

Chancellor Whidden's Attack on Professor P. S. Campbell

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, MARCH 25, 1926.

No. 48

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE GOSPEL IN JOSHUA AND JUDGES.

The Seventh Lecture of a Series on "How to Study the Bible."

By Rev. T. T. SHIELDS.

Delivered in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto, Tuesday Evening, Feb. 20, 1923.

(Stenographically reported).



THESE two books cover a period from the time of Moses to the days of Samuel, possibly to the reign of Saul,—that is to say, Judges may probably have been written about that time. The book of Joshua covers a period, approximately, of twenty-five years; while the book of Judges covers a period of from four hundred and thirty to four hundred and fifty years, perhaps four hundred and sixty or four hundred and seventy-five years in all—nearly half a millennium.

The book of Joshua undoubtedly was written by Joshua himself. It appears to be the word of an eye-witness. It relates incidents which came within the knowledge of the writer himself. The book of Judges very probably was written by Samuel or one of his school of prophets some time toward the close of Samuel's life during the reign of Saul. Now these two books are a link in the chain of the divine purpose, and they are a part of the divine record of the unfolding of His eternal purpose of redemption. There are no superfluous words in Scripture. God always says enough; He never says too much. We shall find in the book of Joshua and in the book of Judges that the same principle we have been discussing in respect to the earlier books of the Bible obtains: they are full of the gospel and of the Christ of the gospel. Moreover, the book of Joshua is based upon the book of Moses. You cannot dispense with any part of the Pentateuch without in some measure invalidating the book of Joshua. Joshua comes to carry on the work of Moses, and the book of Joshua records the fulfilment of prophecies which are written in the earlier

books, notably the book of Genesis. And in the book of Joshua you have the story of the partial possession of the promised land.

Now incidentally, I remind you of this, that the Scripture if allowed to speak for itself will take care of itself. One of the surest evidences of the divine inspiration of the books of the Bible is to be found in their mutually confirmatory relation to each other. They stand or fall together. You cannot dispense with one without quarrelling with all the others. They are so linked together that you cannot break the chain without breaking the record of the continuity of God's purpose. Prophecy, it has been said, is prewritten history, and history is fulfilled prophecy. The study of God's Word will help us to interpret other books; it will help us in our interpretation of profane history as well as in our interpretation of the sacred history recorded in the Word itself.

I.

And as an example of what I mean, let us consider THE PROVERBIAL ASPECT OF THESE BOOKS, what they teach in relation to the providence of God in the lives of individuals and of nations. More and more the effort is observable today to exclude God from the life of man. Some one has said that it is the business of science to push the Great First Cause back as far as possible, and men have succeeded in pushing the Great First Cause so far back that multitudes of people have lost sight of Him altogether. It is assumed that men have been accorded such a complete autonomy that they are practically self-governing; that law is automatic in its operations; and the sense of a personal God has been almost lost,—in fact God, the personal Law-Giver, to the many seems now so remote that men scarcely think of Him as being a Person at all. In the individual and in the national life, the sense of God and a belief in His personal care, in His providential government, is almost a thing of the past. But if you study these books of Joshua and Judges you will find a principle which obtains throughout the Bible. But you will find it strikingly illustrated here, that God is present in the midst of His people; that He is concerned with human affairs; that He has not withdrawn Himself from His world; that He has not shut Himself within the machinery of law which He Himself has set in operation; but that He is over and above it all. The idea of the divine immanence, of God's being in every thing and everywhere and a part of every thing, has taken possession of the modern mind, even of the minds of those who perhaps would not be able to formulate their belief in words. The idea that God is a vague Something rather than a real Somebody, that He is the atmosphere, a spirit, a force, anything but a personal and transcendent God with whom men have to deal—that idea, I say, is everywhere present, and finds its expression in many of the religious cults of the day. The sense, therefore, of His personality is lost: we are told that God is in the air we breathe; that He is in the life we live; that we hear Him in the music that strikes our ears; that we see Him in the beauty we admire; that He is inescapable; that He is in everybody; that we are all a part of God. A good friend told me the other day about being at a funeral service. The occasion was the funeral of the wife of a certain professor in one of the educational institutions of this city. The funeral service was conducted by the head of that institution, which by the way, is one of the denominational colleges. This friend told me that in the course of the service this educational leader never once mentioned the name of Christ; but he recounted the good deeds of the lady who was gone; and he said, "She is gone to God. She came from God. We all came from God, we are all going to God. We are absorbed into God." But Who God was, how He

was to be approached, whether He ever took account of men's thoughts and words and actions, not a word was suggested. And yet that man was the head of a so-called Christian college in this city. That is the kind of thing young men and young women are being trained to believe to-day.

Now, if you come back to the Bible you will find—take these books for an example—that God is everywhere represented as a personal God. These Scriptures are designed to reveal God: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." He has revealed Him in the Old Testament, and as I said to you a few evenings ago, whatever revelation of God there is in nature is also a revelation of Christ. But God is revealed in the Scriptures as a personal God; and as you read these books of Joshua and Judges, I am sure you will find they have the effect of bringing God near, of bringing Him out of the hazy unknown: He is no longer "the unknown God"; when you read these Scriptures you discover that He is the Judge of all human actions, and that He is to be reckoned with always. These books ascribe certain personal attributes to God. He is represented as a God Who loves, as a God Who can be grieved, as a God Who thinks, Who plans, Who wills, Who speaks, Who hears, Who governs. All the attributes of personality are ascribed to Him on the pages of these two books; and you will find that the pantheistic conception of God to which I have referred falls far short of the revelation of God given us in the Bible. God does draw near to His people. And while it is true that He is in the flowers: "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow;" while it is true that the birds are within the circle of His care, "He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry;" while "God is a Spirit," and is ubiquitous and inescapable, —we cannot avoid His presence wherever we may go; He is not only immanent, He is transcendent, too: He is not only a part of His world, but He is over and above His World, a Person endowed with all the attributes of personality.

