

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL ISSUE

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, BY JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, CAN., AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY

T. T. SHIELDS, *Pastor and Editor.*

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

Address correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

Vol. 4

TORONTO, OCTOBER 15th, 1925

No. 23

Will the Convention Approve the Appointment of McMaster's New Professor, Rev. H. T. Marshall?

(EDITORIAL NOTE: We hope our readers who live outside the bounds of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec will excuse us for occupying our entire space in this issue with domestic matters. We have been obliged to omit the sermon, the S. S. Lesson, and other material in order to find space for the matter of this special issue. We comfort ourselves with believing that Baptists everywhere are interested in the principles for which this paper is contending; and that a victory won in one part of the field helps the cause of truth everywhere. We shall publish two S. S. lessons in next issue.)

At the meeting of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, held in Talbot Street Church, London, October, 1924, the action of McMaster University in conferring a degree upon President W. H. P. Faunce was discussed from two o'clock in the afternoon till eleven o'clock at night, with only an hour's intermission for tea. As a conclusion of this discussion, the following resolution was moved by the Editor of this paper, and seconded by Chancellor H. P. Whidden, of McMaster University, and was carried unanimously:

"Whereas, discussions have arisen from time to time within this Convention regarding the action of the Senate of McMaster University in granting certain honorary degrees, therefore be it resolved,

"That, without implying any reflection upon the Senate, this Convention relies upon the Senate to exercise care that honorary degrees be not conferred upon religious leaders whose theological views are known to be out of harmony with the cardinal principles of evangelical Christianity."

The degree question was only an incident: the important thing was that the Convention had once again put itself on record as standing firmly for the "cardinal principles of evangelical Christianity". We came from the Convention

hoping that the Governing Bodies of the University would now recognize that it was useless to expect the Convention to approve of any action which involved even an indirect endorsement of modernist principles. We were, of course, aware of the fact that the Convention had frequently expressed its adherence to the great fundamentals of the faith before; but the expression of the last Convention differed from all others in this, that for the first time since McMaster University was established, the Convention refused to vote confidence in that Institution; which action, everybody was aware, could not fairly be construed as indicating that the Convention was any less devoted to its educational enterprise than before: it simply meant that it could not endorse the action of its Governing Bodies in a particular instance in having honoured a man who was a noted exponent of theological liberalism. Throughout the year we had hoped that the Senate of McMaster University would read the handwriting on the wall, and would endeavour in the future to shape its policy in harmony with the spirit of the resolution with which the debate on education concluded.

Quotation from The Gospel Witness of April.

We have refrained from any word or action, during the year, that could possibly be interpreted as a violation of the agreement implied in the fact that the resolution referred to, being moved by the writer of this article, was seconded by the Chancellor of the University. Since the Convention we have felt under obligation to assume that the University would stand uncompromisingly for the fundamentals of the faith. In our issue of April 23rd last, we wrote as follows:

“Notwithstanding their endeavour in the earlier part of the discussion to secure an expression of approval from the Convention, it is fair to assume from their final action that, as a result of the long discussion, both the Chancellor of the University and the Dean in Theology came to a clearer view of the whole matter, and shared the Convention’s judgment as registered in the resolution finally passed. We are aware of no word or action spoken or taken, since the London Convention, which would justify anyone in forming any other conclusion than that they both acted with the utmost sincerity when, as members of the Committee, they recommended, and, as delegates, they voted for the resolution which was finally passed. Their action would go far in the direction of realizing a requirement clearly set forth in the speech of Mr. S. J. Moore when moving the adoption of the report of the Board of Governors. Mr. Moore said:

“The Board of Governors did not find themselves in a position where they could submit to this Convention to-day any plan definite enough with respect to the enlargement of the borders of the University; and, therefore, have not submitted such a plan. There is one primary need that must be met before that appeal can be made—and that is, that there should be clearly and unmistakably in the minds of our people the conviction that the University deserves the sacrifice which they are asked to make.”

“Following the quotation given above (we are quoting from a stenographic report of Mr. Moore’s speech), Mr. Moore added, ‘I submit that it (McMaster University) is entitled, absolutely entitled, to that confidence.’

“The Convention’s action later in the day in refusing to vote confidence in the University showed, that in respect to the Faunce matter, at least, the Convention did not share Mr. Moore’s view. **But after the**

resolution was passed, drawn by a Committee of which the Chancellor, the Dean in Theology, and Mr. Moore himself were members, the resolution being seconded by the Chancellor and supported by both the Chancellor and Dean Farmer, the confidence which Mr. Moore insisted was necessary to adequate financial support, may fairly be assumed to have been restored.

"The one disturbing factor in the whole situation consisted in the fact that at least two members of the Board of Governors did not vote for the resolution, and that another member of the Board, who is known to exercise great influence in determining the policy of the Board, was not present at the Convention. We are not, therefore, creating suspicion, but only recommending reasonable caution, when we say that it would be too much to hope that those influences which for years have endeavoured to commit the University to the adoption of a co-operative attitude toward Modernism, had repented. We wish it were possible to believe that every member of the Senate of McMaster was in cordial agreement with the Convention's expressed loyalty to the cardinal principles of Evangelical Christianity.

"The Dean in Arts in the December number of *The McMaster Graduate* has this to say of two professors no longer on McMaster's Staff:

'Dr. Cross, a profound thinker, teacher who trained his students to think for themselves, and sincere Christian who exemplified in his life the spirit of his Master, is Professor of Systematic Theology at Rochester. Dr. Matthews, one of our own graduates in Arts and Theology, who became the storm centre of theological controversy, but who, in my opinion, was misjudged, is expounding the Old Testament at Crozer. The churches heard him gladly when he preached to them, for his words were winged with comprehensive knowledge of the Bible, with veneration for its writers as prophets inspired of God, and with unswerving conviction of the moral and spiritual values of their messages.'

"We regret that Dr. McLay should have written these words at a time when it was so necessary that nothing should be done to further shake the confidence of the Convention in the University. It was surely as unwise as it was unnecessary for Dr. McLay to go out of his way to endorse two professors who are notoriously modernistic in their views; and at the same time, to take a fling at those by whom, in his opinion, Professor Matthews was 'misjudged'. Even Dr. Fosdick himself has not gone farther from the evangelical position than Dr. Cross.

"While Dr. Matthews was still on the Staff of McMaster University he was defended by members of the Senate; and all who questioned his loyalty to the Word of God were denounced as 'trouble makers'. We have before us at the moment Professor Matthews' book, entitled, 'Old Testament Life and Literature'. In this book Professor Matthews commits himself absolutely to the composite theory of the Hexateuch with all the implications of that position.

