SPECIAL EDITION TEN CENTS PER COPY

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 29th, 1925 No. 26

Shall Modernism Capture McMaster?

By T. T. SHIELDS

By the decision of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, in Hamilton, October 21st, an entirely new educational situation has arisen. In order that I may put all the facts together in one paper for convenience of distribution I propose briefly to summarize the events leading up to the Educational Session of the Convention on October 21st.

The Educational Session of the London Convention of 1924 closed with the passing of the following resolution:

> 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 intending 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.

Nothing unusual occurred during the year until the announcement of the Senate and Board of McMaster University that Rev. L. H. Marshall, of Coventry, England, had been appointed to the Chair of Practical Theology in succession to Dr. Gilmour. At the first meeting of the Senate following this announcement I submitted the following communication:

Toronto, September 24th, 1925.

To the Senate of McMaster University,
Dear Brethren:

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. T. H. 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 the 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 Ampthell 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 Princess Gate, Liverpool, of which Rev. Marshall was for seome 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.

Because the Senate refused to take action, this statement was published in *The Gospel Witness* of October 13th, 1925.

Because Dean Farmer has said that Mr. Marshall had adopted the moderate critical view of Dr. Driver, I made certain comments in *The Witness* on the Senate's action, referring to what Dr. Farmer had said; and gave quotations from Dr. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament", in order to show Dr. Driver's position. (*The Gospel Witness*, Oct. 15th, 1925, Vol. 4, No. 23). To these comments we shall refer later. It is enough here to call the reader's attention to the reasons I have given in the following statement, for submitting it to the Senate. I regret exceedingly the necessity of discussing Mr. Marshall in this matter; but the truth is, the University is much bigger than any one man, and the cause of evangelical truth is far more important than McMaster University. I have called down upon my head the wrath of McMaster because I told the Denomination what its Senate had done.

Who Has Misrepresented?

In his address in submitting the report of the Board of Governors to the Convention, Chancellor Whiddon charged that I had been guilty of making two misrepresentations and two false statements in *The Gospel Witness*. Before dealing with that question I now quote the Chancellor, showing how he gave the impression that my request for the appointment of a committee had been complied with, and that the committee had been appointed. I set out below, first, the Chancellor's words taken from a stenographic report of his address:

Now, it has also been given to the public that a request was made to the Senate—and since the inside affairs of the Senate have been given to the public, I think it is only right that I read the reply of a committee appointed by the Senate to deal with the request which Dr. Shields made of the Senate some three and a half weeks ago that a special committee be appointed to interview Professor Marshall upon his arrival—not at the dock, but a little piece away from it.

The following is the last paragraph of the Committee's report to the Senate:

"We therefore feel that the action of the Senate was consistent and regular, and that there is no need for any further review of its action. On the contrary; we bespeak for Professor Marshall our confidence and Christian welcome."

After the Chancellor, Dr. Farmer, and Mr. E. C. Fox, had spoken, before addressing the Convention I requested that the minutes of the Senate's meeting under discussion should be read. To this, by motion, the Convention agreed. I now quote from those minutes, that my readers may know how far my request that a committee of the Senate should enquire into the report from England that Mr. Marshall was a modernist, had been complied with:

Mr. E. C. Fox said:

"I would like to move that a committee composed of the Chancellor, of the two Deans and the Chairman of the Board be appointed to consider what action should be taken in respect to the statement as read by Dr. Shields, and that a report be brought in to the next meeting of the Senate."

Later in the meeting, and before the motion was put, Mr. Fox said:

"My motion is not to appoint a committee to interview Mr. Marshall. I want to make that clear."

I now quote from the stenographic report of my speech, and of Dr. McNeill's interruption. After stating what I had done in reporting to the Senate what I had heard from England, and quoting from *The Gospel Witness*, I continued:

"I sak this Convention if in that action I played the part of an unreasonable and suspicious man?

—(Cries of "No.").—

What else under the circumstances could I do?

DR. MACNEILL: Wait for the report of the Senate Committee.

A DELEGATE: Honour the majority of the Senate.

DR. SHIELDS: I am very glad Dr. MacNeill has called attention to the report of the Committee. I asked for a committee to be appointed. Mr. Fox moved the appointment of a committee, and subsequently, as you heard it read this afternoon, he said: I desire it to be understood that this Committee is not appointed to interview Mr. Marshall. The Committee was appointed to look after me, apparently! Mr. Marshall emphatically declared, I appeal to the record—Mr. Fox, I beg your pardon—Mr. Fox emphatically declared that he wished it to be understood that that committee was not appointed to interview Mr. Marshall; it was not a response to my request, but it was appointed to see what action the Senate would take in view of my statement. I had absolutely no guarantee that that committee would investigate or even interview Mr. Marshall. In proof of that I call your attention to the fact that the Chancellor has told us—you have heard it—that I was recommended to interview Mr. Marshall personally. The Chairman of the Board recommended me to interview Mr. Marshall personally. Mr. Merrill was quoted as saying that the appointment of such a committee as I asked would be going back upon the Senate's decision; and every word in that report goes to prove that there was not one member of the Senate who favoured the suggestion that any committee should be appointed, and I was told that if I were dissatisfied I should go and talk with Mr. Marshall himself.

A DELEGATE: I should like to ask for information. From reading that report I understood a committee had already been appointed.

THE CHANCELLOR: The report would indicate that, and the paragraph in the report of the Board and Senate would indicate it very definitely.

DR. SHIELDS: I should like to ask the Chancellor to explain what committee was appointed. The Committee had been appointed which had already reported to the Senate, and the Senate made the appointment. Was there any other committee?—(Cries of "No!")—What committee?

THE CHANCELLOR: No other committee. A duly authorized and constituted committee had been appointed according to the custom of the Senate of McMaster University, and this Convention has never challenged the charter provisions of the constitutional operation of a Senate of McMaster Uni-

versity. That committee was representative. It included—if I may give fuller information,—Dr. Shields?

DR. SHIELDS: That is what I want.

THE CHANCELLOR: By the decision of the Senate early last winter, a few weeks after the death of Dr. Gilmour, it included the Deans, the Chairman of the Board, the Chairman of the Executive, Dr. MacNeill, the Rev. W. A. Cameron, and the Chancellor. That committee reported.

DR. SHIELDS: May I enquire, then, Mr. Chairman, through you, if Dr. MacNeill will kindly explain the import of his remark that I should have waited for the report of the committee? What committee and what report?

Dr. MACNEILL: I will be very glad to explain.

DR. MACNEILL: The committee to which I referred when I raised the question from the floor a moment ago was the committee that was nominated by Mr. Fox and appointed by the Senate to ascertain how they should deal with the communication that Dr. Shields had laid on the table, and I do claim that Dr. Shields had no right to thrust this question out into the public—into the Convention—until that committee had reported.

DR. SHIELDS: Then, Mr. Chairman, I beg to ask for a re-reading of that part of the minutes in which Mr. Fox emphatically declares it has no relation to Mr. Marshall.

THE CHANCELLOR: Here are the two items that will make that clear. One is a record of fact, not a quotation, as a result of inquiries concerning the probable arrival of Professor Marshall.

"The Chancellor states that Mr. Marshall cannot reach Toronto before October 8th.

"Mr. Fox: My motion is not to appoint a committee to interview Mr. Marshall. I want to make that clear."

DR. SHIELDS: I ask, then, what hope there was of the question raised being dealt with by the Committee when the committee emphatically was instructed that they were not appointed to interview Mr. Marshall?"

I ask my readers to judge from these records whether the Chancellor and Dr. MacNeill were accurate in their reference to this committee. I should not like to use the ugly word "misrepresentation" in respect to their action, but certainly they misinterpreted the facts. I can only assume they did so unintentionally. I call attention to the fact that the Chancellor's words were a preface to his attempt to convict me of "misrepresentation."

Take Appeal to Whole People

In view of the foregoing, I submit that the Senate's absolute refusal to take any action looking toward an enquiry as to whether there was any truth in the allegation that Mr. Marshall was a modernist, is established. There was therefore nothing for me to do but to take my appeal to the people. But who are the people? Are they the delegates to the Convention only? Surely the sixty thousand or more Baptists who are called upon to support our denominational interests have a right to be informed of the facts. And these sixty thousand cannot possibly judge of facts from the reports in the secular press; while, from our past experience, we are forced to the conclusion that there is little hope of a full and fair report of the Convention being given in any other way. It is for these reasons the facts are now published in *The Witness*.

What The Gospel Witness Reported.

I return now to the Chancellor's charges that *The Gospel Witness* had misrepresented the facts respecting the discussion in the Senate. We answer that allegation by printing what we said in this paper, and what is recorded in the minutes of the Senate as read to the Convention at our request:

"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 author-

ship 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 Mr. 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.

"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 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 St. 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 impossble 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 thy 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 in 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 nterpret it, yet his appointment was recommended by the Dean!

Extracts From the Minutes of Senate Meeting.

Dr. Farmer said: "'He had the statement of the doctrinal position of the institution, and he gave his hearty adhesion to those statements. I pointed out in the Senate that in his department—of course his department is not the Old Testament as stated in that letter; he is in the department of Practical Theology and the Arts Bible—I stated that his general view was in sympathy with the general moderate, what may be called the Driver view, the moderate critical view. That has to deal with dates and authorship and so on. I do not know just where to draw the line, but he told me that the first chapter of Genesis was one of the proofs to him of the inspiration of the Bible and the general historicity. He accepts miracles. The difficulty is where we are to draw the line in this matter of a man's view of the date and authorship of the various books, but theologically he is sound, and in his spirit I judge him to be a man of exceptional loyalty and devotion and resolution to the Saviourhood and Lordship of Christ.

"'DR. SHIELDS: Do I understand you to say that if it had been the Old Testament you would not as ardently support him?

"'PROFESSOR FARMER: If it were the Old Testament I would have been more careful at all events in certain questions along those lines.

"'DR. SHIELDS: Would you really say a man is safe to teach the New Testament who has some question about the Old?

"'PROFESSOR FARMER: On the matter of authorship and dates and so on, I say I do not know where you should draw the line.

"'DR. SHIELDS: You would admit then that that is your understanding, that he does take the Driver position?

"'PROFESSOR FARMER: In general I think he does take that general view of the dating of the Old Testament books.

"'DR. SHIELDS: Does the Senate believe the Convention would approve of the appointment of a man holding that position?