It is most instructive, in this connection, to see the march of His purpose in history, and to see how true it is, that God buries His workmen, but carries on His work. There were Noah, and Abraham, and all the patriarchs and in due time Moses,—each had his place in God's plan, but when his work was done, he was called away, and another took his place. The book of Joshua begins, "Now after the death of Moses;" and when you turn over to the book of Judges you read, "Now after the death of Joshua:" but through all the Scriptures there runs the unchanging purpose of Him to Whom we ascribe immutability, and eternity, saying, "But thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." You will find that all the books of the Bible are linked together, and the plan and purpose of God gradually unfolds right to the end. It is a divine revelation, and such continuity of thought, such unity of design cannot be explained on any other hypothesis than that the Book is the Word of God Himself.

Another aspect of this disclosure of His providential dealing is to be found *in the entrance of God's people into the land of Canaan as His instruments of justice.* You know that the modernists in general, profess to be greatly disturbed at that idea of God, that, commanding His people to go in and possess the land, He should command them to exterminate the nations who occupied that land of promise. Somebody says, "I cannot conceive that God ever gave such an order as that." But if you would understand even the newspapers of to-day; or the history of our own time in general, read the first seven books of the Bible, particularly the first six. God said to Abraham (if I may resort

to paraphrase), "The day will come when I will give you yonder land. It shall be the possession of thy seed for ever." But He said, "Not yet; four hundred years and over must pass before you come into possession of the land." And the reason for the delay is given in these pregnant words, "For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." God is "the Judge of all the earth." He "who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance," is also the "God of knowledge, by whom actions are weighed." Abraham got a glimpse of God when respecting Sodom he said, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Yes, "the Judge of all the earth" will do right; and there is need for judgment in the world to-day, as there has always been. And if you read these books you will find that "the Judge of all the earth" is doing right, and He is judging men and judging nations, and that He is upon the throne governing the inhabitants of this world. When at last their lease had expired, when the cup of the Amorites' iniquity was full, when they had reached the limit of the divine patience and forbearance, then God sent His people in to be His sword of judgment; and it was an act of moral sanitation. There are men so bad that they are not fit to live: our laws recognize that; our laws recognize that in the interests of society in general sin must be punished, men must be judged; that "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." God rules the whole world; and if an inspired pen were to write the philosophy of the history of our own time we should see that there was a moral reason for the collapse of Russia, for the fall of Germany, for the present European situation; beyond any doubt, the God Who judged in the land of Canaan is judging in the world to-day, and He is bringing His own purposes to pass. His justice is disclosed in this book of Joshua; and in your study in detail you will find on almost every page of both these books that God is ruling His people. As surely as reaping follows sowing in the physical realm, it will follow sowing in the moral and spiritual realm; and these two books clearly illustrate the truth that whatsoever a man or a nation soweth,—that shall he, or it, also reap. And if we would discern the hand of God in history we should read these historical portions of Scripture in order that by their principles we may be assisted in our interpretation of history in general.

II.

More particularly, however, I want you to look at *the evangelical aspect of these two books*. The name of Joshua is nearly analogous to the name of Jesus, similar and yet different. Joshua was first called Hoshea—"he will save." But when he and Caleb had viewed the land of promise, and come back and said, "Our God is surely able to lead us into that land," his name was changed to Joshua. His own name was linked with the name of Jehovah: it meant not that he would save, but that Jehovah by him would save. His very name had in it a confession of his faith. In contrast with that, it is said of Jesus, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." Joshua was but a symbolic instrument of the Saviour Himself; and as you read the book of Joshua you will find that behind Joshua the true Saviour always stands—or indeed, perhaps it would be more correct to say that He goes before him in his conquests of the land of promise.

Again we are dependent upon the New Testament. We shall find in the Epistle to the Hebrews the true interpretation of the book of Joshua. Read the first four chapters of Hebrews at your leisure, when you come to the study

of the book of Joshua itself, and you will find that an inspired commentator there points to the spiritual analogy between the achievements of Joshua and the victories of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now the course of the Christian life is closely analogous to that of Joshua and his people. I said to you last week, and it is in the printed lecture this evening, that there was no antagonism between the law and the gospel—and that is perfectly true: "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." Moses brought his people within view of the promised land, and Joshua led them across the Jordan into their possession. And as they are brought into the land they are taught that the land is not given to them because they are better than other people, that they are not brought into possession of this great inheritance because of their own righteousness; but that because of the iniquity of the people whom they are sent to dispossess, God is now leading them into the land of promise. Thus they are brought into this land by God's sovereign choice, by the power of His own hand, by grace alone, and without any merit whatsoever on their part. And that is true of the Christian also. The land is there "flowing with milk and honey," with fruit in abundance, and it is designed for the possession of God's people. But it may be theirs only as they go in to possess it; and I suggest to you that as you study the book of Joshua you will find a very useful illustration of the relation of faith and works. The book of Joshua illustrates the truth that while the inheritance is by promise, that it is ours by the gift of God's sovereign purpose, yet it becomes actually ours only as we enter into possession of the land: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." And the only proof that you and I can give to those about us that we are Christians is in the fruit of the Spirit, in the evidences of a consecrated life, which it is our privilege to display from day to day.