Following this, we gave extracts from Professor Matthews' book, and then added:

"Prevention is better than cure! When once a professor has been appointed, if his position is discovered to be unsound, it is impossible to raise opposition to his teaching without introducing personal considerations. In this article we are not discussing unsound professors, but vacant

Chairs, and dealing with principles in the abstract. It is to avoid the necessity of holding discussions involving persons, this article has been written. We respectfully suggest to the Senate and Board of Governors that the utmost care should be exercised in even considering men to fill the vacancies referred to, to see that they are in cordial agreement with the great doctrines of supernatural Evangelical Christianity."

A Letter to the Chancellor.

We have thus defined the attitude of *The Gospel Witness* from the London Convention of 1924 until now. We ask our readers' indulgence as we review the history of our attitude toward the University for some years past. Following the retirement of Professor I. G. Matthews at the end of the University session in the spring of 1919, we sent the following letter to the Chancellor of McMaster:

"Toronto, May 3rd, 1919.

"Chancellor A. L. McCrimmon, M.A., LL.D.,
McMaster University, Toronto.

"My Dear Chancellor McCrimmon:

"I am venturing to write to you with respect to a matter which has long exercised my mind. It appears to me that the authorities of McMaster University have now before them an opportunity to place the University in such relation to the Denomination, as a whole, as would enable many who, for a long time, have been compelled conscientiously to refrain from a full and unreserved support of its work, to devote themselves to its interests without the least reservation, and with the utmost possible heartiness.

"But before I come to the subject I have in mind, let me clearly define my own position in relation to the University. I am deeply convinced that no department of our work more profoundly affects the life and character of the Denomination than that of McMaster University. For years I have longed to feel at liberty to give it unreserved and enthusiastic support. I am aware that no reasonable man will condition his support of an institution upon his being able, in all particulars, to agree with its administration; and I hope you will acquit me of any such opinionated intolerance as an attitude so conditioned would involve. But if, and when, the teachings of even one professor in an institution infringe, or, at the very least, compromise principles which a man holds to be vital to Christian faith, it is impossible for him to give indiscriminating support to such institution without compromising his own conscience.

"At the Convention held in the Bloor St. Church in 1910, at a critical juncture in the discussion of the Chancellor's report, fearing a split in the Convention, I accepted the responsibility of seconding an amendment to the report in the following terms:

"The Convention approves of the statement touching the attitude of the University to the Bible presented to the Senate on the 15th November, 1909, by the members of the Theological Faculty and relies on the Senate and Board of Governors to see that the teaching in the Institution is maintained in harmony therewith."

"This amendment, the Year Book for 1910 says, was 'carried by a large majority.'

"The excerpts from 'the statement touching the attitude of the University to the Bible—by the members of the Theological Faculty,' which were embodied in the Chancellor's report, are as follows:

'The divine inspiration of the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments, and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice.'

'The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and are the only sufficient, certain and authoritative rule of all saving knowledge, faith and obedience.'

'The divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as a complete and infallible rule of faith and practice.'

'That McMaster University should be organized and developed as a permanently independent Christian school of learning, with the Lordship of Christ as the controlling principle.'

'In Christ all things consist.'

"The paragraph of the Chancellor's report following these excerpts reads:

" 'These statements refer to fundamental doctrines, and indicate the attitude of the people of our Baptist Churches, as well as the attitude of the University, towards the Bible.'

"I have quoted the terms of the Amendment, and the excerpts from the Theological Faculty's 'Statement' at length, that you may have them before you for convenient reference. They are taken from pp. 29 and 135, respectively, of the Baptist Year Book, 1910.

"The responsibility I assumed in seconding the Amendment referred to, at the Convention of 1910, compels me to address you now. For in that action, I assumed that the resolution was designed to avoid the disruption of the Convention, and to effect, at a not distant but convenient date, a vacancy in the Chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis. And while the date of that vacancy, as events have proved, was more remote than I then expected, it has at last occurred; and it is with respect to that vacancy I now write you.

"During the interim I have been greatly perplexed as to what was my own duty in the premises. Students have on several occasions come to me with their complaints of the teaching of the Chair of Hebrew, and others have urged that some action should be taken. I have patiently waited, however, recognizing the difficulties in which the situation involved the Governing Bodies; and have tried to allay the fears of some by the expression of my own hope, that the undoubted and uncompromising loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God of other professors in the University, must be relied upon, until a change could be effected to counteract, in some measure at least, the teachings of the Chair in question. But from all that I have heard from many quarters, and from witnesses of undoubted reliability, I am profoundly convinced that the Senate and Board of Governors, in respect to the Chair of Hebrew, have not justified the Convention's reliance, as expressed in the resolution I had the honour of seconding at the meeting held in the Bloor Street Church, October, 1910. And I am bound to confess, that in no other act of my public ministry have I found it so difficult to keep pace with my own conscience, as in refraining from protest against a situation which the resolution I supported was intended, as I supposed, conveniently to remedy, but to the continuance of which situation my own action had rendered me an unwilling accessory.

"And now, Mr. Chancellor, I write to you as the head of McMaster University, as I feel under the circumstances I am in honour bound to do, respectfully to remind you, and through you, the Governing Bodies of the University, of the position to which the Convention by solemn resolution stands committed. That there has been no recession by our people from the position taken by the Convention in 1910 is abundantly evident; for whatever else the Conference held in the Jarvis Street Church in February last may have meant if provided unmistakable and overwhelming proof that the Denomination as a whole still holds the conviction of 'the divine inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice;' and the Convention has strictly enjoined the Senate and Board of Governors 'to see that the teaching in the Institution (McMaster University) is maintained in harmony therewith.'

"I am not authorized to express anyone's views but my own; but I am retiring Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, an unequivocal subscription to the Denomination's expressed conviction in respect to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, on the part of the appointee, should be regarded as an absolute sine qua non.

"I am not authorized to express anyone's views but my own; but I am firmly of the opinion that it would be little short of disastrous for the Senate and Board to appoint to the Chair of Hebrew a professor holding views on that subject similar to the views held by the professor retiring. Hitherto those of us in the Denomination (and I believe they are overwhelmingly in the majority) who hold the historic Baptist view of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, have had no quarrel with McMaster University as a whole; but only with an individual professor. But if another man holding similar views to those held by the professor now retiring were deliberately appointed by the Senate and Board of Governors, in spite of the Convention's expressed conviction on this subject, and in disregard of the Convention's instructions to the Senate and Board of Governors in respect to the same, such an appointment would, in the nature of the case, compromise the entire University as an institution; and in such circumstances, acquiescence, or even neutrality, for a great multitude of people, in which I should certainly be included, would longer be absolutely impossible.