"'PROFESSOR FARMER: I want to add this word. I believe there are a great many things we want; we want a man who is perfect in every department if possible, but the matter of spirit, genuine love to God and Christ, genuine faith in Him, genuine love to the brethren, that is a very important matter; and when a man has all the other points and on that one point he will not take exactly the same view as I do, I felt under all the conditions it was a wise step to take, and I made the recommendation accordingly. The statement I made in the Canadian Baptist is a true representation of his theological attitudes and his spirit, I think.

"'DR. SHIELDS: I must say frankly that if there is no more satisfactory explanation of the appointment of Mr. Marshall and his position, than that that Dr. Farmer has given, you are inviting great trouble in

the appointment of Mr. Marshall. I do not presume to judge him at all. You know all I know about it; I have communicaated to you every item I have on this subject; but I have written, as I said, to make inquiries. Personally I must express my disappointment that the Dean in Theology has no fuller or more satisfactory explanation than that. As to a man's spirit, it is a little difficult to understand a man's spirit by an occasional interview; you have to know a man under all circumstances and over an extended period to know his spirit. There are the facts. I have asked the Senate whether they will afford opportunity for the members of the Senate to talk with Mr. Marshall in the presence of other members, either in the Senate as a whole or a committee appointed by the Senate, which I think is not an unreasonable suggestion.

"'THE CHANCELLOR: Do we desire to go into this matter further? I shall be glad to make a statement in a moment. I think although this is a special meeting it might have been well to have had the minutes read. I think a brief statement from Mr. Matthews as to the particular way in which we came to get in touch with Mr. Marshall might throw light on the question.

(The Chancellor then read a paragraph from the minutes of the meeting of July 14th.)

The minute shows the fact that Dr. Shields' telegram had been received, and gives the telegram itself. I think it right to say to the Senate what was practically said in full at the meeting. When the Senate was called, it was called on a 16-day margin, without any definite thought that Mr. Marshall would be recommended by the Committee. The Committee had not yet met Mr. Marshall, but there were two other lecturers to be appointed. We did not try to trump up a meeting of the Senate and Board. It was a very large meeting. Another member of the Senate who was appointed to the Board by the Convention was in California at the same time; we could not wait till he came home to hold the meeting. But a very large number of those who were within reach of Toronto came to the meeting.

"'Now, with regard to Mr. Marshall himself, I am sure—and Dr. Shields has already said it—that we ought not surely to base our estimate of a newly-appointed professor of practical theology on the general kind of statement that appears in those letters from Mr. Robertson, who is unknown to any of us, I take it. Such statements are being made constantly about men. To say that Mr. Marshall has been trained in all the —— I have forgotten what of the Germans,——

"DR. SHIELDS: Arts.

"THE CHANCELLOR: Tricks.

—— Now really I think that was pardonable during the war period —— There is another break.

"DR. SHIELDS: I am not adopting that; I tried to cover that ground and say I won't judge any man; let him speak for himself.

"THE CHANCELLOR: The fact remains that that prejudices the whole case in so many minds. As Dean Farmer stated frankly in his very full anonuncement in the Canadian Baptist, Mr. Marshall was careful when in Germany to select evangelical German professors. I defy a person who knows the scholarship of this time to class Professor Diessmann among the destructive critics. He is not so called by old fervent Evangelicals like Dr. F. B. Meyer. And so for trying to make it appear to this Senate, or subsequently to our body, that because he is pastor of an open membership church, that that is to be counted against him—we do not believe in open membership, but who has ever trumped that up against Dr. F. B. Meyer? I want to refer to that because a letter of this kind surely should not weigh very heavily. I am sure that numbers of letters like that might be written by certain men in England.

"With regard to Mr. Marshall, I had never met him. I believed when the Chairman of our Board reported informally concerning his meeting with Mr. Marshall at the suggestion of certain of our brethren in London, that here was a providential find; a man possessing the qualifications we needed for this work. I talked intimately with Mr. Marshall when he was here. I had taken care to mail to him not only a copy of the charter, but

copies of our reports containing statements and reaffirmations in order that he might know what this University stood for. In talking with him I was convinced that he did believe in the great central truths that we Baptist people have held dear. I do not know that I went into the matter of all of his critical views. But so far as I could learn, Mr. Marshall did not hold any critical views as to the authorship or dates of the Old Testament Scriptures that were different from the views held by scores and hundreds of scholars and scholarly ministers and laymen throughout the British Empire who are looked upon as soundly evangelical. He does not accept Archbishop Ussher's dating; he does not accept all of that particular views of authorship that some people do; but from all I could learn, at no point did he hold a critical view which was inclined in any sense to upset a strong and adequate view of the doctrine of inspiration. If I was entirely deceived, or if I misinterpreted his position, I certainly did not know that I misinterpreted it.

"DR. MACNEILL: I think there is a reference in one of those communications to his position in regard to the resurrection. 'He need only be asked about the resurrection.'

This last sentence is in quotation marks and is from the letter.

"DR. SHIELDS: I think that is there. (Reads: 'A few pointed questions on inspiration, bodily resurrection of Christ would reveal his position'.)

That ends the quotation from the letter of Mr. Robertson.

"DR. MACNEILL: That would discount in my mind the value of the letter altogether, for the simple reason that one of the things Dr. Farmer reported in his interview with Mr. Marshall was that he accepted the resurrection simply on the ground that there was the open grave and that was the answer to it.

"DR. SHIELDS: I would not lay undue weight upon those letters, you understand. I tried to say that.

"DR. MACNEILL: At the same time, the submission of them here tends to prejudice the whole case.

"DR. SHIELDS: I do not consider it. I think I should be seriously lacking in the discharge of my duty if, hearing of these things from a man who, so far as I know, is a man of good standing in the Baptist ministry—if, hearing of these things I failed to call your attention to them, I think I should be doing wrong. I think it is exceedingly desirable that any man beginning his work in this University should begin with every sort of influence in his favor. Now, all I have said is this, Here are those suggestions. Granted for the sake of argument that they come from some lightweight, or some extremist, surely in the interests of this institution it is worth while to ascertain if there is anything in it, and if there is not anything in it—this came to me without my seeking, and there is no doubt it will come to other people—why should we not as members of this Senate put ourselves in a position unequivocally to deny these things, if they have no foundation in fact?

"I see no objection whatever to a man being asked: Just what is your position? I do not think anyone here would have any hesitation in stating our position over and over and over again. I would remind you also that sometimes objection has been taken to matters having been brought to the attention of the Convention on the ground that it was not first submitted to the Senate.

"I now submit this reasonable proposal to the governing body of McMaster University, and ask you to take action, and promise in a written word that if the report is shown to be without foundation, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to do my utmost to make Mr. Marshall's ministry here a success. Now, I do not think that is an unreasonable request. It is just for the Senaate to consider whether it is worth while. Of course, if you waive aside a suggestion of that sort—I do not know any more about Mr. Robertson than you do, I never heard of him; I have since seen his name and an article by him in a periodical published in London—but whoever he is, there the fact is. Dr. Farmer said Mr. Parker said we should keep our minds open to the truth and open to facts. I bring to you this

communication which I do not say is a fact, I do not know; but if your minds are open to facts, then I submit you ought to investigaate it and make sure. If you do not do so, the responsibility must rest with the Senate and not with me. I have discharged my full duty as far as the Senate is concerned.

"MR. MATTHEWS: This question arose the very moment I returned from England. I happened to hear of Mr. Marshall, and on making investigation found he was a very high class man, so I asked him to come to London and chat things over, which he did. He said he was absolutely satitsfied to consider a call from the Senate on the basis of the McMaster position, and I brought that message to Canada. Now the point arose the very moment I returned that the Senate would have to make the investigation you speak of, Dr. Shields, and after consultation with the Board of Governors Mr. Marshall was invited to come to Canada for the very purpose which you now outline.

"As far as I am aware, the Senate made its investigation through its Deans and Chancellor, and after a very full conference with Mr. Marshall touching all these points as to his theological position, and afterwards the Committee reported to the Senate. So it does seem to me that the request Dr. Shields made has been complied with before the request was received, in the sense that we in a formal way have accepted the report of our Committee, going over those very details that he has outlined.

"I do not see why the Senate should ask for another investigation. We paid the expense of Mr. Marshall out here, we were so nervous and anxious about his position then, and we were absolutely satisfied. If any member of the Senate has misgivings through hearing reports from England or anywhere, I should suppose it would be the duty of that Senator to get in touch with Mr. Marshall after he arrives, and satisfy himself. If I had any misgivings—as I had, as a matter of fact—I discussed those matters very clearly with Mr. Marshall. I do not think the Senate is called upon to go over the ground again which they covered so completely before.

"MR. FOX: This matter has been considered in a perfectly regular course in which members of the Board of Governors and Senate had an opportunity of being present and making this appointment. Dr. Shields rather indicates that if the Senate does not reconsider this matter, or put the members of the Senate in a position where they can cross-examine, re-cross-examine, Mr. Marshall, that he, after having served notice to the Senate, will feel at liberty to take the matter before the Convention.

"I find myself in agreement with Dr. Shields on the one point, that he does at least come before the Senate and serve warning that that is what he proposes to do, for it was decidedly a criticism of Dr. Shields' actions heretofore.

"I agree thoroughly with Mr. Matthews that an appointment having been made after careful examination, the only proper way in fairness to Mr. Marshall and the Senate, the only proper way to open the matter is virtually by way of some charge. I do not believe a professor should be continually open to official cross-examination. I would suggest therefore in view of the difficulty that has been raised, and because I think if it is at all possible we ought not to contend at the coming Convention, but consider constructive matters in regard to the University, I would like to move that a committee composed of the Chancellor, of the two Deans and the Chairman of the Board he appointed to consider what action should be taken in respect to the statement as read by Dr. Shields, and that a report be brought in to the next meeting of the Senate.

"MR. McKECHNIE seconds the motion.

"DR. SHIELDS: Mr. Fox has read into what I said, has put his own construction upon my remarks. I am glad to know what Mr. Matthews has said. If the Senate is really desirous of carrying the denomination with it in all matters, I think it would be wise sometimes even to go the second mile. I would not be understood to speak disrespectfully, I do not intend anything of the sort, of the gentlemen who had conversation with Mr. Marshall, but I do submit that they are not the only men in the denomina-

tion competent to pronounce upon a subject of that sort. And where there is a doubt it might be worth while trying to clear up that doubt.

"Now, I would remind the Senate that we are in a position where this University needs above all other things not only to command the confidence of the denomination, but so to shape its course as to make it abundantly evident that it deserves such confidence. I have said nothing of bringing this matter to the Convention as a matter of fact. I have not thought as far as the Convention at all. In a few hurried moments I dictated what I have read to you, and I thought it only fair to submit it to you. I must say in all frankness that the remarks of the Dean in Theology himself are about as disturbing to me respecting Mr. Marshall as these letters. If I have misunderstood Dr. Farmer I hope he will correct me, but I understood him to say that after ascertaining Mr. Marshall's view of the Old Testament that had it been the Chair of Old Testament he was considering, he would not have felt the same measure of confidence in recommending him. Is that fair?

