going to tell you in the two or three minutes that remain the results of my investigation along this line. I don't know whether you all understand what the importance of that work is. Don't you know, in any document, unless you can establish the text the document is unreliable? If you can not make out the individual letters of an epistle you get, how are you going to understand the letter? How can you bring it into a court of law if you can not read it? If every other letter is illegible, what are you going to do about it? If you can not read the writing, what are you going to do about it? The text of the Old Testament is the basis of your history, theology and faith in the document. In any document brought before any court of law, the fundamental thing of all is to first get your text, just as you catch your hare before you cook it. So don't you depreciate what I am saying about the text. The text is fundamental to everything about history and about the Bible. If you can not get the text and a good enough text to believe that it gives substantially what the original writers wrote, why you can not be sure of what the original writer says. You all catch that, do you?

The Text of the Old Testament Genuine

So this is the fundamental thing I am talking about today. The result of these thirty years which I have been putting on the text has been this: There is not a page of the Old Testament (there were about thirteen hundred and ninety in the old Hebrew Bible) there is not a single page of that but what you can read and be sure that you can depend upon the contents of the page. Now you know you might get a letter in which, if your correspondent wrote as I do, you might be in a little doubt as to whether I was speaking of "dear" or "deer." It would be dear all right, but you can't make out which is meant. From the page of the letter you will get the idea and get what it meant. You can be absolutely certain that we have the text substantially of the Old Testament that Christ and the Apostles had and that was in existence from the beginning. I haven't time to give the proof of that now. Perhaps if I thought best I would give you an argument based on text, just to show you that it is fundamental and to show any of you critics that may be here that I can prove from the text as it is the Old Testament, the reliability and historicity of the Old Testament.

DR. GRAY.—I will not take any of the time of this hour for announcements, but these will be made at 11:00, but will immediately present to you our next speaker whom we are glad to welcome here with us for the first time at one of our conferences. President I. R. Detweiler, of Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.

high over all other names, that has in it the omnipotence of God. Make use of the name.

Introducing a Man to Jesus

A man came into my study a few weeks ago to talk to me about a key. But I talked to him about Jesus, Who has some keys also; and the man said, "I don't know anything about Him." I said, "Would you like to?" And he replied, "Honestly, I would like to know Him the way you do." I said, "He is here and I will give you an introduction to Him; but He always likes to have people introduced to Him on their knees. Kneel down and I will introduce you to Jesus." The man knelt down and I told Jesus what Jesus knew very well without my telling Him—that the man was there on his knees and wanted an introduction, and after I prayed I said, "My brother, just speak to Him and ask Him to show you His face, His cleansing blood and His salvation." He did, and then put his arm and touched me and said, "Let us get up; I am saved."

How Convicts of Sin?

"In the name of the Lord Jesus"; but there is one other word and when I mention that my task is done. I wonder if we think much about the Spirit of God as we study our sermons and as we preach our sermons. Do you know that you have not got to convict the audience of sin? that this is not your duty at all? "When He is come, He will convict of sin." Oh, I must get the argument, if argument be what God is pleased to give me. I must get the appeal and make the right use of it, but as I use the argument and the appeal, the Holy Spirit takes the truth and convicts the hearer of sin.

I shall never forget the day I saw that first. I went into my pulpit, where I had always thought it was my business to do the whole thing, to get men convicted of sin and converted; I said, "Now, Spirit of God, I will do my part and I will leave Your part to You," and when eight men came down the aisle to find the Lord Jesus Christ, I made my discovery that the Spirit convicts of sin, and they were washed, sanctified and justified through the Spirit of our God.

I could talk to you further about this text, but I will not tax your patience. Do you want to lose your bad past. You can do it in a moment; I did. Do you want to come into possession of all the blessedness that inheres in those three words? You can do it in a moment; I did. But you must allow the Spirit of God to touch you, and you must allow the Son of God to cleanse and save you. Will you do it?