"On the other hand, if it were announced, perhaps even in advance, that the Governing Bodies would not consider the appointment of any man who was not avowedly and unmistakably in agreement with the Denomination's expressed convictions; or, if such an announcement could not wisely be made in advance, but the appointment being made, if it could be given out that the appointee had been selected, not alone for his scholarship, but for his uncompromising loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God, such an announcement would rally the whole Denomination to the University's support as nothing else could do. And let me add: the radical teachings of many theological seminaries are driving many young men to the short-course Bible colleges because of the well-known loyalty of these colleges to the Bible as the Word of God. I therefore believe that if McMaster University, now that opportunity offers, places herself strongly and openly on the side of the historic Baptist view of the

Bible, she will almost certainly attract many students from the United States; and may easily become in a few years, one of the most influential of the theological institutions on this continent.

"I offer no apology for this long letter. It deals with a subject of tremendous importance; and is the culmination of more than eight years of disquietude and deep dissatisfaction and concern in respect to the matter of which it treats. Moreover, I repeat, I have written because I conceive my action at the Convention of 1910 to involve an obligation, in view of the prospective vacation of the Chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis by the present occupant, to remind the Senate and Board of Governors of the Convention's solemn pronouncement on that occasion.

"If, as I hope, and shall earnestly pray, such an appointment as I have ventured to suggest, and such as I believe the Convention will expect, is made, I beg to assure, you Mr. Chancellor, that McMaster will find no truer friend, and no more loyal supporter, than I.

"With much respect, I beg to subscribe myself,

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

"P.S.—As this letter is not in any sense confidential, I have read it to a few friends, one of whom suggests that I should make it clear that the letter is not intended to be personal; but is written with a view to its presentation to the Senate and Board of Governors; I beg to request therefore, that it be so regarded.

T. T. S."

We regret that we did not preserve the Chancellor's reply. We remember only that he replied briefly, expressing the hope that an appointment would be made which would be agreeable to the Convention. In this, he was not disappointed, for Professor H. S. Curr was appointed that summer as Dr. Matthews' successor.

THE CANADIAN BAPTIST RE-OPENS THE CONTROVERSY

We hoped that the controversy was then finally settled; but in September of that year an editorial appeared in *The Canadian Baptist* which reopened the whole question. We print below the first instalment of that editorial. We should like, did our space permit, to print it all; but we think this will be enough to acquaint our readers with its general tone. Moreover, it was upon this instalment, and without waiting for the rest, we based our protest.

"THE INSPIRATION AND AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE".

"Some fifteen or twenty years ago the question of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures agitated the evangelical churches of Great Britain a great deal more than it does to-day.

"This agitation has now largely ceased in the old land because the leading-men in whom these churches have large confidence have brought themselves and their people into clearer light. Occasional echoes of the old acrimonious disputations are still heard there, but in the main they have ceased to interest or influence intelligent Christian people.

"It is a singular circumstance that on this continent a considerable number of Christian people, including a fair proportion of ministers, are still thrashing away at many of those questions touching the Scriptures, which are regarded as settled questions in Great Britain. To some extent this is true among churches in Canada, and it is especially true in the United States where some crude theological views still prevail in many

quarters in which some partially educated but very dogmatic preachers are still making loud proclamations of views and theories as to the Scriptures, which were laid aside years ago in England and Scotland.

"Any of our readers who are still perplexed as to the disputations that occasionally prevail in our midst, touching the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures will be greatly helped by the recital of the story of how light and relief came to Christian people in the old land. Incidentally, reliable light is also thrown on the way in which the methods of modern scholarship affect our views of the Scriptures, when these methods are used by trusted, reverent and scholarly Christian men who abound in England and Scotland.

"The story and explanation of how conservative Christian men in Great Britain have made the transition from many untenable theories and inherited beliefs about the Bible to a position in which their religious beliefs can be maintained without creating a breach with other spheres of knowledge, was told some dozen years ago in one of a series of books published by the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches of Great Britain. The well-known Baptist minister, Rev. F. B. Meyer, was selected as general editor of the series, while so distinguished a scholar and stout defender of conservative theology, as Principal Forsyth, M.A., D.D., of Hackney College, London, wrote the introduction to the pronouncement which was entitled, 'The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture', and one of London's oldest, most venerated and accomplished pastors, Rev. J. Munro Gibson, M.A., LL.D., was selected to write the text, and who, while naturally assuming authority for the exposition of views set forth, speaks with the unqualified approval of such men as Principal Forsyth and other trusted leaders of British nonconformity. That this pronouncement was sent forth throughout the old land by the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches of Great Britain, gives it a standing that challenges attention and respect.

"This week we have space only to quote a few of the striking sentences from the introduction by Principal Forsyth:

"There is no more difficult position to-day,' writes Principal Forsyth, 'than that of the minister who has to stand between the world of modern knowledge on the one hand and the world of traditional religion on the other, and mediate between them. It is not a case of adjusting his own faith to the new knowledge. He has done that and can go on doing it. It is a case of adjusting the new knowledge to the untaught faith of others, and doing it in the way of reverence for truth, love for men, and regard for the growth of living faith. Any vulgarian can destroy and offend. But the task of the veracious, alert, and paternal-minded man who has to rear faith amid a world of commotion, to establish the soul in a public war of elements and to secure the Eternal in a tempest, is very delicate and very severe. The difficulty does not readily come home to most people. The plain man, whose demand for a plain yes and no Christ was always baffling, has no idea what it costs to make a traditional creed a moral reality, and to turn as our Lord Jesus had to do, a conventional Messiah to a spiritual Christ.'

"Principal Forsyth holds that what the church now needs is not so much an army of scholars as a supply of capable middlemen or adjusters who know the new truth, the old faith and the believing people, and who can mediate the inevitable transition without fatal accident. With the vision of a seer gazing into the new religious day for the church, he says, 'The premises are being rebuilt, but the business must be carried on; and the builders must be competent to manage both without loss in the process, and with great gain in the end. The education of our ministers must keep this increasingly in view.'

"How then is the growingly complex situation to be faced, according to Principal Forsyth?

"First of all, he intimates, we must have the right sort of ministers to handle the questions at issue. Mere pious talk will not do. 'The worst

heresy', he says, 'is incompetency, degerenating into quackery. It cannot be too clearly understood that no amount of well-doing, and no amount of zeal, and no amount of ethereal mysticism will save the situation. We need men of experimental historic faith, who are also exercised in the knowledge which is creating the present situation. Knowledge will not do it, but it cannot be done without knowledge.'

Having thus described the kind of men needed for the work—religious men with solid attainments in modern scholarship—Principal Forsyth then asks what is the best course for such leaders to pursue.

"Only two courses", he says, 'are possible, (1) either to stand on every statement of an infallible Book, or (2) to treat extreme rationalism with a higher reasonableness, meet the critics on their own ground, accept results tested by their own methods in sounder hands—and proceed amidst all in the experienced liberty with which Christ crucified has set our conscience free to be sure and bold in Him.'

"This latter plan seems to accord with Paul's method and advice: 'Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.'