"PROFESSOR FARMER: I should have gone into the matter as to details more fully than I did in that particular matter, but I wish it to be understood, I say, I do not know where I would draw the line, that in that matter I do not know where any person can draw the line, and I did not feel it was necessary to delay the matter in order to draw that particular line.

"DR. SHIELDS: Very well, I leave the matter with the Senate.

"PROFESSOR FARMER: May I add another word? With reference to his being a member of a certain kind of church, the Committee met Mr. Marshall, and that matter was referred to. The members of the Committee remember that Mr. Marshall stated as his own personal conviction that he believed in a membership restricted to baptized believers.

"DR. MACNEILL: I remember I referred especially to that and asked him especially if, finding himself here in Canada—of course we know many of the English churches are open membership—if in spite of the fact that that obtained in the Old Land, he would be thoroughly in accord with our position. He said absolutely he would, and that was his own conviction. So that should not be held against him.

"DR. SHIELDS: I think that is probably in response to inquiry. I have laid no emphasis at all on the statement.

"PROFESSOR FARMER: It is a very easy thing to make a general statement like that and to leave an impression that is not true of the man. Take another, the resurrection: that letter refers to the matter of resurrection. Now, I can quite understand some people might talk with Mr. Marshall himself about the resurrection and misunderstand him altogether. He believes in the resurrection of Jesus, but like an honest man, I stated to the Senate at the time, he said: 'Now, of course, the resurrection of the body, just the nature of it, may be incomprehensible.' We have to interpret that in the light of Paul when he said that. 'But the empty grave, you believe Jesus rose in a real sense, and there is the spiritual body?' He said 'Yes,' quite emphatically. I can understanad some persons if they were talking with him would go away with the idea that he did not believe in the resurrection of the body, which is not true. He does believe it very profoundly. So I can understand there might be other misunderstandings of his position.

"The thing I want to say especially is that at the present juncture—Mr. Marshall will arrive in a couple of weeks. He has resigned his position over there with, I think, a noble and high purpose to make his contribution to our work in Christian education and to the honor of Christ.

"Now, talk about going the second mile, I would like to ask whether the right thing for us would not be now under the present circumstances to wait and let Mr. Marshall do his work and see whether he does not do it right. If he gives occasion during the course of a year for objection to his teaching or his work, it will be time enough to bring up the difficulty. It seems to me the right thing is to go ahead believing that he is in harmony with our position.

"DR. SHIELDS: Might I just say this? My only reason is, if Mr.

Marshall had been here for a year, any man makes friends, and when we discuss this matter a year hence it is a personal matter. I do not know Mr. Marshall at all; I know nothing but what I have read in these letters and in the Baptist. But it seems to me it would be much easier to deal with the question before he begins than a year hence.

"PROFESSOR FARMER: The man comes, a high-minded man, and in view of that full statement, of ours dealing with doctrine, and he says, 'I come to you in sympathy and harmony with that;' and then on these particular points on which he was spoken with he gives a strong, positive assurance on the theological side. It might be more satisfactory for my personal preference if he had come a little closer to the view that I have thought of in connection with the Old Testament records, but I confess that I am not in a position to draw the line for anybody."

DR. SHIELDS: "I think perhaps I was the first in this denomination, in this Convention, to suggest the putting of McMaster University on a budget, and did for years endeavour to co-operate. I joined with Dr. MacNeill as long ago as 1910 in an endeavour to avoid any sort of division in the Convention by referring a matter back to the Board, and I remind you that the gentleman who was under discussion on that occasion was retained on the faculty of the University for nine years afterwards. Those of you who have read his book know his position, and must have known it before; an absolute denial of the supernatural from beginning to end on every page where the matter is touched upon at all. Yet he was retained on the faculty of this University for nine years.

" 'Now, I appreciate that even if such a difficulty, if such divergence from our views should later on be apparent in the teaching of Mr. Marshall, I have no doubt, at least I fear, that any sort of criticism would be met exactly as every criticism has been met in all the years. Brethren, it is a great mistake to suppose that that kind of thing can be ultimately squelched—it cannot be. I think it is better, even if you put the critics in the kindergarten class and admit that they know very little and all the rest of it, it is a good deal better at least to make some effort to assure them that their criticism is without foundation.

" 'I tried to do the very thing which Mr. Matthews has recommended, that I should personally have a talk with Mr. Marshall. When the present Chancellor was coming here I asked the Chancellor to meet me; I repeated the request; I invoked the good offices of the Chairman of the Board to arrange a meeting, and the Chancellor absolutely refused to discuss anything with me at all, and said this is a matter for the Senate and why should he engage in conversation with one man. I tried to do the very thing. I ask Mr. Matthews if that is not so. Yes, the very thing that Mr. Matthews now recommends, and my overtures were not received, and even then I was regarded as an utterly unreasonable man.

DEAN FARMER'S CONVENTION SPEECH

I now quote from Dr. Farmer's speech. He refers to the McMaster Statement of Faith in the Trust Deed, and Mr. Marshall's subscription to it. I shall return to that when I touch upon Mr. Marshall's speech. But here is a very striking paragraph from Dr. Farmer's speech:

"I have been trying honestly to work on the basis of the charter, and when this thing was in its crisis in July, and I had to make up my mind as to my action, I faced the thing then, before God and in my own room, and I said to myself: As an honest man and as a Baptist Christian man, I cannot turn down a man like that whose spirit is so fine and who so exults in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. And I took my stand, and I am going to stand by it."

I beg to enquire, What was this "crisis" to which the Dean refers when he says he had to make up his mind as to his action, when he faced the thing before God and in his own room? Does not the language suggest that the Dean was face to face with some great problem, and that he had some sort of a battle with himself before he was able to make up his mind as to his course of action? What does he mean when he says, "I said to myself, I cannot turn down a man like that"? Who asked him to turn down this Mr. Marshall?

Against whose protest was the Dean mentally contending? It has never been suggested that any objection to Mr. Marshall was mentioned in the Senate. Was it the Dean s own conscience? Was it his own conviction of truth? Were these the protestants on this occasion? One thing is certain: I was not to blame, for I was in California at the time; and was blissfully ignorant of the whole "crisis". Mr. Marshall had been brought all the way from England for the purpose of interviewing him. It was after the interview, after the Dean had questioned Mr. Marshall so thoroughly, that he faced the thing before God, and in his own room. I ask again: What was the crisis? What was it he faced before God in his own room? Who asked him to "turn down" Mr. Marshall? Was it conscience? Was it conviction? My readers must form their own conclusion as to whether or not Dr. Farmer did in himself feel that there was something about Mr. Marshall's position that was not strictly in accord with that which is believed by the people of this Convention.

The Chancellor made a speech in connection with the submission of the report. This was moved by Dr. Farmer, and seconded by Mr. E. C. Fox, each of whom spoke to the motion. I followed Mr. Fox, and I now quote from the stenographic report of my own speech:

DR. SHIELDS' SPEECH (From Stenographic Report)

"Now, I have done my full duty in this matter, and I have a resolution to propose, Mr. Chairman, which I think possibly will help the situation out.

"I am convinced that the crying need of this denomination is that we should get together, if possible. I do not believe that we shall ever get together on a basis of compromise.—(Cries of 'No, never.')—I do not believe that there is any possibility of fellowship.

"My good friend—was it Dr. Whidden or Dr. Farmer?—referred to the brethren of the south land. I call your attention to this fact that in the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting after meeting votes have been won, and the paper published in Louisville, Kentucky, calls attention to the fact that there are now in the Southern Baptist Convention twenty thousand churches that refuse to co-operate with the denominational budget, and three million Baptists who refuse to co-operate; that there are only five hundred thousand out of three and a half million members and only five thousand churches out of twenty thousand. I ask you if that is leadership? I ask you. You may win a verdict at the Convention, but you cannot get the spiritual and hearty co-operation of the people by any means of that sort. You must win and earn and hold the confidence of your people if you are going to have their hearty support in this educational enterprise.

"It is of no moment to me what you do with me. I am not a factor in this question. I know perfectly well that wherever a man takes a stand on this matter he at once becomes a target, and it becomes a personal issue everywhere. It is so all over the continent. I have travelled the continent as much as any of you; I think I am as conversant with the religious conditions of this country as any of you. I know a little about English Baptist conditions, and although I am an Englishman I do not want the type of Baptist life that they have in England; I do not want dry baptistries and diminishing membership and diminishng Sunday schools. I do not want that.

"Nor shall we ever get a better condtion of things by compromising on these vital issues. Again and again the Convention has pronounced upon it, again and again it has come up here. We went away last year—I was not the offender. This thing was done in my absence. I had not a thing to do with it. This information came to me. I was in honour bound to submit it to you, and I lay the responsibility—I laid it first upon the Senate—I now lay the responsibility upon the delegates of this Convention for the continuance of the kind of thing that we have had in this Convention for the last few years, and in order to make it very, very simple for you, I propose to offer a resolution respecting myself.

"I propose an amendment to the motion, which I uoderstand is that the report be adopted. I propose the deletion of all words after the word that, and that the motion be amended to this effect:

'That the Convention may have the opportunity to express approval or disapproval of the Rev. T. T. Shields as a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University in respect to his request of the Senate for the appointment of a Committee to inquire as to the alleged modernist views of the newly-appointed professor, the Rev. L. H. Marshall;

'It is hereby resolved that the position of the said Rev. T. T. Shields as a member of the Board of Governors be, and is, hereby declared vacant as from this date;

'And that since the said member was elected by ballot, the vote on this question be also taken by ballot.'

"I bring back to you the commission you gave me. I have told you how I have tried to discharge my duty. I beg to move that my position be now declared vacant, and I ask you to weigh this question. If you approve of what I have done, if you think my statement to the Senate is a fair proposal and that I did what I ought to have done, then vote 'No', vote rejecting this motion; but if you want to get rid of this trouble-maker from the Senate and Board—I think you will admit, at least, that it is fair play, I do not ask anybody else to do it, I do it myself—if you want to get rid of this trouble-maker from the Senate and Board once for all—I promise you once for all— if you want to have done with him and permit the Senate and Board to go on exactly as they have done, if in your judgment they have acted wisely and in the best interests of this Convention, then vote 'Yes.'—(Cries of 'We will.' and laughter.)—All right. Now, there is a fair proposal; I ask you to declare my position vacant if you disapprove what I have done, and to reject this motion if you approve.