How Christ Saves

I wandered into a little mission hall one June night, and a higher critic friend of mine says that "If I could forget that June night I would be all right. I shall never forget it. A plain man whom I had never seen before told how he was saved. My father was a skeptic and taught me that way, and here this man told of Jesus Who hung on a tree and died. He looked at me and said, "Young man, He died for you."

I had been struck many times in my life, but never so hard as that June night. "Jesus died for you." Then he looked me in the eyes and asked if I was a Christian. I said I was not. "Do you wish you were?" I said, "Yes." "Then listen;

if you owed a debt and I paid it for you, would you believe it if I told you what I had done?" "Yes, I would believe you." "Well, Jesus Christ, Who died on the cross for you, is standing in front of you now, and he says, 'Young man, I paid your debt on the cross.' Do you believe it?" I said, "Yes, I do"; and I was saved. And I went out from that building rejoicing in my Saviour.

A week afterward I went back to that little hall. It was raining and no speaker came. An old farmer spoke up and said, "There is a young fellow named Hinson who was converted last Monday night, and he will preach to us." And I walked up to the desk and stood in front of it and I preached, and have been at it ever since. I go on a vacation once in a while, and then I preach about twice as often as when I am at work. I cannot help myself. I would rather be a preacher than president of the United States.

They talk about the hardships of the pulpit and they are there; but if the Lord said to me, "Hinson, I will send you into the world again; what will you be?" I would say, "A preacher." Even if I am tired when I begin to preach, I am never tired at the end. I believe with John Wesley that the best thing for a threatened illness is to preach sermons, and if I can only go on preaching, I would never die. But one of these times they will catch me when I am not preaching and I shall be dead before I know it.

This is a great gospel, this gospel of God. It has blood in it, and the cross in it, and the name of the Lord Christ in it, and the power of the Holy Ghost in it, and it will save you tonight.

Do you want tonight to see this salvation planned for you? Do you want to have your doubt turned into a beautiful assurance? Do you want to know that you have passed from death unto life? Do you want Christ to stand and say to you, perhaps a church member, "I am your Saviour?" Do you want to get close up to Jesus Christ so that you can see the look in His face and have Him touch you? Then get it and get it now. He is here and the Holy Spirit is here.

Fourth Day's Proceedings

Saturday, February 4

EXTERNAL TESTIMONY TO THE OLD TESTAMENT III.

By Professor Robert Dick Wilson

In our first lecture we discussed methods. First the harmonistic method, showing that every man who has any sense follows a method in his writings and his sayings; he has a method even in his madness; that is, the harmonistic method in which he centralizes all his ideas.

Then I discussed the so-called historical method and endeavored to show that the true historical method proceeds on evidence, and how the law of evidence affects science and history. Then as to its application to history and to the testimony of any expert, I went into an explanation of the way the Lord has led me in my life and prepared me to be an expert and to speak on the facts and evidence concerning the Old Testament.

If I had the time, I would proceed as follows. I would show the evidence we have as to the text of the Old Testament,

its every letter and its transmission into our present time, and second, I would take up the grammar, starting with the morphology and syntax; then the meanings of the words as determined by means of compared versions and by every means possible; then to a consideration of all these things upon the history of the Old Testament and finally upon the religion thereof.

It is perfectly evident to you that I cannot do all this now, but I will hitch up now with my previous lecture. You will remember that I stopped just as I was explaining how some of these consonants in the text have been transmitted. I want to give my time to what I consider to be the strongest evidence of all that can be gotten together in substantiation of the historical accuracy of the Old Testament in its historical verity.

Importance of the Genealogies

We sometimes despise the little things. I remember when it was considered very unprofitable to read over those long genealogies in the first chapters of First Chronicles—nine chapters of proper names, and we wondered why they were in the Bible. Let me tell you this. Today in scientific criticism of the Old Testament, the proper names are one of the most necessary factors to consider. The way in which they are written and all that is connected with the proper names. They have come to be the very foundation of scientific criticism of the Old Testament.