"The task is a high one and must be met, if true religion is to survive. One of the depressing features, however, of the task, according to Principal Forsyth, 'is the persistence and recurrence in lower social-strata of old fallacies that had long been disposed of in the region of the higher knowledge.' For we still have, he says, mental strata where views and habits of mind still flourish which have long gone to limbo in quarters where wisdom is spoken among the full grown.'

"In commending Dr. Gibson's work to perplexed Christians, Principal Forsyth shows not only great insight, but great sympathy for those 'to whom it is a pain to feel their feet slipping from them, or their ground undermined; who have a real though bewildered faith, and who desire above all things to believe, if they could see their way.

"In deprecating the fact that so many of the rank and file of church members just pick up stray notions on the subject from casual sermons, or from the cheap press, Dr. Forsyth describes Dr. Gibson as a man 'who knows where the land lies, and who has the secret of reaching the public with his own settled faith', while the book is described as 'an admirable example of arduous work'.

"In turning next to Dr. Gibson's personal foreword, the reader will be greatly interested in the auto-biographical sketch he gives of his own mental and religious progress in relation to the Scriptures.

"The personal story which Dr. Gibson tells of his own enfranchisement in dealing with the Scriptures is worthy of retelling in a separate article and we therefore hold it for fresh and separate recital in a future issue, as well as some condensation of the more extended review of the whole subject of the inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture, as viewed by the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches of Great Britain."

OUR LETTER TO THE CANADIAN BAPTIST.

Immediately upon the appearance of this editorial we protested in the following letter which was printed in *The Canadian Baptist*:

"Inspiration and Authority of Scripture."

A Protest.

"To the Editor of The Canadian Baptist:

Your leading article under the above heading in your issue of October 2nd, is bound to provoke much questioning in the minds of many of your readers. Appearing, as it does, with full editorial authority it may be regarded by many as indicating the present position with respect to the vital question with which it deals, of the churches of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, for which *The Canadian Baptist* may be presumed to speak. Had the article appeared as an expression of individual opinion it might have been allowed to pass, but as the editorial voice of *The Canadian Baptist*, it constitutes a challenge to at least one

of your readers, and I am greatly mistaken if it be not a challenge to a great host.

"And at the outset I must express my regret that the spirit of the article under review forbids a careful selection of refined weapons when taking up arms against it. Britons were reluctant to meet gas with gas in opposing 'the methods of modern scholarship' as exemplified by the cultured Germans. I am equally reluctant to resort to such weapons as your editorial employs when it launches its attack upon the historically established Baptist position; but I trust I shall not be accounted unchivalrous if I take the field with my gas-mask properly adjusted.

"In such controversies neither side has monopolized the practice of setting up straw men. I shall, on this occasion, endeavour to avoid this alleged common error.—the more especially as a bag of chaff or thistle-down would more accurately represent my own estimate of the weight of 'scholarship' and religious effectiveness represented in the reasoning of the article in question.

"As I understand it, your article tells us that in Great Britain the ever-recurring question of the inspiration and authority of Scripture has been finally settled, and that while 'occasional echoes of the old acrimonious disputations are still heard there, in the main they have ceased to interest or influence, intelligent Christian people.'

"I have seldom read anything more 'acrimonious' than the article under discussion. It is, indeed, an insult to every Canadian Baptist who is not ready to follow the apostles of compromise. In a recent issue you exhorted us to 'trust one another.' But how are men of conviction to trust such leadership as your editorial offers,—especially when it is so insultingly proposed? Frankly, I do not, and cannot.

"With 'the story and explanation of how conservative Christian men in Great Britain have made the transition from many untenable theories and inherited beliefs about the Bible, to a position in which their religious beliefs can be maintained without creating a breach with other spheres of knowledge,' and which was 'told some dozen years ago,' I am not for the moment concerned. Very likely 'the story' will be an interesting one, especially for those whose original 'beliefs about the Bible' were 'inherited'. At all events when it is told each must judge its value for himself. But in advance of the story you inform us that the 'disputations' whose peaceful ending your story is to record, 'have ceased to interest or influence intelligent Christian People in Great Britain,' because there they are 'regarded as settled questions' The inference is inescapable: Either those of your readers by whom these questions are not 'regarded as settled' are not 'intelligent Christian people,' or else we are 'some fifteen or twenty years' behind Great Britain in our religious thinking, and therefore all such are to be editorially castigated as being either dullards or laggards.

"For the purpose of this protest I must quote one paragraph of your article in full:

"It is a singular circumstance that on this continent a considerable number of Christian people, including a fair proportion of ministers, are still threshing away at many of those questions touching the Scriptures, which are regarded as settled questions in Great Britain. To some extent this is true among churches in Canada, and it is especially true in the United States where some crude theological views still prevail in many quarters in which some partially educated but very dogmatic preachers are still making loud proclamations of views and theories as to the Scriptures, which were laid aside years ago in England and Scotland.'

"From this it would appear that in order to rank as 'intelligent Christian people' Canadian holders of 'crude theological views' must hasten to catch up with the Joneses, since these 'views and theories of the Scriptures were laid aside years ago in England and Scotland'. And is this the voice of 'scholarship' which thus admonishes us? Is this an illustration of 'the way the methods of modern scholarship effect our views of the

Scripture'? Must we change our views in order to keep abreast of 'the reverent and scholarly Christian men who abound in England and Scotland'? I shall be the last to underestimate such men. No one who knows me will charge me with being unappreciative of men and things in the country whose unselfish heroism has so recently saved the world; but some of us recognize a still higher allegiance than that which we cheerfully pay to the Throne of Britain.

"And we are familiar with the specious plea of this commonplace editorial. In a discussion on the changing fashions of womankind I heard an English lady say in England about four week ago, 'We in England are rather amused at the effort of Canadians to keep up with the latest fashions. Women's dresses in Canada are always several years behind the fashions in England.' I suggested that the English ladies emigrate to Canada, as they would then be able to wear out their old clothes in a land where such clothes would make them leaders of fashion.

"And this is precisely the method by which the new 'scholarship' has made its greatest gains among 'some partially educated but very dogmatic preachers' who apparently care for nothing so much as to be reckoned sufficiently 'advanced' and in the fashion to be included among the intellectual 'smart set'. I make no apology for my irony. In my attitude toward the presumptuous arrogance of this faith-destroying thing the plumes itself in peacock feathers and struts around under the ridiculously assumed name of 'scholarship', I have progressed from enquiry to amazement, from discovery to disgust, and from indignation to contempt.

"I have had some opportunity of judging of the value of the fashionable religious views which, you say, are so generally held in Great Britain, and which we are recommended to adopt. And what are the facts? Everywhere the churches are losing ground. All sorts of conferences are being held, and innumerable schemes devised to regain the influence the churches once exercised. It has been my privilege to pay five visits to Great Britain in six years. I have travelled the country from end to end, and have talked with many hundreds of people. I have met ministers of all denominations, and while for the most part engaged myself on Sundays, I have had some opportunity of observing the church life in the Old Land. And it is far from encouraging. Everywhere 'union' is being advocated. It is not, however, a union of exuberantly healthy churches that is proposed, but a union of the wasted remnants which the popular views you recommend have brought to the verge of ruin. The Secretary of the Baptist Union has even expressed his willingness to accept episcopal ordination in order to effect union!