There is another principle which it is very necessary we should learn to-day. The book of Joshua reveals *the principle that God never sends His people a warfare at their own charges*. He always goes before them. Joshua was to lead God's people into this land to take possession of it, and in the fifth chapter of this book of Joshua the Angel of the covenant appears before Joshua and announces that He has come to take command as "captain of the Lord's host." And all through this history the "captain of the Lord's host" is present. This book teaches that it is the privilege of God's people to have the Lord with them always. And we do well specially to emphasize this truth to-day. It will do us good, and perhaps it may humble us to learn the lesson from the Old Testament.

Now I do not want to be unduly censorious, or unjustly critical, but I confess that as I view the present religious situation I am more and more filled with concern. It seems to me that the Church of God itself, or a very large part of it, is losing the sense of the Divine Presence. What is the explanation of the fact that many of the great churches in this city can hardly hold a prayer-meeting? Why is it that churches that can assemble great congregations on Sunday cannot gather more than fifty people to pray during the week? We have forgotten the primary lesson of the book of Joshua; for when God sends His people forth to war against evil, to take possession of their inheritance as blood-bought men and women, He always goes before them, and His power is available to those who will ask for it. The church of to-day has lost the vision of "the captain of the Lord's host," and churches are devising all kinds of

schemes for the carrying on of their work, with God practically excluded from it. What do you make of this?—and I do not care if the newspapers are here to report it. A man, who I believe is to be one of our near neighbours, preaches a sermon in Convocation Hall on "Fellowship," and explains Pentecost psychologically: a lot of people gathered together came into such close fellowship, that at last among them they generated power. It is an implicit denial that He "therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear;" it is a denial of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and of the presence of God in the midst of His people. The time is coming, and it is not very far distant it seems to me, when those who believe in the supernatural in this Book, and in the supernatural in the life of the believer, and in a supernatural Power as the energy by which the work of the church is to be accomplished—the time is coming when people of all denominations who believe that, will have to raise their protest against this denial of everything that is revealed in the Word of God. Think of it, a great company of students of the Provincial University I suppose, and other people, gathered in Convocation Hall, being told by a Christian minister that Pentecost is to be explained on the ground of fellowship, and that you cannot formulate a doctrine of the Holy Ghost from the second chapter of Acts! Is not that an appalling apostasy? Of course, it may be very unpopular to make such protests; but I am sure that it is in accord with God's Word, not only of the New Testament but of the Old Testament.

What is the lesson?—*That God's called ones are to live a supernatural life.* You will have to throw the book of Joshua, and the book of Judges too, into the waste-basket, if you deny the supernatural. How do the children of Israel go in to Canaan? The waters "stand upon an heap," and the ark of the covenant preceding them, they go over on dry ground. How do they win their first great victory over Jericho? "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down." Joshua did not make them fall down; they had no great artillery. You will remember the Finnish woman who was baptized here a little while ago. Her husband was bitterly antagonistic to the gospel, and when I was talking with her in the vestry of the power of God to deal with him, she said, "God can deal with him. Why," she said, in her broken English, "He make the earthquake. Nothing for Him to make an earthquake in a man's heart." Do you believe that? "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down"—nothing for Him to lay a city flat! God can do these things. "But surely," an objector says, "you do not believe that the sun and the moon stood still, do you? Surely you do not believe such nonsense as that? Why this clock was wound up from the beginning, and it has never lost a second since first it started to tick. The idea of the sun standing still! It would be impossible." I took my watch to the watchmaker the other day, and I saw him begin to work on it, and really it looked as if I never should have a watch again. But he knew what he was about, and he gave it back to me after he had regulated it and made it to keep time. And there are many ingenious explanations of that miracle, on Gibeon and in the valley of Ajalon. I shall not attempt to explain it; but believing the first chapter of Genesis, I have no difficulty whatever in believing the book of Joshua: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" and whatever may have been involved in that miracle of the sun's standing still, I believe the miracle was wrought, and the day was prolonged. You have heard the story of Wellington at Waterloo, when he is reported to have said, "Would God that

night or Blucher would come." One biographer also says that Napoleon, as he saw the sun going down, needing a longer day, apostrophizing the sun, exclaimed, "What would not I give for the power of Joshua to retard thy fight but one short hour!"

Here, then, is the principle, that these people had been supernaturally delivered from Egypt; they had been supernaturally sustained in the wilderness; they had been by supernatural power brought into Canaan; the walls of Jericho by the power of God had fallen down; and the record says that God gave Joshua a longer day in which to work until his work was done. I do not know how He did it, but I am sure that He did it. And so, also, will our Joshua have ample time in which to carry through His plans.

The book of Joshua reveals that *God's attitude toward sin has ever been the same*: "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity." You have it illustrated in the defeat of Israel before Ai, because of the sin of Achan, the accursed thing in the camp; and there was no victory until it was removed: it is, in fact, illustrated by the divine judgment upon the Canaanites of the land.

There is much that is spiritually suggestive, also, *in the apportionment of the land to the different tribes*. If we could get back to the Levitical principle of the land laws of Moses we should save ourselves much of the trouble to which we are exposed. Everybody had his lot of land there, and it was divided between the tribes according to their number; and it was impossible for one permanently to alienate his inheritance, for at the year of jubilee it reverted to the tribe to which it was originally apportioned. It is suggestive of the truth that in the land of promise, spiritually, we each have our place divinely assigned to us, and as we follow "the captain of the host of the Lord," He will lead us into our possession.