"This amendment will be seconded by my friend, the Rev. John Linton.

REV. JOHN LINTON'S SPEECH (From Stenographic Report)

The Chairman ruled that the amendment I had submitted was out of order, and Mr. Linton therefore spoke to the general motion to adopt the report. Mr. Linton said, in part:

"I believe that the revival which increasing thousands of our people are praying for, and which many of us believe is right at our very door, cannot, however, be brought about if this Convention officially adopts an attitude of easy tolerance toward modernism. Brethren, if we are to have the answer to our prayers, if we are to have the smile of God upon our churches in city and country, we must seek to please God.

"A DELEGATE: Amen!

"REV. MR. LINTON: It is not what Dr. Shields thinks,—(Cries of 'No') —or what Dr. Marshall thinks,—(Cries of 'No')—or what anyone else thinks; it is, What would God have us do to-night. We might as well be frank, we might as well know where we stand. I plainly see that there is a great gulf between the attitude of some of the members of our Board of Governors and the attitude adopted by over ninety per cent., I believe, of our Baptist people. (Cries of 'No!' 'No!') I shall be most happy to have it shown me that that is otherwise. **We all would.**

"Very well, then. What is the proof of that? I believe, my friends, that it can be proven up to the hilt that our Board of Governors has again and again taken a different attitude toward modernism from that which is believed by our people. Now, let me prove it if I can. It is not a pleasurable task, but let us just face the facts. We will know where we stand, we will come to some agreement, and then we can go home and praise God for a Convention where men, either young or old, can stand up and be permitted to express the convictions of their souls: It is a great thing to be a Baptist.

"Regarding the appointment—or let me go back into ancient history——

"A DELEGATE: I rise to a point of order. Are we here to listen to the sermons of Mr. Linton? He may be a good preacher—(Cries of 'Sit down'). —when are you going to stop? There ought to be some limit, Mr. Chairman.

"Rev. MR. LINTON: Mr. Chairman and fellow-delegates, I promise you I will make this just as brief as possible, and indeed I will not take many minutes. (Cries of 'Go on!')

"Very well, then. A reference was made by my friend, Dr. Farmer, to

the Convention of Bloor Street, 1910. And there our Convention made a pronouncement. They said that the people stood upon the doctrinal statement that was written into the trust deeds of the University charter. Very well. The members of the Board of Governors knew then—if they did not know then they knew later—that one of the teachers on the staff of McMaster University was not teaching in harmony with that statement.

"Now, friends, I am not standing here to tell what I have heard from someone else or what I have read. I sat in class-room for a whole year, and I heard Professor Matthews lecture after lecture, and it is known to all that Dr. Matthews did not accept the plain statements of God's word. Now, that is known to us. Let us face it. Dr. Farmer knew that; the students often told Dr. Farmer about it. The Chancellor then knew it. Everybody knew it. What was the attitude of the Board of Governors toward that teaching? One of tolerance. Would that win the smile of God? (Cries of 'No!') Would that help or hinder the prayers of godly people in this countr'y's churches and its pastorates? Not at all.

"Then we come to the honouring of Dr. Faunce. Now then, please be indulgent while I speak of these things. The Senate and Board of Governors wished it to be understood that in honouring Dr. Faunce they were not fellowshipping his views. Certainly, I accept that. But the uestion I ask is this: Why is it that mmedately the statement was published that the Board of Governors and Senate had honoured Dr. Faunce, immediately the common people knew it was a colossal blunder. Why could not our Board of Governors see what was obvious to the rank and file of our people? Because—the answer is this—they do not share our feeling toward this thing which denies the plainest statement of the word of God. There is no other interpretation. They do not share our dread, our hatred, of this thing. 'So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine f the Nicolaitanes,'—said Christ—'which thing I hate.' Rightly or wrongly, I believe that God hates false teaching. I believe that Jesus Christ hates that which denies the truth of His written word. I believe that; that is why I am speaking.

"And now we come to our friend Professor Marshall. Dr. Farmer says that Mr. Marshall accepts the statement of belief written into the character of the University. Now, when we all agree with that statement of belief one would think it would be reasonable to accept the statement of Mr. Marshall as being sufficient to cover the ground. We ought to be able to accept that. But, friends, Mr. President and delegates, I cannot accept that, and I will tell you why.

A DELEGATE: Why not?

REV. MR. LINTON: Very well, I will tell you why:—and in not being able to accept it, I trust I am doing no injustice to Mr. Marshall—Because Dr. Matthews signed that. That is why. It won't do any harm at all just to let everything be known and seen, and then quietly and with the blessing of God let us decide these things.

Now then, one of the statements in that doctrinal creed covers the deity of Jesus Christ. My friends, Jesus Christ! Dr. Matthews said that he accepted the deity of Jesus Christ. All right. Jesus Christ said: As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish—(laughter)—that shows how little some people know. Even so the Son must be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

If I know the meaning of language, Jesus Christ, my God and Lord, said that a man named Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a fish, and at the end of that time he was raised from the fish. My Lord said that. He said further, that the men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of this man Jonah. And thirdly, my Lord, the one whom we believe as the Lord of this Convention, said that the men of Nineveh would rise up in judgment and condemn this generation, because they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and 'a greater than Jonah is here.'

Now, my friends, let me be fair and careful. A Baptist minister whom you all know, whom you all love, whose name I may mention if it is necessary, went to Dr. Matthews and elicited from him the information that he did not believe that the story of Jonah was historical, he did not believe that Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, or was brought out of it, or that the account was reliable as history.

A DELEGATE: Mr. President, what on earth have we to do with Professor Matthews?

SOME DELEGATES: Let him alone.

REV. MR. LINTON: The answer is, What had Dr. Farmer to do with Dr. Matthews? Everything. We are less concerned with technicalities than with getting at the truth of the matter. Then we might be helpful to each other.

Friends, let us know where we stand.

A DELEGATE: Remember your promise.

SOME DELEGATES: Carry on.

REV. MR. LINTON: Very well, I will carry on, and hurry on, too. Just this statement. There is a great majority of the people in this Convention—let everybody know it—who will accept the plainest statement of God's word, no matter how difficult it may be to believe. That is not difficult. But to accept for the teaching of God's word a man—when a man is proposed as the one who shall teach our young ministers, and when Dr. Farmer says—now let me be careful again—that Professor Marshall adopts the moderate critical view—I think that is fair—the moderate critical view; when I hear from the lips of our Dean in Theology that Professor Marshall adopts the moderate critical view of Dr. Driver—

(Cries of 'No, No. Say it all.')

Very well. And when I read in Dr. Driver's own writings that quite irrespective of the miraculous features in the narrative, even apart from the miracles—(Cries of 'Hurry up.')—it must be admitted that there are indications that it is not strictly historical; in other words, you who know the meaning of words know that Dr. Driver does not believe that the story of Jonah was a fact. Jesus declared it to be a fact. Very well, now. We are not discussing Dr. Driver, but we are discussing the appointment of a professor to teach our young men, our own boys and girls, whom the Dean has said adopts the moderate critical view of the Old Testament, and Dr. Farmer plainly told us—(Cries of 'No, no. Say it all.')—

THE VICE-MODERATOR: Order.

REV. MR. LINTON: dates and authorship.

SOME DELEGATES: That is right.

REV. MR. LINTON: I listened carefully to what Dr. Farmer had to say regarding dates and authorship. There is not any minister here who has any mind at all who does not know that there is a world of things wrapped up in the subject of dates and authorship. Brethren, we have been through it all—we have been through it all.

A DELEGATE: Amen!

REV. MR. LINTON: We have listened to those who have told us that Daniel was written in the year 180, in spite of the fact that upon every page of the book God put the date himself, thus stating that the prophecy of Daniel, which was written in the fifth century, was written three hundred years after the things that he was supposed to be prophesying took place. The utter destruction of the whole book! There is a great deal more in dates and authorship than many of you imagine. But I listened carefully to what Dr. Farmer said, and I am sure that Dr. Farmer said this—I know he said it—that Dr. Farmer's view of the Old Testament is not Professor Marshall's view of the Old Testament. Dr. Farmer said that. He won't deny that.

Very well, then. Do you wonder that some of us who are longing to see the windows of heaven opening upon us and His blessing sweeping this country like flame,—do you wonder that some of us are timid about having appointed to the Chair of Practical Theology a gentleman whose views of the Old Testament are not Dr. Farmer's views? If they are not Dr. Farmer's views, how far away are they away from Dr. Farmer's views? That is the question. And I say to you in closing that the great thing for us to do to-night—if we get through to-night—is to do something, whatever it may be, that will please God and honour His word.

A DELEGATE: Amen!

REV. MR. LINTON: And honour His word. The way to a revival of spiritual power is not by the road of an easy tolerance toward that which

has been a blight upon every church and every denomination that has countenanced it.

Professor Marshall's Speech.

I now quote from the stenographic report of Professor Marshall's speech, and I shall make my comments as I go along:

> Why has this hue and cry been raised against me? Well, of course there is only one explanation, and you must excuse me if I am plain and straight. It is my nature to be plain and straight. The responsibility for it all rests with the editor of The Gospel Witness. All I want to say on that point is simply this, that Dr. Shields has filled the minds of thousands of people in Ontario and Quebec and elsewhere with suspicions about me.
>
> In doing that he had not a scrap of direct evidence in the form of any word or deed of mine, either in Canada or in England, that was in any way prejudicial to evangelical Christianity. If he had any evidence, I ask him simply to produce it. These suspicions have been cast upon me simply on the strength of two letters written by an obscure Baptist minister who counts for absolutely nothing in the Baptist denomination in England.

The writer of the letters, the Rev. W. M. Robertson, is here described by Mr. Marshall as "an obscure Baptist minister who counts for absolutely nothing in the Baptist denomination in England." Let us for a moment assume that to be strictly in accord with the facts. What then? If there is a fire to be extinguished, what matters it who turns in the alarm, whether he be white, or black, or yellow?

But how did it come to pass that Mr. Robertson wrote on this matter? He did not write without being asked to write. Mr. "A", in Toronto, wrote to Mr. "B", in England, making enquiry about Mr. Marshall. As Mr. Marshall had once been a pastor in Liverpool, Mr. "B" wrote Mr. Robertson, forwarding the letter of Mr. "A" of Toronto. Mr. Robertson replied to Mr. "B"; and, also at Mr. "B"'s suggestion, we believe, wrote direct to Mr. "A" in Toronto. Mr. "B" also sent the letter he had received from Mr. Robertson to Mr. "A", and Mr. "A" sent both letters to me. These were submitted to the Senate in the hope that publicity would be thus avoided. Mr. Marshall must not blame Mr. Robertson for replying to the enquiries which were sent him. He may blame me if he will; but the responsibility rests chiefly with the Senate.