"It may be that the course you champion is popular with certain ministers and theological professors, but it is absolutely certain it is not popular with the great unchurched masses who turn away with disappointment and disgust from the pulpits which no longer have a positive message. If a tree may still be known by its fruits, it is sober truth to say, that the fruits of the new view of the Scripture which your editorial recommends are the most-damning evidence of its pernicious character that could possibly be adduced...

"In *The British Weekly* of July 10th, Sir William Robertson Nicoll had a leading article entitled, 'The Preaching of the Cross.' In this article he says:

"'Preachers do not, as they used to do, beseech men with much entreaty to receive the gift. They may state the truth of salvation, but they do so without pressing it on their hearers. They assume the take-it-or-leave-it attitude. The consequence is that the church does not grow, but rather decreases and the confession of Christ is rarer and rarer among men.'

"Replying to this article in the issue of August 28th, Professor G. A. Johnstone Ross, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, among other things, says:

"The author of that article fails, I think, to do justice to one of the

greatest difficulties which educated young preachers have in preaching the Cross; it is the difficulty of construing theologically the person of our Lord.

"No effective atonement can be made for the sin of the world except an atonement in which God is Source, Agent and Sufferer.' But is Jesus really God?"

"I wonder whether, many of our laity appreciate the intellectual difficulty which some of our younger ministers have in giving to our Lord, however much they may revere Him, the status and value of God."

"We older men can easily, though wistfully, recall a time when we read our New Testament, preached our sermons, and prayed our prayers without a shadow of hesitancy about the Godhead of Jesus. Unitarianism for us was unthinkable, condemned by its chill sterility."

"But then came upon us wave after wave of 'New Testament criticism': the elevation of the Synoptic tradition to a place of historical value all its own; the analysis of the documents; the confidently trumpeted results as to the picture of Jesus which was the 'true historic residuum'; the rejection of the Fourth Gospel not merely as unhistorical, but as a distortion of the real picture; the slighting of St. Paul."

"What we really need is a return from the humanistic and naturalistic ways of looking at our Lord (which have become too fashionable because of our sociological interests), and the concentration of scholars upon the steps by which Christian folk in the first century came to give Him the honors of Godhead. What happened in 'the tunnel' A.D. 30-50? How does the 'Jesus of History' emerge as Lord of Providence and Dispenser of Grace and Judgment in St. Paul's earliest letters?"

"And now, Mr. Editor, one thing more. What is to be the answer of the 'considerable number of Christian people, including a fair proportion of ministers', and 'some partially educated and very dogmatic preachers' to the challenge of your editorial?"

"I do not know. But I know the answer of one. I am proud to be classed in this connection with 'unlearned and ignorant men'. One of the unmistakable badges of presumptuous ignorance in the realm of religion is the approval of the mechanical, ostentatious, oracular, religious, 'scholarship' of the much-exalted and smugly complacent 'modern' academician. From his imprimatur may I by God's good grace, for ever be delivered!"

"I have written strongly, I know, but not impulsively. I write at this moment deliberately and in contemptuous anger. It is time some Canadian Baptists became angry! And I write to provoke the question: When will the considerable number of Christian people, including a fair proportion of ministers', and 'some partially educated and very dogmatic preachers' who are 'still threshing away at many of those questions touching the Scriptures which are regarded as settled in Great Britain', demand a reckoning of those in the Denomination who boast of having laid those views aside, and who so noisily proclaim their own ascendancy in denominational counsels?"

"We are talking of a 'Forward Movement'. 'Forward' whither? and to what? Is it to be in the direction to which your editorial points? Does this editorial view fairly represent the views of the majority of the members of the churches of this Convention? Are they willing that the denominational organ should so represent them to the world? Some of us must by some means discover where the Denomination stands on these vital questions, and whither it is moving. I am personally of the conviction that the farther we move 'forward' in the direction in which your article would lead us the farther we depart from 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints'. If the only principle for which Baptists now stand is the much-vaunted 'liberty' to doubt everything and be sure of nothing,—except that those who believe the Bible to be the inspired and authoritative Word of God are 'partially educated' and are not to be classed with 'intelligent Christian people', it is a principle which few will sacrifice to 'forward'. And I am much mistaken if it be not found that the majority of our churches still believe that Baptists still have a peculiar mission; and that the distinctiveness of our message consists in

positive principles and not in mere negations. And I would here venture with all respect to urge the 'considerable number of Christians, including a fair proportion of ministers' and 'some partially educated and very dogmatic preachers' who have not yet thrown their 'crude theological views' to the critical wolves to attend the coming Convention with the determination of making their views known, and their votes felt in the shaping of our denominational policies.

"I am prepared for the torrential Niagara of adjectives which will be loosed to describe my uncharity and unmitigated and hopeless ignorance. But I cannot understand how any one who loves the Bible as the Word of God because therein and thereby he has learned Christ, and because his infallible Lord has borne witness to its absolute reliability, could carefully read your editorial without being deeply grieved and indignantly angry. I am resolved to avail myself of the first opportunity of testing the attitude of the Denomination toward the position taken in your article. Meanwhile I send you this, my indignant protest. And I send it in the earnest hope that it may be possible to demonstrate at the coming Convention, what I feel certain is the fact, that the Denomination as a whole still stands true to its historical position in its present attitude to the question of the inspiration and authority of Scripture. Then we can all heartily co-operate in a real and great 'Forward Movement'.

(Signed) THOMAS T. SHIELDS.

P.S.—Permit me to add, that at the Ottawa Convention I intend to move an amendment to the motion to adopt the report of the Publication Board to provide an opportunity for the Convention to say by vote whether or not The Canadian Baptist in the article in question correctly represents the Denomination's view of the Scripture. T. T. S.

The Ottawa Convention, 1919

At the Convention held in Ottawa in 1919, we submitted a resolution reviewing and repudiating the editorial, the last clause of which read as follows:

"Therefore this Convention, while expressing our affectionate regard for and our implicit confidence in the Editor of The Canadian Baptist, hereby declares its disapproval of the editorial in The Canadian Baptist of October 2nd, entitled, 'Th Inspiration and Authority of Scripture,' on the ground that in its representative character as the organ of the Convention, The Canadian Baptist in the said editorial commends to its readers some new vague view of the Scriptures different from that to which the Convention declared its adherence in 1910, and upon which the denominational University is declared to be founded."

The Year Book of 1919 states that the resolution was carried, only a few voting in the negative.

Who Is The Anonymous Enemy?