I believe we shall use this Bible in the Millennium. Did you ever think of that? There is to be a millennium some day. We are not going to be bothered with the critics always. Some day the devil will be chained in the bottomless pit. I heard our good friend, Dr. Riley, say once that he would love to be pastor of a Baptist church when there was no devil. I nearly emulated our Brother Long, when he said that, I nearly said, "Amen." I should like to have an experience like that in this world when there is no devil abroad. I expect to. We shall reign with Christ upon the earth, whatever is involved in that. And I believe it will be one of the joys of the millennium, one of the things that will help us to worship God every day, just to see His Word being fulfilled, meeting each other every day and perhaps turning back to the book of Joshua, and indeed back to Genesis, and then forward through all the Bible and saying, "Brother, sit down with me. Look! God said it long ago, and here it is." I feel sure that in the days of the millennial glory we shall study Genesis, and indeed the whole Bible, and that we shall see God fulfilling His Word in the millennial period; and it will help us to worship God and to adore His everlasting faithfulness to see Him doing exactly as He has said. His promise to Abraham that his seed shall possess the land for ever has not been in its full and complete sense fulfilled; but it will be. Not one word that God ever uttered can fail of its accomplishment; every prophecy shall be fulfilled, and every promise will be performed: everything that God has said in this Book shall be done, will yet be accomplished. You had better get a good binding on that Bible of yours, for you will need it for a long time. The Bible will never wear out, it will last for ever: it is "the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."

III.

Now only A WORD ABOUT JUDGES:

There were thirteen judges, and the book of Judges tells the story of their rule in the land of Israel covering a period of four hundred and thirty years. When you are discouraged a bit and you want a little light on the problems of

life, turn to the book of Judges if you would see the hand of Providence in the life of the individual: if you would trace the effect back to the cause, read the book of Judges carefully, and see God working. The book is illustrative of *the discipline of divine grace*. The people who are brought into the promised land and enter into possession of it, fight their way through and take possession of the fortresses in the mountains, and dispossess the people of the land—and yet after that God has to discipline them.

And once more, *all through the book of Judges, as in Joshua, you will find the presence of God proclaimed*. The Angel of Jehovah comes again, and again, and again, and again—four times, distinctly, He appears in the book of Judges. He has not withdrawn Himself from the affairs of men. He never will!

There is also a very suggestive word in the third chapter, to the effect, that *the fighting is never done*. "Now these are the nations which the Lord left, to prove Israel by them, even as many of Israel as had not known all the wars of Canaan; only that the generations of the children of Israel might know, to teach them war, at the least such as before knew nothing thereof." The Lord deliberately left certain nations in the land of Canaan in order that the people who came after Joshua should have their share of the fighting. You can generally accept this principle that the thing that troubles you so much is left to keep greater troubles away. The Lord leaves these things, like Paul's thorn in the flesh, in order that we may be humbled in His presence, and cast ourselves upon His mercy continually.

But if you want further light on the evolutionary hypothesis, read the book of Judges. You will find abundant evidence of the tendency to degeneration, that men left to themselves go down, down, down, but never up. Time after time God lays His hand upon a man whom He sets forth to be their judge, and as long as he lives and exerts his weighty influence, he seems to hold the people to a certain plane of moral living; but as soon as he dies, down they go again. There is always that tendency to degeneration: "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

You may find *an interpretation of your circumstances in the book of Judges*. For instance, we find that when the people of the Lord depart from Him, the Lord stirs up the king of Moab, or He stirs up somebody else, and by means of the heathen round about them he chastises His people in order that they may be brought back again into fellowship with Him: "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." And when we get into a difficult situation perhaps it will help us to study the book of Judges, for thus we may discover the cause of it all. Grace always finds a deliverance. God's people are delivered again and again.

There are two stories particularly full of the gospel. Read that matchless story of Gideon. I sometimes think that that is the best history of the experience of Jarvis Street Baptist Church that could be written. Read it. It is right up-to-date. Not thirty-two thousand, but God reduces them until Gideon has only three hundred men. Again the Angel of the Lord appears, and all that is accomplished by Gideon is accomplished by the presence of "the captain of the host of the Lord." It is impossible, it seems to me, to read that story without finding the gospel in it.

And then there is the last fascinating story of Samson, the strong man. What a type he is of the believer,—chosen to a separated life, called to a life of supernatural accomplishment, raised up to be a deliverer of God's people; and yet falling into the snare of the enemy, losing his power, having his eyes put out, going down to grind at the mill—and then the word of hope: "Howbeit the hair of his head began to grow again," and Samson recovering his strength, and dying at last in glory, and "the dead which he slew at his death, were more than they which he slew in his life:" "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

I have made the barest suggestions this evening, again, especially respecting Judges; but as you read these two books in the light of the New Testament you will find that they are full of spiritual teaching, and that there is every evidence that they are a temple of truth in which God Himself has taken up His abode.

May He bless us every one for His Name's sake.

The publication of this paper as a missionary enterprise is made possible by the gifts of members of Jarvis Street Church and others, and is sent to subscribers by mail for \$2.00 (under cost) per year. If any of the Lord's stewards who read this have received blessing, we shall be grateful for any thank-offering you may be able to send to The Witness Fund at any time; and especially for your prayers that the message of The Witness may be used by the Holy Spirit for the defence of the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the exaltation of Christ. As our funds make it possible, we hope to add to our free list, from time to time, the names of ministers at home and missionaries abroad.