And here has been our difficulty from the beginning. A tablecloth or a curtain may take fire in one's parlour, but if someone is in the room at the time it may easily be smothered, so that a person in the next room may know nothing of it; but if no one is in the room, nor in the house, and the fire is observed from without, it becomes necessary to break the windows to get at it; and to call out the whole fire brigade and disturb the whole neighbourhood. Our difficulty in McMaster has been that for twenty years we have had no one at the head of the University, nor at the head of either of its departments, to take action where action was necessary; and whenever even an enquiry was made from without, the enquirer has been treated as a criminal who was bent upon the destruction of the Institution. One might have supposed that for policy's sake, if not for the sake of principle, the Senate would have had the sense of an ordinary politician and endeavoured to take the matter suggested into its serious consideration. On the contrary, as the minutes printed in the foregoing pages will show, I was denounced for daring even to question the wisdom of the appointment made.

Who is Rev. W. M. Robertson?

But now, Who is this Mr. Robertson whom Mr. Marshall says is "an obscure Baptist minister who counts for absolutely nothing in the Baptist denomination in England"? In our issues of October 1st and 8th, we printed two addresses by Mr. Robertson, delivered in the great Central Hall, in London. We would recommend our readers to read these addresses, and Mr. Marshall's address on, "Religious Education," at the same sitting, and judge of the spiritual and intellectual quality of each, always bearing in mind that Mr. Robertson is "an obscure Baptist minister who counts for absolutely nothing in the Baptist denomination in England".

Mr. Robertson is not so obscure as to be unknown in London; and anyone who knows anything about English church life knows that a man may be very

prominent in "the provinces" without ever being sufficiently known to be invited to London. But what does the official record say about Mr. Robertson? In the Baptist Handbook for 1925 of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, page 247, Mr. Robertson is set down in the list of the Baptist ministers in the British Isles in the same official list that Mr. Marshall's name appears in (page 237). And from the British Hand-book it appears that he preaches in an auditorium having a seating accomodation of twelve hundred, and his membership is four hundred and eighty-seven; while the open membership Baptist Church at Prince's Gate, Liverpool, of which Mr. Marshall was pastor from 1911 to 1919, the membership was two hundred and ninety-two. Mr. Robertson's church is only short six members of being the largest membership of the Baptist churches in Liverpool. These particulars are given on page 79 of the Baptist Hand-book for 1925. But according to Mr. Marshall, Mr. Robertson "counts for absolutely nothing in the Baptist Denomination in England."

If that be so, we wonder how much Mr. Marshall counts for? But this is ever the attitude of gentlemen of Mr. Marshall's school: they are always prominent, and those who disagree with them are "obscure"; they are always the mighty men,—particularly in respect to scholarship, while others "count for absolutely nothing"!

Life would be drab indeed if one could not find something in it occasionally to amuse; and one of the most amusing spectacles at the recent Convention was the attitude of a man named Edgar—Rev. W. S. Edgar, Pastor of Gilmour Memorial Church, Peterboro. He may be a very prominent man, but we had not heard of it! But he rises in the Convention and, among other things, speaks on this wise:

> My reason for appearing on this platform to-night is to throw some light on this mysterious Mr. Robertson of whom we have been hearing so very much. He is a personal friend of mine. We studied together in Glasgow. I have been in Toxteth Tabernacle taking part in his services at his invitation. I spent six weeks in Liverpool and I attended his church, took his prayer metings, addressed women's meetings; therefore I claim to know him very intimately. He is my friend and I do not wish to say one word derogatory of his character; yet at the same time I shall not hesitate to give him an intellectual threshing for interfering in a business which was no concern of his.
>
> It has been stated here to-night that he is an accredited, responsible minister of the Baptist Union of England. No such thing is the case. He is a member of no Baptist association of any kind. He is a Baptist minister who has withdrawn from the Baptist Union of England because, he says, they are all modernists.

No one ever said he was a minister of the Baptist Union.

Mr. Robertson's passport to obscurity is his withdrawal from the Baptist Union. If that be so, he is in good company; for the greatest preacher the world has ever known since apostolic times, C. H. Spurgeon, also withdrew from the Baptist Union—and for the same reason. And I suppose that those downgrade tendencies Mr. Spurgeon lamented might almost be considered as conservative to-day. A returned missionary from Africa testified in the Jarvis Street prayer meeting last Saturday that he spent six weeks in Liverpool last January, and after making full enquiries, discovered that the one throbbing evangelistic centre in the whole city is Toxteth Tabernacle of which Mr. Robertson is Pastor. We do not know whether Mr. Robertson finds it necessary to spend his time with the Girls' Life Brigade, the Boy Scout Movement, and the Girl Guide Movement, in order to hold young people in his church; but we are assured that his church is crowded, and that people are being converted all the time. Beside which, he is in demand for addresses all over England.

Since the Convention we received the following letter from one of our Ontario Pastors who was not present, and whose name we withhold only because we have not been able to ask his consent to publish it:

> "I have read with indignation the comments regarding Rev. W. M. Robertson with whom I am acquainted. My knowledge of that loyal servant of Jesus Christ is personal, for I was for some time a pastor in the Liverpool

Association of Baptist churches. He is far from being the "obscure" Baptist minister referred to by Mr. Marshall, who, if he spoke truly, would acknowledge that for gospel preaching and scriptural teaching Mr. Robertson stands in the front rank of British preachers, being in constant demand on Convention platforms."

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S SPEECH.

Mr. Marshall said in part (as stenographically reported):

I notice that Dr. Shields carefully guards himself by saying that my orthodoxy or otherwise must be judged on the basis of those two letters. Then I ask, Why were those letters spread broadcast through this country? Without any personal pique or malice or ill-will to Dr. Shields I simply say as a man—and I am out for just a clean fight; I am ready to shake hands as soon as it is over if he will—

A DELEGATE: That is English.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL:—I want to say this, I consider Dr. Shields' action was a gross breach of Christian charity, it was a gross breach of good manners, and it was absolutely and utterly un-British. Let me get on, please, friends. I want to add this further, that in England, men in the fighting ring, whiskey drinkers at the bar, and men on the race-course would be ashame dto stoop to the tactics which Dr. Shields has adopted.

I am not blaming Dr. Shields for attacking me at all, I am blaming Dr. Shields for the method of his attack. That is all. I do not claim to be immune from attack. It is all very well to say that he is not definitely accusing me. That is the method of the common slanderer, who tells you some horrible tale about somebody and then whispers: Of course, we don't know whether it is true or not. But it is too late when it is out. The poison gas is already on the breast of the breeze—and it is in this case, so far as I am concerned.

All I say is this, Dr. Shields should first of all have had direct evidence from my lips or from my pen that I was unfaithful to the gospel of Jesus Christ before he spread these reports abroad at all.

Sympathy With Professor Marshall.

We have much sympathy with Mr. Marshall, and sincerely regret the necessity of giving publicity to his views. Frankly, we acknowledge that we have been forced to give his views a publicity which they do not intrinsically deserve. But we do not think of Mr. Marshall as Mr. Marshall at all: he is a new professor, he is the embodiment of certain views of the Bible and of the Christian gospel, which are to be established in McMaster University. The University has been the Denomination's chief source of ministerial supply; what is taught there is bound to affect the life of the whole Denomination. Rightly or wrongly, we have been, and are still, profoundly convinced that Mr. Marshall's views are a menace to the spiritual life of our churches. The Senate, as a whole, compelled us, because they did not put out the blaze, to cry, "Fire," in the hearing of the whole Denomination.

Where Responsibility Rests.

But we must here lay the responsibility especially upon the Dean in Theology. We repeat Dr. Farmer's words, as contained in the minutes of the Senate which were read to the Convention:

> I stated that his general view was in sympathy with the general moderate, what may be called the Driver view, the moderate critical view. That has to deal with dates and authorship and so on."

The Driver View.

Let me pause here for a moment to consider what the Driver view is. In the first place Dr. Driver removes Christ as an authority respecting the authorship and dates of the different parts of the Old Testament. He says in his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, edition 1913, on page 12:

> "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."

On page 324, on the book of Jonah, he says:

"It must be admitted that there are indications that it is not strictly historical."

Of Jonah's prayer he says:

The Psalm (Jonah 2:2-9) 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.

On Psalm 110 Dr. Driver says:

"This Psalm, though it may be ancient, can hardly have been composed by David. If read without proejudicium. 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."

Yet this is the psalm of which our Lord enquired, "While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any many from that day forth ask him any more questions.'

Peter also in his sermon at Pentecost ascribed the authorship of this psalm to David: "For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Isreal know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

We could quote much more, but what does this moderate critical view make of the Old Testament? Consider it in relation to the teaching of Christ, or Peter in the case cited, or of Paul's epistles in general and of the epistle to the Hebrews in particular.

Now, we are not responsible for attributing this view to Mr. Marshall. This is what Dean Farmer says, and that we might do neither Dr. Farmer nor Mr. Marshall an injustice, we published the whole matter in our issue of October 15th, and gave two pages of quotations from Dr. Driver's book. In the discussion at the Convention neither Dr. Farmer nor Mr. Marshall said one word to indicate that a mistake had been made in attributing such views to Mr. Marshall. They each spoke at length, each had a copy of *The Gospel Witness* before him while speaking; and if these things were not true they had every opportunity to deny them. We can only assume therefore that what Dr. Farmer said in respect to Mr. Marshall's holding Dr. Driver's view, is true.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL continued:

I have the confidence of Dr. Carlisle, and of Dr. Shakespeare, I have the confidence of Dr. Charles Brown, I have the confidence of Dr. T. R. Glover, I have the confidence of Mr. Aubrey, the Secretary of the Baptist Union; and I venture to say that if the question were raised in the council of the Baptist Union in London, to-morrow, as to my fitness from every point of view for the post I shall hold at McMaster, there would not be one dissentient voice. Therefore I can, though I should like to be on good terms with everybody, I say I can safely dispense with the patronage of Mr. Robertson.

Mr. Marshall enjoys the confidence of Dr. Glover. A little later I shall have something to say about Dr. Glover.