Ever since the Ottawa Convention one thing has greatly troubled us; the then Editor of The Canadian Baptist, the late Dr. W. J. McKay, admitted that he was not the writer of the article in question. It was on this ground we inserted the words expressing confidence in the Editor. We are morally certain we know the name of the author; but we have not been able to obtain the consent of the brother who positively affirms that he knows who wrote these articles, to publish the name and the proof. It is enough to say that somewhere, lurking in the denomination, there is the cowardly spirit who sought to inject his poison into the blood stream of our denominational life. We still have a hope that the day will come when some in possession of accurate knowledge on this subject, will have the courage to publish the facts; but until then, the Denomination must remember that it is subject to the machinations of this cowardly, anonymous, secret enemy of Evangelical Christianity who is still lurking in our midst.

Our Recent Communication To The Senate

We come now to the question which the Convention will, in the nature of the case, have to face. At a meeting of the Senate of McMaster University held September 4th, 1925, we read the following communication:

Toronto, September 24th, 1915.

"To the Senate of McMaster University,

"Dear Brethern:

"With much reluctance I feel it to be my duty to lay before the Senate a communication which has reached me from England, relative to the appointment of Rev. H. T. Marshall, of Coventry, to the Faculty of McMaster University. And before doing so, I desire to put on record a copy of a telegram sent to the Registrar of the University from Los Angeles, California, July 13th, 1925, which was as follows:

'Mr. E. J. Bengough,
Registrar, McMaster University,
Toronto, Ontario.

'Notice Senate Meeting received to-day. Confident Convention would not approve any important action such as filling vacant professorships at emergency meeting called midsummer when some Convention-elected representatives known so far away make attendance impossible. Desire as such representative respectfully lodge protest against important action under such circumstances.

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

"I am aware that meetings of the Senate cannot be arranged to suit the convenience of all; but this telegram was sent in order that the Senate might know that this important meeting was called when it was physically impossible for some elected representatives of the Convention to be present.

"The communication to which I refer has come to me without any solicitation. I was interested in the report of Mr. Marshall's appointment; and was hoping that the gentleman selected would be as much in accord with the views of the Convention as was the last appointee who was brought from across the water, Professor H. S. Curr. I made no effort to ascertain Mr. Marshall's position, and held no communication with anyone in England.

"I have before me two letters: the first was addressed directly to a member of a Baptist church within the Convention; the second letter came to the same gentleman indirectly, and in response to someone's enquiry. I was out of the city at this time, and had no knowledge whatever of any enquiry respecting Mr. Marshall's position having been made.

"The first letter, addressed directly to the Toronto Baptist referred to, is as follows:

17 Amphthell Road, Liverpool, August 19th, 1925.

'Dear Sir:

'I am at present on holiday in Wales and have just learned of the appointment to the staff of McMaster University of Rev. H. T. Marshall late of Princess Gate Church, Liverpool, and now of Coventry. I understand you are in a position to make your influence felt and I trust that even yet it may not be too late. Mr. Marshall is a Modernist and of entirely different stamp to Rev. Henry S. Curr whose place he is to take. The church of which he was pastor here is open membership. A few pointed questions on Inspiration, bodily Resurrection of Christ would reveal his position. I learn from Rev. Hughes of Toronto now in this country, that a fight has already taken place over Modernism at McMaster; and if this appointment is confirmed, Modernism has gained a great victory. Please pardon my writing, but knowing the facts I could not but let you know.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. M. ROBERTSON.

"The second letter, which is a reply to someone's enquiry, is in the following terms:

Liverpool, August 19th, 1925.

'Dear Sir:

Your letter to hand. The church at Princes Gate, Liverpool, of which Rev. Marshall was for some time pastor, is an open membership church. I cannot say as to his Coventry charge. He is a Modernist trained in all the arts of the Germans and his appointment in the place of Rev. Henry S. Curr, M.A., B.D., at McMaster is nothing short of a calamity. When I saw the announcement of his appointment I marvelled greatly, and sincerely hope that something may yet be done to frustrate such a colossal blunder. Let a few pointed questions in fundamentals be put to him and the position will be made clear.

'Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) W. M. ROBERTSON.

"I beg the Senate's leave to offer a few observations respecting these communications. In the first place, it will be obvious to all that it would be unfair to pass any judgment upon Mr. Marshall's theological position on the basis of either of these letters. I would call the Senate's attention to the fact that no word spoken or written by Mr. Marshall is quoted: we have only an opinion of a minister who laboured with Mr. Marshall in the same city. Everyone will agree that Mr. Marshall should be allowed to speak for himself. On the other hand, I would venture to point out that when such a communication is brought to the attention of the Senate bearing the name of a responsible and recognized Baptist minister who charges that Mr. Marshall is a modernist trained in all the arts of the Germans'; and that his appointment to McMaster is nothing short of a calamity; and who expresses the hope that something may yet be done to frustrate such a colossal blunder,' this Senate, charged to direct the teaching of a University owned and supported by a Denomination holding the strong evangelical position to which our Convention has repeatedly, by resolution, committed itself,—I say, in view of all these things, this Senate cannot afford to ignore such a communication as is here presented.

"My only desire is to safeguard the Denomination against the possibility of admitting to the teaching staff of the University one whose views are at variance with the things commonly believed among us; and in order that there may be no necessity for any public agitation on this subject, I respectfully ask the Senate to take such steps as will obviate the possibility of a mistake being made in this matter. It would seem to me to be a reasonable suggestion either that Mr. Marshall should come before the Senate, and that permission should be given to all members to question him touching the subject represented by these letters; or, otherwise, that a committee of the Senate should be appointed to interview Mr. Marshall with the same end in view.

"In the event of this report of Mr. Marshall's position being proved to be without foundation, and if from his own lips we learn that he is true to the faith once for all delivered, it will be my great pleasure to do everything in my power to make his ministry in this University a success.

"I venture respectfully to submit this matter to the judgment of the Senate.

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

How The Senate Received It

After the communication was read the Dean in Theology, Dr. J. H. Farmer, said that he, with the Chancellor, accepted full responsibility for recommending Mr. Marshall to the Senate. In discussing Mr. Marshall's position, the Dean said that he understood Mr. Marshall to occupy substantially Dr. S. R. Driver's position on critical questions; and added that while he would, personally, take

a more conservative view on questions of authorship and dates of the Old Testament Scriptures, he was not himself quite sure where we ought to draw the line. He said also that he could understand how some people might question Mr. Marshall's position on the resurrection, but that he had carefully enquired of Mr. Marshall respecting this matter, and that Mr. Marshall had said he would have to interpret the resurrection in the light of Paul; and that it was a spiritual resurrection. The Dean said that he then asked Mr. Marshall if he did not believe that the grave was empty, and that Christ did really rise; and that to this Mr. Marshall returned an affirmative answer. Dr. Farmer said that had he been seeking a man for the Chair of Old Testament, he did not think he would have recommended Mr. Marshall. Thereupon we enquired of the Dean whether he thought it was safe to appoint a man to teach the New Testament who did not believe the Old?