Editorial

CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN ATTACKS PROFESSOR CAMPBELL.

The Canadian Baptist of March 25th contains an article by Chancellor H. P. Whidden which is an attempt to answer Professor Campbell's letter which appeared in the same paper last week. Dr. Whidden's letter is true to form. It has been the practice of McMaster University for years never to face the main issue, but always to attack the witness.

Let us take the first sentence of Dr. Whidden's article:

"While not questioning the sincerity of Professor Campbell or discussing at the present the propriety of his act in writing the surprising letter which appeared last week, it seems necessary to call the attention of our Baptist people in Ontario and Quebec to certain matters of importance which probably have become confused in the minds of many."

Why should the Chancellor refer to the Professor's "sincerity" at all? He implies that he may at a future time discuss the "propriety" of the Professor's act; and calls Professor Campbell's communication a "surprising letter". McMaster has long questioned the "propriety" of anyone's daring to criticize its action. Is there any impropriety in a Christian man's bearing faithful testimony for Jesus Christ? That is all Professor Campbell has done.

The Chancellor refers to a definition of Modernism. We do not know whether we are responsible for the definition or not. It was quoted by Dean Farmer at the Hamilton Convention, and on March 18th in the editorial columns of *The Baptist* as follows: "Modernism has been defined as 'the substitution at every point of the natural for the supernatural'." If that was our definition quoted from *The Gospel Witness* we have no objection to it. That is what Modernism is when it is finished. A rotten apple, in the strictest sense of the term, would be an apple rotten through and through; but who would think of denying that an apple is rotten because there is a small part of it to which the rot has not yet extended? Modernism, when it is finished, does lead to "the substitution at every point of the natural for the supernatural"; but the substitution of the natural for the supernatural at any one point is Modernism. Professor Marshall in his classes endeavours to explain most of the miracles on natural grounds. For some of them, as yet, apparently, he has found no satisfactory explanation.

The Chancellor refers to Professor Campbell as Professor Marshall's "colleague and brother in Christ". No one can miss the implication of this sneer.

The Chancellor complains that "by his own confession Professor Campbell has read only limited portions of Professor Marshall's published addresses and sermons." Well, what of it? Is it necessary to drink the whole bottle of poison in order to be sure it is poison? Does the Chancellor "question the sincerity of Professor Campbell" when he says that Professor Marshall's sermons have produced "an entirely different impression upon other people who are as orthodox as Professor Campbell"? If he does not question his sincerity, what does he question? He complains that Professor Campbell has not read "any of that great message, 'Not Ashamed of the Gospel'." Is the Chancellor defending a professor who is orthodox only in spots? or is his orthodoxy to be judged by his exhibition utterances rather than by his class-room work and his average and regular public addresses?

And then the Chancellor resorts to the usual cowardly complaint in these words: "Above all, he has failed to confer with Professor Marshall personally for even one minute concerning his views of Christian truth, and what is even more vital, his real Christian experience." Let us examine this remark. Why should Professor Campbell confer with Professor Marshall "personally"? We are open to the same charge, for the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* has never personally conferred with Professor Marshall, and has felt no obligation to do so. We suppose the Chancellor intends in this objection a reference to Matthew 18: 15-17. We submit that the direction given in this passage was never intended as a way of settling public offences. Professor Marshall is a public man. When he has spoken and his sermons have been printed, why should any man be required to ask a personal interview? Would there not be in such an enquiry an implied suggestion either that the public utterance was insincere, or that the speaker might privately be persuaded to change his opinions publicly expressed? Professor Campbell is a man of long experience in public Christian service, and is surely competent rightly to value the public utterances of another professor without "personal" discussion. We have heard this silly objection, which is now voiced by the Chancellor so often that we think it is about time it was held up to public ridicule. If Professor Marshall is unable clearly to express his views in language which ordinary people can understand, he is unfit for any teaching position. If, on the other hand, he is able to make himself clearly understood in his mother tongue, he ought to be willing to be judged by his public utterances.

And what of "his real Christian experience"? That is not the question at issue. Professor Marshall is being judged as a teacher. For the sake of argument we may assume that an orthodox heart may be allied with a heterodox head or a modernist tongue. The students are unable to judge the condition of a man's heart, but will be influenced by the teaching of his lips; and whatever may be "his real Christian experience", if his lips do not teach the truth he ought not to be permitted to hold a position in a Christian school of learning. Chancellor Whidden ought to know that "our Lord and Master Himself" laid down no such law as he prescribes for Professor Campbell. We hope the Chancellor's use of Scripture is not a sample of McMaster's teaching.

The second paragraph of Dr. Whidden's article reads as follows:

"Had Professor Campbell been bearing administrative responsibilities, such as those devolving upon Chancellor, Dean or Secretary, he would doubtless see some things in very different perspective. Unless leaders assume the role of dictators they are bound to strive sympathetically to study and understand the viewpoint of others, believing the truth of the Scriptures which says 'In the multitude of counsellors there is safety'."

Does Dr. Whidden mean to say that an administrative position incapacitates a man for the perception of spiritual truth? or on the contrary does he suggest that the essential truths of the gospel take on a different color when viewed from the "perspective" of an administrative position? What possible bearing can the fact that a man occupies an administrative position have upon such questions as are now at issue? The question Professor Campbell discusses is as to whether Professor Marshall is or is not a modernist. What has the "multitude of counsellors" to do with that? Does the paragraph under review suggest that a man "bearing administrative responsibilities" ceases to have any conviction and must take a middle-of-the-road position between opposing attitudes toward Revealed Truth?