Professor Marshall continues:

Now, I come to the charges of Dr. Shields himself, who accuses me of having unsound views of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Well, what are my views? My views about the resurrection are simply based on the New Testament. I believe in the empty grave upon the first resurrection morn, and I believe that Jesus after His Passion showed Himself alive to His disciples by many infallible proofs. If Dr. Shields' views about the resurrection are different from those, that is no concern of mine at all. I consider the New Testament is higher authority even than the authority of Dr. Shields.

It is stated here in plain terms that I do not believe in the Old Testament. My reply to that is simply this: I will yield to no one in this Convention, not even to Dr. Shields himself, in my love of the Old Testament and in my belief in its inspiration, in my belief that it is the inspired word of the living God. Technical questions I refuse altogether to discuss in public; I do not think it is advisable at all.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL AND "TECHNICAL QUESTIONS"

Professor Marshall is undoubtedly wise to refrain from the discussion of technical questions in public, as a rule; but the Convention was not an ordinary public meeting. Hundreds of ministers were there. Moreover it was an official Baptist gathering where delegates from the Churches were assembled, and, at that particular session, to hear the report of the Governors appointed to administer the affairs of the Convention's own University. Surely he might have condescended to a discussion of technical questions sufficiently to give a clear and unequivocal statement on the matter under discussion, for example, the Driver position respecting the Old Testament.

Let us now return to Professor Marshall and examine his interesting exegesis of 1st Corinthians 2: 4: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" etc: L

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S SPEECH CONTINUED

Yes, I believe in the divine inspiration of the scripture as surely as Dr. Shields, although I confess quite frankly and openly that I may not interpret scripture as Dr. Shields does. I am glad that I do not. I will tell you why. I have got in my hand *The Gospel Witness* for to-day—the special number, I presume, that was issued to try and finish me off. Dr. Shields says here, quoting me:

'So, I believe, it is in the best sense of the term, natural for the spirit of man to seek illumination and strength and inspiration from the spirit of God.'

You know what I said on that point. And then Dr. Shields goes on:

'Let us see how far this agrees with the teaching of scripture: But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God:

Now, Dr. Shields quotes that against me. I am not making any debating points, I am no dialectician, I simply want the plain simple truth. To win a victory by mere argument is absolutely nothing to me and I do not care about it.

All I want to say is this, and again I say it in all charity, if a man sets himself up as a great authority on the Bible he should be accurate in his interpretation of the Bible. Now, there are plenty of Greek scholars in this audience to-night who will be able to pull me up if I say anything wrong. Those words 'natural man' are a translation of the Greek *anthropos psuchikos*, which should be translated, instead of 'natural man', 'psychic man.' Am I not right, Dr. Farmer?

DR. FARMER. You are right.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I will tell you what Paul's thought is. This is Paul's thought about human nature. He says that man is, in the first place, flesh; in the second place, mind; in the third place, spirit. And there are, so to speak—this is the Pauline doctrine, this is the doctrine of the New Testament about human nature—Paul maintains that the three

ingredients of human nature are flesh and mind and spirit. And he puts men into three different classes. He says there are some men in whom the flesh is absolutely predominant; the mind is dormant and the spirit is dormant. And what sort of people are they? He says they are carnal, fleshly. He says, on the other hand there are some people who keep down the flesh; the mind is in the ascendant, but their spiritual nature is dormant. What does he call them? They are not fleshly, but they are not spiritual; they are psychic. On the other hand there are those who do not only keep the flesh under, they also have the mind alert, and the spirit alive toward God. What does Paul call them? He calls them the spiritual.

Now, what is the meaning of this text? Paul simply maintains that the psychic man, the man whose mind is alert but whose spirit is dormant, cannot understand the things of the Spirit of God. Of course, he cannot I never said that he could.

Following this piece of extraordinary exegesis and before attempting any answer, I cannot refrain from quoting an interview with Professor Marshall which appeared in *The Toronto Star Weekly* of October 24th. As *The Gospel Witness* goes all over the world, and is read by about one thousand ministers besides thousands of lay readers, my readers, especially the readers of the sermons, ought to be informed of the Editor's ignorance and general incompetence. As the Editor has been in his present pulpit for nearly sixteen years, and Professor Marshall has been in Toronto only about as many days, the readers of *The Gospel Witness* ought to be advised of Prof. Marshall's great discovery at once. So here it is:

Interview With Prof. Marshall in The Toronto Star Weekly.

"Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields uses scripture in his reply to the address I delivered at Hamilton on Monday night both inaccurately and ignorantly," said Professor H. T. Marshall of McMaster University in an interview with The Star in answer to an article appearing in "The Gospel Witness," of October 22nd.

"He does not yet understand the scriptures and would be well advised to devote himself carefully to Bible study. According to the Apostle Paul there are three ingredients in human nature; body, mind and spirit. The people in whom the flesh is predominant Paul calls carnal, that is fleshly. The people in whom the mind is predominant, though the flesh is kept under while the spirit in them is dormant, Paul calls psychic. The people in whom the spirit is predominant and alive to the spirit of God, Paul calls spiritual. To quote Paul's words, 'The natural man (Greek, the psychic man) receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, is no answer to my contention that the spiritual instinct is in man. What Paul means is that the merely intellectual man cannot through mere intellect alone apprehend the things of God. Nor is it an answer to quote Paul as saying, "I know that in me that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.' The great qualities of human personality do not reside in the flesh but in the mind and spirit of a man. A man who interprets scripture as Dr. Shields does in these cases proves himself utterly incompetent as an exponent of the word of God."

Mr. Marshall commits himself to the trichotomous theory of the elements of human nature, and in his interview with The Star Weekly he implies that those who do not subscribe to his theory are not competent to expound the Word of God. A little later I shall show that in rejecting that theory I have a good many scholars on my side—who may possibly be not greatly inferior to Professor Marshall.

Mr. Marshall says that Paul says: "There are some men in whom the flesh is absolutely predominant; the mind is dormant and the spirit is dormant." Will he tell us where Paul says that? Animals have instinct; men have reason, and that faculty surely belongs to some other than the fleshly part of our nature. When Mr. Marshall says that there are some people in whom the flesh is absolutely dominant, what does he mean? Does he mean actual flesh and bones and blood, divorced from all rationality? Does he mean mere sentiency? One in such a condition could be neither moral nor immoral,

but only unmoral and fit only for a bed in a hospital. Where does Paul describe such people as being carnal or fleshly?

Again: Mr. Marshall says, "There are some people who keep down the flesh; the mind is in the ascendant, but their spiritual nature is dormant. What does he (Paul) call them? They are not fleshly, but they are not spiritual: they are psychic." Is this what Jude means when he describes some "sensual (psychic) having not the spirit?" Does Paul, or any other scriptural writer, describe anyone in such terms? Is the psychic man of the text we are considering a mere Stoic who has gained the mastery of the flesh while insensible to the spirt? Our modernist friends often decry what they call the proof text method, but surely Mr. Marshall's alleged exegesis properly belongs to that species of mental gymnastics described in the Scriptures as a "striving about words to no profit". The "spiritual" men, we believe Mr. Marshall correctly describes as "those who not only keep the flesh under, they also have the mind alert, and the spirit alive toward God." But in view of the fact that the distinguished professor of McMaster bows me out of court as an ignorant incompetent, I cannot do better than appeal to some higher authority (the Highest of all authority I shall appeal to presently). For some years one of the theological text books used in McMaster has been Dr. A. H. Strong's "Systematic Theology". I think I cannot do better than quote at length from this authority on the respective merits of the dichotomous and trichotomous theories.

1. The Dichotomous Theory.

Man has a twofold nature,—on the one hand material, on the other hand immaterial. He consists of body, and of spirit, or soul. That there are two, and only two elements in man's being, is a fact to which consciousness testifies. This testimony is confirmed by Scripture, in which the prevailing representation of man's constitution is that of dichotomy.

That the Scrptures favor dichotomy will appear by considering: (a) The record of man's creation (Gen. 2:7), in which, as a result of the inbreathing of the divine Spirit, the body becomes possessed and vitalized by a single principle—the living soul.

Gen. 2-7:—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul"—here it is not said that man was first a living soul, and that then God breathed into him a spirit; but that God inbreathed spirit, and man became a living soul—God's life took possession of clay, and as a result, man had a soul. Cf. Job 27:3—"For my life is yet whole in me, And the spirit of God is in my nostrils"; 32:8—"there is a spirit in man, And the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding"; 33:4—"The spirit of God hath made me, And the breath of the Almighty giveth me life."

(b) Passages in which the human soul, or spirit, is distinguished, both from the Divine Spirit from whom it proceeded, and from the body which it inhabits.

Num. 16:22—"O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh"; Zech. 12:1—"the Lord, which formeth the spirit of man within him."; Heb. 12:9 "the spirit o fthe man which is in him the spirit of God"; Heb. 12:9—"the Father of spirits." The passages just mentioned distinguish the spirit of man from the Spirit of God. The following distinguish the soul, or spirit, of man from the body which it inhabits: Gen 35:18—"it came to pass, as her soul was in departing (for she died)"; 1 K. 17:21—"O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again"; Eccl. 12:7—"the dust return to the earth as it was and the spirit return unto God who gave it"; James 2:26—"the body apart from the spirit is dead." The first class of passages refutes pantheism; the second refutes materialism.

(c) The interchangeable use of the terms "soul" and "spirit."

Gen. 41:8—"his spirit was troubled"; Cf. Ps. 42:6—"my soul is cast down within me." John 12:27—"Now is my soul troubled"; Cf. 13:21—"he was troubled in the spirit," Mat. 20:28—"to give his life (*psuche*) a ransom for many"; Cf. 27:50—"yielded up his spirit (*pneuma*)." Heb.

12:23—"spirits of just men made perfect"; C.f. Rev. 6:9—"I saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God." In these passages "spirit" and "soul" seem to be used interchangeably.

(d) The mention of body and soul (or spirit) as together, constituting the whole man.

Mat. 10:28—"able to destroy both soul and body in hell"; 1 Cor. 5:3—"absent in body but present in spirit"; 3 John 2—"I pray that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth." These texts imply that body and soul (or spirit) together constitute the whole man.

For advocacy of the dichotomous theory, see Goodwin, in Journ. Society Bib. Exegesis, 1881: 73-86; Godet, Bib. Studies of the O.T., 32; Oehler, Theology of the O.T., 1:219; Hahn, Bib. Theol. N.T., 390sq.; Schmid, Bib. Theology N.T., 503; Weiss, Bib. Theology N.T., 214; Luthardt, Compendium der Dogmatik, 112,113; Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, 1: 294-298; Kahnis, Dogmatik, 1: 549; 3: 249; Harless, Com. on Eph., 4:23, and Christian Ethics, 22; Thomasius, Christi Person und Werk, 1: 164-168; Hodge, in Princeton Review, 1865; 116, and Systematic Theol., 2: 47-51; Ebrard, Dogmatik, 1: 261-263.