Members of the Senate expressed the view that the Senate had already satisfied itself of Mr. Marshall's fitness; and that if the Editor of this paper were not satisfied, it would be well for him to interview Mr. Marshall personally.

The Chancellor recommended us to invite Mr. Marshall to preach in Jarvis Street, and sometime to play a game of golf with him! We need make no comment on the character of such a suggestion, except frankly to say to our readers that with great reluctance and disappointment we submitted our communication to the Senate as relating to matters of infinitely greater moment than the playing of golf.

The only action of the Senate on the subject was a motion moved by Dr. E. C. Fox, appointing a committee to consider what action the Senate should take in view of our communication. To say that Mr. Fox's speech was a "bitter" attack upon the writer for daring to raise the question is to use the mildest language we know. We must inform the Convention that this same Mr. Fox did not accept the Convention's decision as registered in London, for he was one of the two members of the Board of Governors who remained seated when the resolution was passed.

Dr. Driver's and Mr. Marshall's Position.

We now come to another matter: the Dean in Theology plainly declared that he understood Mr. Marshall to occupy Dr. Driver's position on critical matters. A few extracts from Dr. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament", Edition 1913, will be sufficient to give our readers some idea of Mr. Marshall's position. On page 12 of the preface we find the following:

"It is objected, however, that some of the conclusions of critics respecting the Old Testament are incompatible with the authority of our blessed Lord, and that in loyalty to Him we are precluded from accepting them. That our Lord appealed to the Old Testament as the record of a revelation in the past, and as pointing forward to Himself, is undoubted; but these aspects of the Old Testament are perfectly consistent with a critical view of its structure and growth. That our Lord in so appealing to it designed to pronounce a verdict on the authorship and age of its different parts, and to foreclose all future inquiry into these subjects, is an assumption for which no sufficient ground can be alleged. Had such been His aim, it would have been out of harmony with the entire method and tenor of His teaching. In no single instance, so far as we are aware, did He anticipate the results of scientific inquiry or historical research. The aim of His teaching was a religious one; it was to set before men the pattern of a perfect life, to move them to imitate it, to bring them to

Himself. He accepted, as the basis of His teaching, the opinions respecting the Old Testament current around Him: He assumed, in His allusions to it, the premises which His opponents recognized, and which could not have been questioned (even had it been necessary to question them) without raising issues for which the time was not yet ripe, and which had they been raised, would have interfered seriously with the paramount purpose of His life.* There is no record of the question, whether a particular portion of the Old Testament was written by Moses, or David, or Isaiah, having been ever submitted to Him; and had it been so submitted, we have no means of knowing what His answer would have been. The purposes for which our Lord appealed to the Old Testament, its prophetic significance, and the spiritual lessons deducible from it, are not, as has been already remarked above, affected by critical inquiries."

* It does not seem requisite for the present purpose, as, indeed, within the limits of a Preface it would not be possible, to consider whether our Lord, as man, possessed all knowledge, or whether a limitation in this, as in other respects,—though not, of course, of such a kind as to render Him fallible as a teacher,—was involved in that gracious act of condescension, in virtue of which He was willing "in all things to be made like unto His brethren". (Heb. 2:17).

On page 322, on the book of Jonah, Dr. Driver says:

"Both in form and contents the Book of Jonah resembles the biographical narratives of Elijah and Elisha (1 Ki. 17-19, 2 Ki. 4-6, &c.), though it is pervaded by a more distinctly didactic aim. It cannot, however, have been written until long after the lifetime of Jonah himself."

On the same book, page 324, Dr. Driver says:

"On the historical character of the narrative opinions have differed widely. Quite irrespectively of the miraculous features in the narrative, it must be admitted that there are indications that it is not strictly historical. The sudden conversion, on such a large scale as (without pressing single expressions) is evidently implied, of a great heathen population, is contrary to analogy; nor is it easy to imagine a monarch of the type depicted in the Assyrian inscriptions behaving as the king of Nineveh is represented as acting in presence of the Hebrew prophet. It is remarkable also that the conversion of Nineveh, if it took place upon the scale described, should have produced so little permanent effect; for the Assyrians are uniformly represented in the O. T. as idolaters. But, in fact, the structure of the narrative shows that the didactic purpose of the book is the author's chief aim. He introduces just those details that have a bearing upon this, while omitting others which, had his interest been in the history as such, might naturally have been mentioned; e.g., details as to the spot at which Jonah was cast on to the land, and particulars as to the special sins of which the Ninevites were guilty."

"No doubt the materials of the narrative were supplied by tradition; and these the author cast into a literary form in such a manner as to set forcibly before his readers the truths which he desired them to take to heart. The details are artistically arranged. The scene is laid far off, in the chief city of the great empire which had for long been Israel's formidable oppressor. Jonah, commissioned to proceed thither, seeks, with dramatic propriety, to escape to the furthest parts known to the Hebrews in the opposite direction."

On page 325 Dr. Driver speaks as follows:

"The Psalm 2: 219 is not strictly appropriate to Jonah's situation at the time; for it is not a petition for deliverance to come, but

a thanksgiving for deliverance already accomplished (like Ps. 30, for instance) Hence, no doubt, the Book of Jonah was not its original place; but it was taken by the author from some prior source. The expressions in vs. 3, 5, 6, &c., may have been intended originally in a figurative sense (as in the Psalms cited above, from which they are mostly borrowed) but they may also have been meant literally (see vs. 5b, 6a, which are not among the phrases borrowed), and have formed part of a Psalm composed originally as a thanksgiving for deliverance from shipwreck, and placed by the author, in Jonah's mouth on account of the apparent suitability of some of the expressions to his situation."

On Psalm 110, page 384, we read:

"This Psalm, though it may be ancient, can hardly have been composed by David. If read without *præjudicium*, it produces the irresistible impression of having been written, not by a king with reference to an invisible, spiritual Being, standing above him as his superior, but by a prophet with reference to the theocratic king. (1) The title "My lord", v. 1, is the one habitually used in addressing the Israelitish king (e.g. I Ki. 1-2 *passim*); (2) Messianic prophecies have regularly as their point of departure some institution of the Jewish theocracy—the king, the prophet, the people (Isa. 42:1, &c.), the high priest, the Temple (Isa. 28: 16): the supposition that David is here speaking and addressing a superior, who stands in no relation with existing institutions, is—not, indeed, impossible (for we are not entitled to limit absolutely the range of prophetic vision), but—contrary to the analogy of prophecy; (3) the justice of this reasoning is strongly confirmed by vs. 5: 5-7, where a subject of the Psalm is actually depicted, not as such a spiritual superior, but as a victorious Israelitish monarch, triumphing through Jehovah's help over earthly foes. The Psalm is Messianic in the same sense that Ps. 2 is: it depicts the ideal glory of the theocratic king, who receives from a prophet (v. 1) the two-fold solemn promise (1) of victory over his foes; (2) of a perpetual priesthood (cf. Jer. 30: 21b: see p. 143). In the question addressed by our Lord to the Jews (Matt. 22: 41-46; Mk. 12: 35-37; Luke 20: 41-44) His object, it is evident, is not to instruct them on the authorship of the Psalm, but to argue from its contents: and though He assumes the Davidic authorship, accepted generally at the time, yet the cogency of His argument is unimpaired, so long as it is recognized that the Psalm is a Messianic one, and that the august language used in it of the Messiah is not compatible with the position of one who was a mere human son of David."