In the third paragraph of his article, Chancellor Whidden says:

"Is not the opening paragraph of the letter an illustration of the danger of pressing unduly an individual viewpoint? It may have been wrong for Professor Campbell to vote as he did at the Bloor Street Convention in 1910. It was wrong if he voted contrary to his conscientious convictions. But it was not wrong for those who honestly believed that to be the right course. Difference of opinion is one thing; the question of right and wrong is another. We need to be careful about judging one another. Each must give account of himself to God."

The next paragraph refers to the following in Professor Campbell's letter:

"At the Convention held in Bloor Street Baptist Church in 1910, Dr. MacNeill as mover, and Dr. Shields as seconder, of a motion for the revention of Dr. I. G. Matthews as professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in McMaster University, in my judgment each did wrong to himself, did wrong to the church, did wrong to the denomination, did wrong to McMaster University, and, above all, did wrong to his Lord, and so also did the writer of this article do wrong, and with him, too, all the members of the Convention who that day supported that motion. Dr. Harris told the truth. Dr. Matthews was then, and is to-day, a pronounced Modernist"

We will venture to comment upon this by quoting from a letter which we addressed to the Chancellor and Senate of McMaster on May 3rd, 1919, at the time of the resignation of Prof. I. G. Matthews:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"In Christ all things consist."

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

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

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

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

The above quotation is from a letter written to the Chancellor in May, 1919, in an endeavour to secure an orthodox successor following the resignation of Professor I. G. Matthews. We quote it here only to show that in seconding

Dr. MacNeill's motion we did not vote to retain Prof. Marshall but supposed we were voting to remove him, but in a way which would avoid the disruption of the Convention. We have no desire, however, to defend our action on that occasion. We took it in the hope that it would effect the necessary change without further conflict, which might well have been the result, had not the Governors betrayed the trust reposed in them by the Convention. Notwithstanding, our action was a grave mistake of which we have deeply repented, and for which we have sought to bring forth fruit meet for repentance ever since.

In paragraph four, the Chancellor refers to the recent visit of Professor Kanamori as having been "arranged with the full knowledge and approval of the Chancellor and the Dean of Theology". It will be observed that neither the Chancellor nor the Dean were responsible for the Professor's coming, but they merely "approved" of the arrangement; and this is referred to as a proof of the University's loyalty to the orthodox position. We have observed that when people get into trouble and are called before the police, they interview their friends to try and procure character references and we would remind our readers that it was while the University was under fire that the Chancellor and Dean "approved" of Professor Kanamori's coming to McMaster. But what if the Chancellor and the Dean had actually arranged for his coming? Is that an evidence of the University's orthodoxy? If that be so, what shall be said of the University's invitation to Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, one of the outstanding liberal theologians of America, to both address the University on a special occasion and to receive an honorary degree at its hand? Does not the principle work both ways? The difference between the two incidents is only this, that Professor Kanamori's visit was "approved" at a time when the University's orthodoxy was urgently in need of credentials.

In paragraph five Dr. Whidden attempts to reply to Professor Campbell's statement that many of the graduates of McMaster have been pronounced modernists. We agree with the Chancellor thus far, that it would be unfair to hold the University wholly responsible for the theological views of its graduates. As godly parents may sometimes, to their sorrow, see their children go astray, so of those who come from the most orthodox colleges, some may depart from the faith. But these surely should be the exception rather than the rule. If there be no special advantage in a "Christian institution of higher learning", why should we be so earnestly exhorted to support one? And it cannot be wholly without significance that so many of the students of McMaster have turned out to be champions of Modernism. After hearing Dean Farmer's defense of Modernism at the Convention, we are not at all surprised, notwithstanding the Dean's personal views, that so many of his students should have taken the path of compromise.

Next to Chicago University there is perhaps no school on the Continent that turns out more modernists than Rochester Theological Seminary; and next to the President of that institution the three principal men, Professors Cross, Parsons, and Vickert, are all McMaster men. When the infidel Darrow wanted professional opinion to support him in the famous Scopes trial he was aided by a McMaster graduate, a Dr. Newman (we forget his initials), of Chicago, one of the outstanding evolutionists of the Continent; when Chicago University needed a man in its Extension Department, trained in the fine art of manipulating churches so as to establish particular students in selected pulpits, it appointed a McMaster graduate who hails Dr. Fosdick as a modern apostle; when Crozer Theological Seminary wanted a man who could keep in step with the apostate Vedder who seems to be seven-eighths of an infidel, they appointed Professor I. G. Matthews, of whom both the Dean in Arts and the Dean in Theology of McMaster University are, until this day, the enthusiastic apologists. On the other hand: How many of McMaster's graduates anywhere in the world, in this time of admittedly widespread and fearful declension from the faith, are recognized as outstanding defenders of revealed religion? It is true that some of McMaster's present students are putting their professors to shame in this matter; but it is not without significance that this school of undoubted and admitted religious compromise, known as McMaster, has failed to produce outstanding champions of the faith.

The sixth paragraph reads as follows:

"There must indeed be a lack of evidence of modernism in McMaster when Professor Campbell has to bring up the case of a graduate who upon the Professor's own admission imbibed the poison of modernism not in McMaster but in Muskoka—for which McMaster was in no way responsible. Nor should our people fail to recognize that the Home Mission Stationing Committee which reached the decision referred to was not primarily influenced by the Superintendent and Secretary of that Board, as Professor Campbell intimates, but rather by the four members of the committee from the Theological Faculty of McMaster. While they had great regard for the young graduate concerned, they did not fail to recognize and fulfil their duty in the matter."