I am glad I am to speak to an audience that knows its Bible. I do not say the English Bible. Its language does not matter. If you know the Bible in any language you know it well enough for my lecture. Those of you who know your Bible and Bible history will recall that there are a great many names of foreign kings as well as of the kings of Judah and Israel in the Old Testament.

There are twenty-nine kings whose names are mentioned, not merely in the Old Testament but on documents written in their own time and many of them under the supervision of the kings themselves, written on Egyptian, on Assyrian, Persian and other monuments. Some of these Assyrian documents mention the names of kings of Judah and Israel. The documents of the Old Testament, in return, mention the names of a number of Egyptian and Assyrian kings as well as those of other nations—Moab, Tyre and Sidon. You remember that.

Now, there are the names of twenty-nine of these kings mentioned in the Bible that are also mentioned on their own monuments. These names are spelled in the original with nothing but consonants, but that is no trouble to us. When we go to look at these names, there are one hundred and ninety-five consonants in these twenty-nine proper names. We find that in the documents of the Bible, the Hebrew Bible, of these one hundred ninety-five consonants there are only two or three of them about which there would be any question of their being written in exactly the same way that they were written on their own monuments by the men themselves or under their direction, some four thousand years ago—some about twenty-four hundred years ago.

I wish I had hold of all the lawyers and judges in Cook county. I do like to talk to lawyers and judges. One judge said

to me the other day when I made a speech in his town, that if he had known I was going to make that kind of a speech, he would have had his whole bar in to hear my "legal" address. I would rather talk to lawyers and professors than to any one else—no reflection on the rest of you, but I like to have men who know I am right.

Accuracy in Transmission

But here are these one hundred ninety-five consonants, all right, and no possibility of a variation except in two or three of them, and even they are defensible by the laws of phonetics. Now you business men know that sometimes you get a letter and look at the signature and when you have to address an envelope for a reply, you look at it again and then you *forge* the name on the envelope, trying to copy it just as nearly as you can, because you cannot tell what the letters are. Now you think of names being handed down for from twenty-five hundred to four thousand years so that every letter is clear and correct—that is a wonder!

Let me give you some comparisons. One man blamed me for not referring to the classical writings more in discussing certain questions in my first book on Daniel. Now, here is a list made by a great scholar, the greatest scholar of his age. He was the librarian at Alexandria in 200 B. C., and he made a list of the kings of Egypt—thirty-eight of them. Only three or four of them are recognizable at all. You cannot read enough of more than four or five of them to know what he meant. Here is another great librarian who wrote in Greek. He made a list of forty-one kings of Assyria; in only one of them can you tell what is meant, and that one is not spelled right.

Here is Ptolemy. Well, Ptolemy has a list of the kings of Babylon and Persia. He has eighteen kings of Babylon. Not one of them is spelled right. You could not make them out if you did not know from other sources what he means.

I will not enlarge upon this subject. I want you to know that there is no book in the world that has been handed down as has the Bible. And we today study every consonant of the Bible.

I am going to carry you further along this line of kings. If any one talks against the Bible, ask him about the names of those kings. Here is another thing. There are twenty-nine kings of Egypt, Israel, Judah, Moab, Damascus, Tyre, Babylon, Assyria, Persia, mentioned, both in the Bible and on the monuments. Every one of these is mentioned in the Bible as king of the right country. Every one of the twenty-nine is mentioned in the correct chronological and synchronous order.

Historical Accuracy of the Bible

I wish I had hold of one of these bright mathematicians—about fourteen years old. I would give him a little problem in arithmetic. If you had ten lines of kings extending for sixteen hundred years, and you were set the problem of picking out twenty-nine kings out of these ten lines and putting them in a record or story of any kind, what would be the probability of any person being able to get the twenty-nine kings in the right place, in the right time, and synchronize them properly? The chance of getting them right would be as one to infinity—no chance at all. It would be absolutely

impossible for you to get them right. But the Bible has them right! The Bible in the Old Testament shows its historicity by the fact that those names of twenty-nine kings are in the right places.