2. The Trichotomous Theory.

The element of truth in trichotomy is simply this, that man has a triplicity of endowment, in virtue of which the single soul has relations to matter, to self, and to God. The trichotomous theory, however, as it is ordinarily defined, endangers the unity and immateriality of our higher nature, by holding that man consists of three substances, or three component parts—body, soul, and spirit—and that soul and spirit are as distinct from each other as are soul and body.

We regard the trichotomous theory as untenable, not only for the reasons already urged in proof of the dichotomous theory, but from the following additional considerations:

(a) *pneuma*, as well as *psuche*, is used of the brute creation.

Eccl. 3:21—"Who knoweth the spirit of man whether it goeth (marg. 'that goeth') upward, and the spirit of the beast, whether it goeth (marg. 'hat goeth') downward to the earth?" Rev. 16:3—"And the second poured out his bowl into the sea; and it became blood, as of a dead man; and every living soul died, even the things that were in the sea"—the fish.

(b) *psuche* is ascribed to Jehovah.

Amos 6:8—"The Lord God hath sworn by himself" (lit. 'by his soul,' LXX. *launton*); Is. 51:1—"my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth"; Jed. 9:9—"Shall I not visit them for these things? saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged?" Heb. 10:38—"my righteous one shall live by faith: And if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.'

(c) The disembodied dead are called *psuche*.

Rev. 6:9:—"I saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God"; Cf. 20:4—"souls of them that had been beheaded."

(d) The highest exercises of religion are attributed to the *psuche*.

Mark 12:30—"thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . with all thy soul"; Luke 1:46—"My soul doth magnify the Lord"; Heb. 6:18, 19—"the hope set before us; which we have as an anchor of the soul"; James 1:21—"the implanted word, which is able to save your souls."

(e) To lose this *psuche* is to lose all.

Mark 8:36, 37—"For what doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and forfeit his life (or 'soul,') For what should a man give in exchange for his life (or 'soul,')?"

(f) The passages chiefly relied upon as supporting trichotomy may be better explained upon the view already indicated, that soul and spirit are not two distinct substances or parts, but that they designate the immaterial principle from different points of view. Systematic Theology, by A. H. Strong—pp. 243-245.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S SPEECH CONTINUED.

Let us now resume the "thread" of Professor Marshall's discussion:

One more example of Dr. Shields' inaccurate exegesis. Taking up my statement:

"I believe that we are so made by our Heavenly Father that the spirit-instinct is an inalienable part of our nature,—

You know the passage. Well now, what does he say about that?

"The scripture says: For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing.

Did I say that the spiritual instinct was in the liver? Did I say that it was in the lights? Did I say that it was in the blood? I said nothing of the sort. I quite agree with the Apostle Paul: In this flesh of mine dwelleth no good thing. I sometimes look forward to the day when I will be rid of it. But I am not all flesh; of course not. You must again get Paul's conception of human nature—flesh, mind, spirit. In the flesh, of course, dwelleth no good thing. But that does not say there is nothing good in the mind and nothing good in the spirit of man. Of course it does not. Dr. Shields' interpretation of scripture is pretty well on a par with that of Mrs. Eddy,—

(Cries of 'Oh! Oh!' and 'Hear, hear!'(

—who says—

(Cries of 'Oh! Oh!')

Let me finish my sentence.

(Cries of 'No, No!' 'Take it back.')

No, I want to finish my sentence.

THE VICE-MODERATOR: Gentlemen—

(Cries of 'Take it back!')

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I want to finish my sentence.

THE VICE-MODERATOR:—you have been exceedingly courteous.—Continue your courtesy.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I say let me finish my sentence. I am not going to take it back yet. I will take it back in a moment if you think it unfair. I was not meaning Mrs. Eddy generally. I mean in one particular case—(Cries of 'Oh! Oh!')—Wait a minute. Will you let me finish my sentence? Mrs. Eddy at one point in her book says—I cannot remember the words exactly, but she says you never want to use ointment for the skin. Why? Because Jesus said: 'Take no thought for the body.'

Now, that is a false use of holy scripture entirely, and all that I am maintaining now is that there is a false use of holy scripture in Dr. Shields' quotation: 'But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.' I am not suggesting that Dr. Shields' general method of interpretation is on a par with that of Mrs. Eddy at all. I am simply meaning in these particular cases he is just as wide of the mark as Mrs. Eddy so often is.

Was This Ever Surpassed?

We have read a little, but we think this surpasses anything we have met with anywhere: "Did I say that the spiritual instinct was in the liver: Did I say that it was in the lights? Did I say that it was in the blood? I said nothing of the sort. I quite agree with the Apostle Paul: In this flesh of mine dwelleth no good thing. I sometimes look forward to the day when I will be rid of it. But I am not all flesh; of course not. You must again get Paul's conception of human nature—flesh, mind, spirit. In the flesh, of course, dwelleth no good thing. But that does not say there is nothing in the mind and nothing good in the spirit of man. Of course it does not." Through the stormiest moments of the whole Convention Professor Marshall endeavoured to tell the Convention that my interpretation of Scripture was pretty well on a par with that of Mrs. Eddy who said, "You never want to use ointment for the skin. Why? Because Jesus said: 'Take no thought for the body'."

Is this what the students are to be taught by the Professor of Practical Theology? When Paul spoke of his "flesh", did he mean "liver" and "lights" and "blood"? Let us examine some of his uses of the term: In Galatians 1:16, Paul says, "I conferred not with flesh and blood." Did he mean that he con-

ferred not with the "liver" and "lights"? "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornification, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings and such like." Some of these "works" are obviously fleshly in the physical sense; but what of idolatory, witchcraft, hatred, variance, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies? Do all these belong to the same category as "liver" and "lights"?

Again: when Paul says in Galatians 5:24: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts," does he mean that their bodies have actually been nailed to a cross, or that their flesh has been mutilated? Or again, in Romans 6:6 "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Are we to follow Professor Marshall's literalization of the term "flesh," and commit suicide in order that the body of sin may be destroyed? Was it for this sort of exegesis Professor Marshall was brought from England? Once again: our distinguished pedant observes, "In the flesh, of course, dwelleth no good thing. But that does not say there is nothing good in the mind and nothing good in the spirit of man. Of course it does not." Obviously, Professor Marshall believes there is something good in the spirit of man, and in the mind of man, for he has said that "the spiritual instinct is an inalienable part of our nature". And this is the thesis he is discussing; and he labours to prove that while it is not in our flesh, there is something good in the mind and in the spirit.

Does Prof. Marshall Believe Man Totally Depraved?

Let us now go back for a moment to the McMaster Statement of Faith. One of the doctrines set out in that Statement is "the total and universal depravity of mankind," Dr. Farmer made mention of the fact that Mr. Marshall had subscribed to the whole Statement; but certainly he does not believe in the total depravity of mankind. Yet he is said to have accepted that Statement.

But let us see whether Paul's statement that "in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" is confirmed by other scriptures, and, at the same time, whether Mr. Marshall's contention that the spiritual instinct is an inalienable part of our nature finds any scriptural support. Our Lord Himself said: "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies"; in Ephesians 2:3 Paul says that those who were dead in trespass and sins "fulfilled the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others"; in Romans 1:28 we are told, "God gave them over to a reprobate mind"; Paul speaks of the "fleshly" mind; of the "carnal" mind; of the "vanity of their mind"; of many of "corrupt minds"; some of whom it is said even "their mind and conscience is defiled"; "the carnal mind is enmity against God"; "an evil heart of unbelief." But surely this in enough when we remember our Lord's words, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

Notwithstanding our reduction to the ranks of the theological awkward squad by Mr. Marshall, we still believe that Paul teaches, by the Holy Spirit, in the 2nd chapter of 1st Corinthians that the gospel is "the wisdom of God in a mystery"; and that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit."

Prof. Marshall's Confession of Faith.

Let us now hear Prof. Marshall's confession of faith:

> I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; I believe in the deity of Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord; I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and the final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour; I believe in the virgin birth; I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God; I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave—remember that—in the empty grave on the first Easter morn. I have already testified on that point. I believe that Jesus ever liveth to be the inspiration of all his followers. I am a fundamentalist in

the New Testament sense of the term. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And nobody in the wide, wide world shall ask any other fundamentalism of me.

(Cries of "Hear, hear.")

I believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God from Genesis to Revelation; I believe in the life hereafter, as the trust deed says, both for the just and the unjust; I believe in the necessity of conversion, in the need of people being born again.

The Infallibility of Christ.

The Professor is careful to say that "on all the great questions of morality and religion, the absolute and final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour." Christ is not infallible in all realms, as Dr. Driver would insist. He is not an authority on the authorship or dates of the Old Testament Scriptures, therefore He does not stand in the way of accepting the critical view of,—Jonah, for instance, or the 110th Psalm.

Vicarious Sufferings.

Mr. Marshall says: "I believe in the vicarious sufferings of Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God." Some one will say, "Surely, that is satisfactory." Once of a day, it might have been, or before Modernism stole the terminology of Evangelicalism; And even now it might have sufficed, had we not Mr. Marshall's address on "Religious Education" before us. Still our Professor avoids the blood; still his words are sufficiently ambiguous to either include or exclude the truth that Christ died instead of sinners.

Two Distinguished Writers.

Let us here quote from two distinguished writers on this subject:

The historic Jesus has given the world its most appealing and effective exhibition of vicarious sacrifice. Vicarious sacrifice is not new in man's life. Gravitation is no more deeply built into the structure of the physical universe than is vicarious sacrifice into the essential nature of the moral world. Save when some one who need not do it voluntarily assumes the burden of man's misery and sin, there is no salvation from any want or tragedy that mankind knows. All this deepest realm of human experience, universal as it is, is summed up in the Master's Cross. He has given us so perfect and convincing an illustration of the power of a boundless love expressing itself through utter sacrifice that he has become the unique representative on earth of that universal principle and law.

Wherever one meets vicarious sacrifice—in Livingstone voluntarily assuming the burden of Africa's misery, in Father Damien becoming a leper to the lepers when he need not have done it, in Florence Nightingale taking on herself the tragedy of battlefields which she never had causd—it always is the most subduing and impressive fact mankind can face.

Who is it writes thus? DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK in "The Modern Use of the Bible." pp. 229-231.