In this connection we had better relate a little history. The student referred to imbibed the poison of Modernism at a Student Christian Movement Conference in Muskoka. We do not know how long the Conference lasted, but probably not more than a couple of weeks. Yet that was enough to destroy the young man's faith and set him on the road to Unitarianism. But the Chancellor says that for this "McMaster was in no way responsible." And then he attributes to the influence of four members of the Theological Faculty of McMaster the fact that this young man was refused a Home Mission Field. What are the facts? The Student Christian Movement, beyond all peradventure, is a movement for the making of infidels. At the close of an address in Edmonton about a year ago, a young lady came to the writer and thanked him for his address on the supernatural which she said the Lord had used to bring her back to the Christian faith. When asked what had disturbed her, she said it was not her studies in the university, but the influence of the Student Christian Movement which had all but destroyed her. What has been the relation of McMaster University to that Movement? During his Presidency of Brandon College the present Chancellor encouraged the Movement in his own college and spoke of it in the highest terms. In McMaster practically all the members of the Faculty but two favored the establishment of the Movement in McMaster. The present Dean in Theology when challenged by the writer on this subject acknowledged his readiness to see the Movement adopted by McMaster students. He asked if we did not think that Baptists ought to go into the movement to save it, to which we replied by asking him why McMaster did not therefore go into Toronto University to save that? or into some other educational institutions to save them? Why the Baptist denomination did not go into the Roman Catholic Church to save that, or into the Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Anglican denominations to save them? We asked him what justification for the continued separate existence of the Baptist denomination could be suggested if the wisdom of his principle were admitted? The fact is, that but for the influence of two professors and the subsequent action of the Student Body, the Student Christian Movement would have found a welcome in McMaster; and would have been endorsed with two exceptions by the entire Faculty. That which in two weeks, or less, destroyed the faith of one student would have been made part of the regular pabulum of the McMaster Student Body. Who was it that stood against this soul-destroying, Christ-dishonouring Movement? Not the Chancellor, not the Dean of Theology, not the Dean of Arts; but two professors only—and PROFESSOR P. S. CAMPBELL WAS ONE OF THEM—our readers will readily guess the name of the second. How dare the Chancellor have the audacity to write such a paragraph as that we have before us when he must know—or ought to know—that but for the influence of this faithful professor, whom he now so unchivalrously attacks, this accursed Movement would have been in full flood in McMaster to-day?

As to the "statements made voluntarily by Rev. H. E. Stillwell" to the effect that the Foreign Mission Board had never had to refuse McMaster graduates: we remind Mr. Stillwell of the cases of the Rev. A. S. Woodburn, and the Rev. Morley Hartley.

Paragraph nine of Chancellor Whidden's article is as follows:

"We must resent the implications in this letter and in others that have been given to the public that the authorities of the University are of set purpose seeking to capture the institution for modernism: How

anyone who looks on the appointments that have been made in recent or earlier years and who surveys carefully the life and work of McMaster graduates can believe that is hard to comprehend".

Reading this paragraph in *The Canadian Baptist* one cannot resist the feeling that the Chancellor must have formed a very low estimate of the intelligence of the readers of that paper. As one of the chief evidences that McMaster is not leaning towards Modernism he refers to "the appointments that have been made in recent or earlier years". On that score McMaster stands before the Convention absolutely convicted. If Professor Marshall is not a Modernist, there never was a Modernist; if his teaching is not destructive of faith in the Bible, then Dr. Driver himself was an apostle of orthodoxy.

In the tenth paragraph the Chancellor objects to the phrase, "easy tolerance". We believe this phrase was coined by the Rev. John Linton; and we can think of no combination of two words in the English language that more accurately describes the attitude of Dean Farmer, and Chancellor Whidden, and McMaster University in general,—that is to say, of course, when there is added, "toward modernism". It would appear that McMaster is intolerant of everything but Modernism.

In the twelfth paragraph the Chancellor objects that Professor Campbell did not discuss these matters during the fourteen years he served on the Senate. It is obviously a difficult thing for a professor to express his fears on such matters. Perhaps Professor Campbell, in view of the present development of things, would himself be willing to admit that it would have been well had he spoken earlier. But why has he spoken now? Surely it is a further illustration of "the last straw". Only because loyalty to Christ forbade a longer silence has he at last issued his warning to the Denomination. We are quite prepared for the Chancellor's pious objection that he ought to have discussed it with the Senate first. We ask, What encouragement the Senate has ever given anyone who tried that experiment. Dr. Elmore Harris made his protest to the Senate first—with what result? He was abused as an enemy of the Denomination, and treated as a chronic trouble-maker, so that at last he was compelled to make his appeal to the Denomination. The Editor of this paper tried the same experiment. Through this paper he advised caution in making appointments; and when the appointment of Professor Marshall was announced, he offered no public word of criticism but made his suggestion in a written statement to the Senate—with what result? He, too, was held up to scorn and abused as a Denominational enemy. Having no other recourse he appealed to the Denomination itself. Now Professor Campbell is to receive his full share of personal abuse such as everyone else has had to endure who has dared to criticise this would-be educational hierarchy.

It is perfectly obvious that there is no cure for McMaster short of a general house-cleaning. The Chancellor's attack upon Professor Campbell appears to us to be the completest possible confirmation of everything that Professor Campbell has said. If the Chancellor's letter is the best answer McMaster can give to the letter of Professor Campbell, in the view of every intelligent Baptist the University, out of the mouth of its Chancellor, pleads guilty.