Remember; some of these kings reigned, like Rameses II, for sixty-two years; some for two months. Why, if you were going to write the history of this century and had to get those little kings in the Balkans and Germany and Austria and Italy down right in their synchronism and in their relativity, you would find it a big problem. But the Bible has its kings right. That is a lesson in paleography and all right in historical chirography.

Now, you will find that the critics of the Old Testament assert that a certain book is late because it has a certain form called Aramaic, in which the words are written in a certain way. This is a very difficult subject. There are twenty-two letters in the Hebrew alphabet. Some of these are sibilants and some are dentals. Now, among the Semites there are four great groups—north, east, south and west. The German finds it very hard to sound the "th"; he says "t" instead, and he says "de" for "the." And a French professor in our seminary spoke of the development of "ze ear." Some of the Jews will put an "sh" instead of the "th." It is a peculiarity of their tongue.

Facts and Not Opinions

When you get these four families of Semitic languages, you will find they change the sibilants and the dentals in a certain way. Attempting to reduce these changes to a science, I found that the writers on the subject did not treat it fully. Mine is the inductive method; I try to get out all the facts before I say anything. Now this question is not to be settled by opinion, but by evidence. I cannot say anything subjectively. No one in this room knows anything about what those changes ought to be or what they might be, out of his own head. It is a matter of evidence. There may be no change at all. If there are changes made, we shall find out what they are.

Guesses of the Critics Overthrown

I got the conviction that these critics said a great many things about Aramaism they could not substantiate. I took a Hebrew dictionary and went through it from the first word to the last, and I gathered up every word that began with an "s" or "t" sound or had an "s" or "t" sound in the second or third place. Then I went to the Arabic and found out what each of these sounds corresponded to in Arabic; then to the Aramaic and found out what each of these sounds corresponded to in that language. I gathered the whole number of them and compared them with the Babylonian language. Then I gathered up my results and could speak with some facts back of me. It makes four volumes of stuff.

I carried this investigation on according to the scientific method, and found there is little in the claim to Aramaism in the Old Testament. There are only five or six of these words in the whole Old Testament that could be even considered doubtful, and the whole argument dropped to the ground.

Demand the Evidence

The brainiest man on earth can know no more about a subject like that than you do, by birth. Some of these men de-

mand of us more belief in their inspiration or revelation or secret internal means of information than has ever been claimed by us for any prophet in the Old Testament or apostle in the New Testament! I tell you the day is at hand when the church, instead of cowering and seeming, as many so-called Christians do, to rejoice in the supposed victories over the Bible truth, will demand that any one who attacks the Bible will produce his evidence. Believe no man who makes a statement against the Bible without bringing evidence, and if he brings evidence and you cannot investigate it, call in an expert that can; and try out your expert, too! You get an expert on a question that demands a knowledge of Babylonian to test the case, and find out whether he knows Babylonian or not.

Passing from this we come next to morphology or etymology, the formation of words. Here are the old time critics, the men who wrote the books some forty years ago. Here is where the professor had a full field for flights of imagination.

Another Fallacy Exposed

Sixty years ago there was no Babylonian known. People read the Old Testament and when they found a form of a noun or verb that did not suit the Hebrew they said it was Aramaic, and that everywhere it appeared it marked the books as late. So the critics in Germany and some of them in this country had just to open their mouths and say anything at all, and everybody believed it, because it came from a professor.

You know the principles of the English language—the parts of speech. Now in Hebrew there is a noun ending in "ooth," rhyming with "booth." The Lord has given us Babylonian. God kept those monuments for this time. The Babylonian documents take us back before the time of Abraham, and we have more literature from the time of the king in Genesis 14 than from the time of Tiberius Caesar, the time of our Lord.

In these documents from the time of this old king we find nouns ending in "ooth," and down from that until the end of the kingdom of Babylon and the destruction of the city, you will find them. It is found not in Aramaic alone, but in the Hebrew and Babylonian languages as well. The whole foundation falls from under the old argument.