But now let us hear from another great theological leader:

In dealing with the Christian religion, its ideas, and the expression given to them, the first thing is to learn the mind of Jesus himself. He was a child of the synagogue; from boyhood he had the custom of going to the synagogue (Luke 4:16), and he was more at home there than in the Temple with its grandeurs and its squalors (Matt. 21:12, 13; Mark 11:15). It would be significant if he with his genius in religion, his insight and intuition in all that bears on God, went back from the stage of the synagogue to that of the Temple, of he fell short of the Prophets. But he does not. He, too, omits sacrifice. His teaching centres in another conception of God. "Your heavenly Father" has not to be persuaded by your gifts, it is the other way round; "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." All ancient ritual, all priestly theory of sacrifice and offering, is more than ever obsolete when we hear the voice of Jesus.

The metaphor of sacrifice is indeed found in the New Testament. It is used because it is a popular way of speech, because it is an easy symbol;

and yet when one tries to define the idea of sacrifice and realizes the essence of Jesus' revelation of God, the more alien the two things become. The metaphor fails; the symbol will not do. It confuses the issues. The expression with which we started, "the Lamb of God," is peculiarly hard to grasp with any clear sense of its meaning; it suggests ideas but it eludes us. If some of us still love the old phraseology of sacrifice, it is because it has been filled with new meaning and has gathered new associations. But the new meaning is too much for the old words; the new wine bursts the old skin. The old conception of sacrifice makes our relation with God, which is so simple and so beautiful in the teaching of Jesus, indistinct again; it leaves the morality of the affair uncertain and difficult. It was never dominant until the adherents of the mystery religions, the heathen, came into the Church, and brought, by sheer numbers, a conception to bear on the teaching of Jesus that was not there at the beginning. Then the wholesale adoption of the Old Testament, and the passion for matching everything in the Old with something in the New, and above all the legalism brought into the Church by converted Roman lawyers, changed the general outlook.

The statement, attributed by the Fourth Gospel to John the Baptist, that "the Lamb of God taketh away the sin of the world" has historically been justified. There is plenty of sin in the world to-day; but we have only to read history to realize the disappearance of a great deal of sin, public and private. There were forms of sin, which, as men lived themselves into the meaning of the death of Jesus, they would have no more. A society, more and more penetrated by the intelligence of Jesus, could not endure to have slavery continue; the atrocious usage of women went; the killing of babies went; and many other like things have gone, and the rest will go. For to-day, where the will of God, as interpreted by Jesus, is real, where people have come near to Jesus, they catch his Spirit and see things as he sees them; they grow conscious of the call to a higher level; they become sensitive to the suffering of others; they find themselves involved in a great change of life, a thorough rethinking of the principles on which they live—a change swift, impulsive, and instinctive in some, slow, deliberate, and carefully thought out in others; but real in both. It means sin taken out of men's lives, new principles of living given, and a new motive in life, a new passion; a new power, a new life—God in short. It is all associated with the realization of Jesus. What the old religion, with its clumsy and vague attempts to reach God, could not do, has been done in human experience by Jesus.

It is not out of the way, then, that the Apocalypse pictures the victorious Christ as the Lamb slain, and again and again associates his victory over sign and evil with his death, and to his death ascribes the purity and beauty of all the white-robed souls that he has redeemed.

And who is this great writer who thus discourses of the death of Christ and "The Lamb of God?" **He is none other than Mr. Marshall's chief sponsor, DR. T. R. GLOVER** of Cambridge. ("Jesus In The Experience of Men"—pp. 69, 70). When a man holding such views could be elected to the Baptist Union of Great Britain, it is no wonder that a man holding such convictions as the Rev. W. M. Robertson withdrew from The Baptist Union. But this Dr. Glover is the man of whose confidence Mr. Marshall boasts. What do Canadian Baptists think of this? Who ever heard of one holding Dr. Glover's views recommending one who believed in Salvation through the blood?

Again Mr. Marshall says:

> I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave—remember that—in the empty grave on the first Easter morn. I have already testified on that point. (Earlier in his address Mr. Marshall said: "My views about the resurrection are simply based on the New Testament. I believe in the empty grave upon the first resurrection morn and I believe that Jesus after His Passion showed Himself alive to His disciples by many infallible proofs.")

We would not do Mr. Marshall an injustice; but surely he could set all minds at rest by a more explicit statement on the resurrection. He says nothing but that

"He showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs." That, of course, is Scripture, but the Scripture does not stop there: it enumerates the proofs. The New Testament says, He bade His disciples "handle" Him, that He bade Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands," etc., and that He ate a piece of broiled fish and of an honeycomb; and Paul summarizes the whole matter in 1 Cor. 15:4-9.

Perhaps we may be charged with being unfairly suspicious. But let us hear again Dean Farmer in a stenographic report contained in the Minutes of the Senate read to the Convention.

> Now, I can quite understand some people might talk with Mr. Marshall himself about the resurrection and misunderstand him altogether. He believes in the resurrection of Jesus, but like an honest man, I stated to the Senate at the time, he said: "Now, of course the resurrection of the body, just the nature of it, may be incomprehensible." We have to interpret that in the light of Paul when he said that. "But the empty grave, you believe Jesus rose in a real sense, and there is the spiritual body?" He said, "Yes," quite emphatically. I can understand some persons if they were talking with him would go away with the idea that he did not believe in the resurrection of the body, which is not true. He does believe it very profoundly. So I can understand there might be other misunderstandings of his position.

Why, I ask again, should Mr. Marshall so state his view of the resurrection as to leave his position open—according to Dean Farmer's own statement—to misunderstanding?

A Modernist on the Resurrection.

But here let me quote one who is regarded as a very great authority in some quarters:

> For the early Christian one argument sufficed for immortality—Christ is risen. Men had seen him after his rising, had heard him, had spoken with him, had touched him. Stoics and Epicureans in Athens laughed when Paul came to the "rising again of dead men" (Acts 17:32) educated people did not talk so; they laughed and dismissed the subject, and went away to thresh again the rotten straw of Zeno and Epicurus, for Athens was a university City.
>
> Can we today say with Paul: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. 15:20), or have we to trim our speech to come a little nearer Athens? We have to consider the resurrection of Christ side by side with what we are coming to know of the facts of psychology, and we have to be as sure of our psychology as of the Christian story. We have to consider the tricks the mind plays upon itself and the part of the physical nature in suggesting them and joining in the play. We have to ask whether the disciples were not just at that stage of culture when the mind fails to realize it is playing such tricks; and whether we must say that Christ did not rise from the dead, but that certain psychopathic temperaments thought he did and suggested it to others. We cannot shirk such questions; and, in the present stage of knowledge, we shall not get, if we are in a hurry, any very encouraging answer.
>
> Guesses have been made at what happened—guesses conditioned by our very slight knowledge of the soul and its way; and I shall not add to their number. Instead of guessing, we note that the group of men whom we meet in the epistles and the Acts are the same we met in the gospels, but in outlook, temper, spirit, and faith they are changed. That is history, and it must be recognized and then, if possible, understood. Something has happened; we may recognize so much; and if we are uncertain what exactly happened, we may note that it turned defeat into victory, it put the hope of immortality on a new footing, and it changed the history of the world.
>
> But in any case, Paul put the matter once and for all when he said: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." We may not yet be able to solve our difficulties as historians, or to construct the story of the risen Christ, but one thing is forever luminously clear—the Christian faith is bound up with immortality; both stand or fall together,

And who is the author of these words? None other than Prof. Marshall's

chief sponsor, DR. T. R. GLOVER, in his book, "Jesus in the Experience of Men"—pp. 125-127.

Once more: Professor Marshall says: "I believe that Jesus ever liveth to be the inspiration of all His followers." Does that even approximate the truth of Scripture?—"But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Why should Professor Marshall say, "Jesus ever liveth to be the inspiration of His followers"? Because his language implies that he knows nothing of the Priesthood of Christ. Sin is not expiated by blood, hence a perpetual Intercessor does not come within his concept of the gospel. Christ is the Example and the Inspiration of His followers, rather than the Substitute and the Intercessor.

Conclusion.

What followed this is of little importance. The hour was late, and people were wearied to the point of exhaustion. There were several speeches. Rev. A. P. Wilson moved the amendment I had moved earlier by making it an addition, and the President accepted it as an amendment to the motion to adopt the report. Mr. Wilson supported his motion by a very able speech, in which he challenged the Convention to say whether or not it approved of Dr. Shields' action by voting on the proposal to declare his position on the Board of Governors vacant; and insisted that Prof. Marshall had not yet declared his belief in the literal, physical, resurrection of Christ.

But it was obvious the supporters of the Senate's action were unwilling to accept a trial of strength on such a motion. At length, therefore, the following amendment to the amendment was moved by Rev. C. R. Duncan of Park Church, Brantford, and seconded by Rev. Mr. Burrell of Leamington.

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out, and that there be substituted the words:

This Convention in adopting the report of the Senate and Board of Governors re-affirms the declaration that touching the attitude of the University to the Bible made by the professors of the faculty of Theology, endorsed by the Senate and approved by this Convention in Bloor Street in 1910, in the following words:

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 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.

And this Convention reiterates its approval of the following sentences from the report of the Senate and Board of Governors at that same Convention.

This action of the Senate does not involve an endorsation of any particular critical views that have been challenged, but is to be interpreted as solely in the interest of that reasonable liberty which has always been cherished by our people as a sacred possession.

And, further, that this Convention commends the Senate and Board of Governors for their action in appointing to the Chair of Practical Theology a professor who, having considered that declaration, sincerely accepted it.

The vote was by ballot. There was much confusion. The amendment to vote on declaring Dr. Shields' position vacant was unpalatable to both sides. The amendment to the amendment included a statement of the fundamentals of the faith which the Convention had adopted before, and at the same time it had a clause approving the Senate's action.

The scrutineers reported the total vote to be 558, with Yes, 399; No, 159.

First Righteousness, Then Peace.

But nothing is ever settled until it is settled right. The issue before the Denomination is now clear, and it will be necessary to prosecute the war

with more vigour than ever. We bid our Canadian readers be of good cheer. God lives, and will yet show Himself strong in behalf of those who fear Him. Already many letters have come to us declaring the writers' determination to fight the good fight of faith to the end at all costs.

"When obstacles and trials seem,
Like prison walls to be,
I do the little I can do,
And leave the rest to Thee.

"He always wins who sides with God,
To him no chance is lost;
God's will is sweetest to him when
It triumphs at his cost.

"Ill that He blesses is our good,
And unblest good is ill;
And all is right that seems most wrong
If it be His sweet will."

THE REGULAR EDITION

OF

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

WILL BE ISSUED

TO-MORROW, OCTOBER 30th.