Dr. Farmer and the Chancellor Responsible.

Our readers will observe that we did not propose that the new professor should be judged by the letters we had received; but we confess that having heard a statement from Dr. Farmer's own lips on Mr. Marshall's position we do not feel it important to enquire further into this matter in England. We have the word of the Dean in Theology that Mr. Marshall's attitude toward the Old Testament Scriptures is substantially that of Dr. S. R. Driver. We have given a few quotations from Dr. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament". Everyone at all informed on these critical questions knows that Dr. Driver, if not one of the most extreme, is at least one of the most advanced of the critics. This article is written to ask the members of the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec whether they are prepared to consent to such teaching being given in McMaster University. We desired to avoid any public discussion of this matter: we took the matter to the Senate, as our communication will show, and respectfully asked that further enquiry be made. The only

response was to be denounced by Mr. Fox as one who only wasted the time of the Senate by useless discussion; and to receive the Chancellor's recommendation to settle these tremendous problems by a game of golf!

Some members of the Senate suggested that Mr. Marshall should be allowed to begin his work in peace; and if it should transpire that he was untrue to the faith, the Governing Bodies might then be relied upon to take action. To this, we pointed out that we had once believed such a course to be safe, and for that reason, seconded Dr. McNeill's motion at the Bloor Street Convention in 1910; but that the Governing Bodies had subsequently permitted Professor Matthews to disseminate his poison for nine long years without taking any action at all. We repeat the last paragraph of the article which we have already quoted, which appeared in our issue of April 23rd:

"Prevention is better than cure! When once a professor has been appointed, if his position is discovered to be unsound, it is impossible to raise opposition to his teaching without introducing personal considerations. In this article we are not discussing unsound professors but vacant Chairs, and dealing with principles in the abstract. It is to avoid the necessity of holding discussions involving persons this article has been written. We respectfully suggest to the Senate and Board of Governors that the utmost care should be exercised in even considering men to fill the vacancies referred to, to see that they are in cordial agreement with the great doctrines of supernatural Evangelical Christianity."

Will the Convention Consent?

When the Dean in Theology and the Chancellor of the University, in spite of the Convention's oft repeated declaration, and with full knowledge of the facts, deliberately recommend for appointment to the Professorship in McMaster University a man taking Dr. Drivers' attitude toward the Scriptures, what may we expect from the University itself? Moreover when, as according to Dr. Farmer's statement is the case with Mr. Marshall, a man replies to a question as to whether he believes in the resurrection of Christ, by saying he must be allowed to interpret it, one cannot help regarding him with suspicion. The Apostle Paul labours to establish the resurrection of the body of Christ as a fact. Any true believer can answer the question. Do you believe the body of Christ was raised from the dead? with a simple 'Yes' or 'No'. But according to Dr. Farmer, Mr. Marshall must first it, yet in appointment was recommended by the Dean! We call our readers' attention again to the statement written into the Trust Deed of McMaster University; and ask them to judge whether this appointment is in agreement therewith:

Statement of Trusts in the Deed of McMaster University.

"The trusts in said deed in so far as they refer to Religious teaching are as follows: 'For the education and training of students preparing for and intending to be engaged in Pastoral, Evangelical, missionary or other denominational work in connection with the Regular Baptist Denomination, whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed of persons who have been baptized on a personal profession of their Faith in Christ holding and maintaining substantially the following doctrines, that is to say: "The Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice, the existence of one living and true God, sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the same in essence and equal attributes, the total and universal depravity of mankind, the election and effectual calling of all God's people, the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, the free justification of believers in Him

by His imputed righteousness, the preservation unto eternal life of the Saints, the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust, the general judgment, the everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting misery of the wicked, immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the only gospel baptism, that parties so baptized are alone entitled to Communion at the Lord's Table and that a Gospel Church is a body of baptized believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God."

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES

The attendance at School was 1,084. The morning congregation practically filled the church. The Pastor called Rev. G. P. and Mrs. Near, who are leaving shortly as missionaries to the Belgian Congo, to the platform. Mr. Near was until recently, pastor at Kenora, Ont. He and his wife desired to come into the fellowship of Jarvis St., and to go out from us as missionaries. They spoke briefly of the work to which they have given their lives, and we are sure have so established themselves in the hearts of Jarvis St. members that they will be constantly remembered by the church in prayer.

It was a special pleasure to have on the platform one of our veteran pastors, Rev. A. H. Brace. We have known this saint of God for many years and can scarcely believe that so vigorous a man can be eighty-one years old. He led us to the throne in prayer, and as he prayed we felt a strong desire to hear this faithful preacher preach again. He responded to our sudden request and we had a rich feast as this Man of God preached on the power of the Holy Ghost. Several came forward at the close of the sermon.

In the afternoon the Pastor motored to Orangeville, about fifty miles each way, and preached to a crowded congregation and baptized twenty for Pastors Gordon, Brown and James McGinlay.

The church was filled in every part in the evening. The Pastor arrived a half-hour late from Orangeville, baptized ten and preached briefly from "This cup is the New Testament in my blood."

Many responded to the invitation. A great Communion service followed. The attendance filled the whole church downstairs. Sixty-three new members were received.

THE BIBLE UNION CONFERENCES.

The meetings held up to the time of going to press (Wednesday midnight) have been seasons of great refreshing. In the James St. Church, Hamilton, Tuesday night, there was an attendance which made the church look full. Pastor James McGinlay preached on the Hebrew children and the furnace. It was a message of great spiritual power. The young preacher thrilled his audience by his appeal to put God first, and to be willing to go further than the furnace door. At least one hundred and fifty, we should judge, came forward declaring their determination so to do.

In Jarvis St., Dr. J. W. Gillon delivered a great address to a great congregation. In Hamilton, on Wednesday, a magnificent congregation assembled in the afternoon and in the evening filled the church. Dr. Gillon spoke twice in Hamilton and Dr. Norris once and once in Toronto. The large congregation which greeted Dr. Norris in Jarvis St. was evidence of the place this great preacher has in Toronto. Many pastors were present both in Hamilton and Toronto. Who can tell what these conferences may bring forth.