Well, I gathered up all the nouns in "ooth" in the Hebrew, then in Aramaic and then in the Babylonian language (You know, I read dictionaries as you read the Bible. When a man comes to talk to me about these questions, I just hit him with a concordance or a dictionary, then wind up with the grammar) and found that these nouns were for abstracts in all three of them.

The Question of Syntax

Coming to syntax. Here again you find that some of the critics attack the Old Testament credibility, saying that certain syntactical usages show that Daniel and some of the other books are late, trying to destroy the historicity of them; but their evidence for this assertion is poor.

For example: Here is a "King X." Some times in the Old Testament he is called "X the King." The question is as to the order of the words, whether it is "X the King," or the "King X." The evidence says that the order "X the

King" is often used in post-exilic writings, and that the order the "King X" is nearly always used in the older Hebrew. That is true. They say that this demonstrates the fact that Daniel is late; later than Nehemiah. But if this is true, what about the historical value of Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah and Nehemiah, and how about the unassailable character of the sacred Scriptures for the early writings follow the Egyptian order, the "King X," but the later writings follow the Babylonian order.

I stand for what I say here. I have worked for three years on a great thesaurus of the titles of the kings, and everybody who writes either for or against me, uses my own works to get his information!

They used this particular testimony to prove that Daniel is not like the other books of the sixth century B. C. But the critics have not produced a single example to prove that the form "X the King" was used subsequent to Nehemiah. None of the recent documents, nor any of the late portions of the Old Testament, nor the Psalms, Proverbs or Job use the order which they claim is late. Their theory breaks down.

The Critics Arraigned

The critics are very fond of the phrase, "all scholars are agreed," but if the greatest of their scholars will make such a blunder, what dependence will you place upon him when he steps beyond the bound of knowledge into the limitless regions of imagination. The charges of the critics are false; and upon what ground or law of evidence are we to be convinced that these documents are false when charges absolutely unsupported by evidence are made against them.

Coming now to the meaning of the words. I think I have investigated every word in the Hebrew dictionary critically. I am sorry I am through with that work. I feel like a man who has solved a puzzle and can do it again and again and has lost the joy of curiosity.

I used to have reverence for professors and for their opinions. One day I was reading over a commentary on Samuel. At the same time I was studying Arabic and beginning to use it for Old Testament criticism. I came across a passage where it speaks of the children of Israel fleeing from the Philistines, hiding themselves in graves or ditches.

This commentator cited one of the greatest scholars in Germany as having said that that word which is translated from the Hebrew Bible as "graves" really meant bushes, and the German professor made sport of the idea of the children of Israel hiding behind bushes when the Philistines were after them with spears. This depended upon the meaning of the word. I took down my dictionary and found that the word really meant "graves," a ditch, or trench. Here was one German professor citing another as authority. I will cite a dictionary, or preferably a document in the original and if possible will look at it myself. But no man is authority for me.

Unreliability of the Critics

When I saw that this German professor would make a silly, foolish mistake like that and make a word mean bush or shrub when it really meant grave or trench, I lost faith in the greatest and naturally, in the least. I never believe any man who says something against the

Bible or its history out of his own imagination. I would not believe any man on earth, even if he brought up evidence, until I had investigated every item of the evidence. I commend this to you, and if you have not the knowledge to investigate the charge made, have faith enough to believe the Bible until the charge is corroborated.

I told you the next point would be history and the last religion. Here is a sample of the history. I do not want you to take this because I say it, but if you do not believe me, don't believe the others either. You have your Bible, or a translation that has been accredited for at least two thousand years, nearly all of it. It has something back of it, and I would just keep on believing that until you are sure it is not true.

I am only going to take up one item from history with regard to this question. It is just a single sentence of three words. Dr. Driver, in his *Literature of the Old Testament* (this is the best book the critics have), says in speaking of the phrase "king of Persia," used in the very end by the author or Ezra-Nehemiah, that there were no kings of Persia when the book Ezra-Nehemiah was written. I would like to repeat this; that the writer of the book of Ezra-Nehemiah would not have needed to use this title while kings of Persia were still kings in Persia, nor was it usual thus to do. This is their case.

I don't know what you think of that. It affects not only Ezra-Nehemiah, but Chronicles and Daniel. If that statement is true, it knocks the historicity of all four. It is the greatest statement the critics have made. It appeals to history and to fact.

I got to writing a series of articles for the *Princeton Review*. I covered all the kings of Egypt and of Babylon from the earliest to the latest; the kings of Assyria and Persia, Greece, Phoenicia, the Arabian and Aramaic kings. I went to the original and have a monumental work which has been published, and everybody treating of the titles of the kings of antiquity has to go to that work.

I found that it is difficult to follow a lot of translations because those very titles which give the evidence are not translated. If you want to find out anything about this subject, there is not one of you who has any right at all to contradict anything I say unless you can read Egyptian and Babylonian and all the rest, going to the original documents to see what is there. I will not take a translation.

Dr. Driver says he read forty titles in a translation, and when I was answering that, I said that I had found two thousand six hundred fifty-six in the originals, where the titles are, with all data concerning them.

They say it was not usual to give the title "king of Persia" while there were kings of Persia; consequently the books must have been written after they ceased to exist.

Answering the Critics

If this were true, it would bring these books down to Greek times. It is sufficient answer to this assertion to say that eighteen different authors in nineteen different documents from Persian times use this title altogether thirty-eight different times; at least six different times it is used of Cyrus and is also used of Artaxerxes III. The title occurs in the

Persian, Greek, Babylonian, Aramaic and Hebrew; it was used in the countries of Media, Babylon, Assyria, Greece and Palestine, and according to Herodotus, in Ethiopia.

I must close. But before closing this review of the lines of defense of the Old Testament Scriptures, I must emphasize the strongest of them all—the great religious ideas of them.

Groping After God

A study of the religious systems of these ancient peoples has revealed to us a groping after God, but nowhere among all the nations is it recorded that a clear apprehension of one living and true God, the Creator and Preserver, the Guide, the Judge, the Saviour and the Sanctifier of his people was attained.

Other religions are outward; concerned with words and deeds. Their sins are offenses; their substitutions are material equivalents; their atonements are physical; their resurrection is a crownless expectation; their judgment is without mercy and a future life with joy is for the few and great.

Superiority of the Old Testament Religion

The Old Testament religion is essentially inward of the mind and heart; love, joy, faith, hope and salvation through the grace of God alone. How account for this religion? The prophets say it came from God. No other theory of its origin can account for its results, its superiority and influence. We add to the prophets' statement evidence which all the quibbling of the critics cannot impune. The prophets say they had their ideas from God. If not, whence? If so, the greatest of all miracles has happened, involving all the rest, for if God spoke through the prophets, the revelations of His will could not be bound by the shackles of time and circumstance.

The prophets who spoke for Him spoke not as men of their own time, but as men of all time; as men who spoke of Him who knows the end from the beginning and has all power in heaven and on earth. The modern critical school is antagonistic to the fundamental conception of the prophet's mission as it was spoken by the prophets themselves. They say that God spoke to them, and they spoke for God. The critics say that they gave utterance to the ideas of the times; that they were limited by the time and place of their prophecy.

But if this were all the source of their information, how then does it come that not from the oracles of Thebes and Memphis, nor from the temples of Babylon, nor from Delphi and Rome, nor from the deserts of Media, but from the sheepfolds and dungeons, from the lowly cots of captives on the banks of the river came forth these great words of hope and salvation and glory for a sin cursed world! Words that have made the desert heart rejoice and blossom like the rose in the sunlight of God's favor, in the revivifying atmosphere of His presence.

"God with us." This is the key to unlock the mysterious chambers of the Old Testament!

INTRODUCTION OF DEAN RANKIN BY DR. GRAY

DR. GRAY.—Dr. Wilson from time to time has been calling for a lawyer, so we are about to present one, Mr. C. W. Rankin. He is a Christian lawyer, and is