As for Professor Campbell: he will more than survive the Chancellor's weak assault. His record is written in the hearts of many hundreds of people in this Denomination who have been led to Christ through his faithful ministry; and in the lives of thousands of others who have been blessed by his consistent testimony. Through all his long career as an educator, he has been as much a missionary as he has been a professor. In fact, Professor Campbell is himself an incarnation of the educational ideal conceived by the founders of McMaster. We have heard from many of his students of the blessing which comes to their own spiritual lives through the Professor's godly example and precept as he so manifestly brings the presence of God with him into the classroom. We are confident that when the members of the churches of this Convention are fully apprised of the facts, and find themselves forced to choose between the milk-and-water, compromising, brand of Christianity represented by Chancellor Whidden's article, and the warm spiritual evangelical type represented by Professor Campbell, the overwhelming majority of votes will be registered for Professor P. S. Campbell.

THE STUDENTS' PROTEST.

Little comment is needed on the protest of twenty-six McMaster students against Professor Marshall's retention on the Staff of the University. Everyone will recognize that it required a great deal of courage on the part of these young men to take this position, and it is practically certain that a large number of others who feared to sign the protest, are in full sympathy with it.

The readers of *The Witness* have been given a letter from the only living executor of the McMaster Estate, protesting against McMaster's breach of trust. We have published the letter of Professor Campbell, who speaks out of thirty-six years of experience in that institution. We have published the testimony of three of Professor Marshall's students, proving conclusively that the Professor's attitude toward the Bible is that of a confirmed modernist. And now we have a protest to the same effect signed by twenty-six ministerial students. What shall we hear next?

McMASTER STUDENTS PROTEST RETENTION OF REV. DR. MARSHALL.

Twenty-six Out of Sixty-nine Students Sign Dissent From Theological Views.
SAY DOCUMENT STOLEN.

The following statement, bearing the names of 23 students for the Baptist ministry attending McMaster University, protesting against the retention of Professor Marshall, was given to *The Globe* last evening. Prepared some time ago, the document, it is stated, was stolen from the rooms of the student in whose possession it was, necessitating the re-drafting of the statement, which follows:

"We, the following Baptist ministerial students of McMaster University, wish to make known to the Baptists of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec that we are heartily in sympathy with three of our fellow-students, W. S. Whitcombe, W. G. Brown and A. J. Fieldus, in the stand they have taken concerning the theological views of Professor L. H. Marshall, occupant of the Chair of Pastoral Theology and Arts Bible of McMaster University.

"The Dean of Theology has stated concerning the theological position of Professor Marshall, '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 authorships, and so on.' Professor Marshall himself has written: 'I regard the Book of Jonah as a Divinely inspired prophetic sermon in the form of a parable or an allegory.'

"We claim that the teaching of Arts Bible and pastoral theology will necessitate the communication of the above-mentioned views to the students. The question at issue, therefore, is no longer, as some have sought to make it, that of the professor's personal liberty, but rather whether we are prepared as a denomination to endorse his views.

"We do not believe that the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec will sympathize with the Driver view, or will welcome into the pulpits of their churches men who accept the moderate critical view that has to do with dates and authorships, and so on.

"We protest against the retention on the staff of McMaster University of one who holds these views, and is a self-confessed liberal evangelical.

"Dated this 18th day of March, 1926.

"(Signed) John F. Holliday, R. Allen Lewis, Wilfred N. Charlton, George A. Brown, E. C. Smith, G. E. Franklin, Harold E. Buchner, A. Eikenaar, William K. Batty, G. E. Downing, George Tranter, Gordon D. Mellish, Oscar Boomer, R. D. Campbell, G. W. Smith, E. E. Hooper, J. McGinlay, E. H. Young, A. C. Whitcombe, E. K. Pinkerton, Stanley Stock, O. J. Coupland, Joseph A. Suggitt".

(From *The Toronto Globe*, Wednesday, March 24th.)

IS THIS "CHRISTIAN"?

Elsewhere in this issue we print the protest of twenty-six McMaster students against the retention of Professor Marshall on the staff of that institution. The Dean of Theology talks much about the spirit of McMaster and

laments the unchristian spirit of certain orthodox people. We take the following from one of the Toronto papers as an illustration of the beautiful spirit of McMaster University:

"Following is the wording in a poster in big black and red letters, at the front of McMaster to-day:

"Escaped!

"A Lie—rumored to have fled conventionwards. Faith and the prophets have another petition supposedly signed by students with first hand information of Marshall, and given to the press.

"No. signing (No. BTh's) 23

"No. represented in Prof. Marshall's lectures 3

"Net number of dumbbells 20

"Even if they fail to judge angels some day they are judging professors now".

Our readers should remember that McMaster is the home of liberty: that when they give to Christian education they are supporting a school which, the Chancellor tells us, is "a thoroughly Christian institution of higher learning".

In an interview the Chancellor refers to the stealing of the document from one of the student's rooms as a practical joke. We wonder what sort of a defence that sort of thing would make in police court?

Water never rises higher than its source. If the ministry of our Baptist churches is to come from such a fountain-head, what are we to expect in a few years? Surely this is but another sign that housecleaning time in McMaster is approaching.

PROGRAMME OF THE FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA.

To be held in The Metropolitan Baptist Church, 6th and A. Sts. N.E.
and The Washington Auditorium, 19th and E. Sts. and N.Y. Ave.

WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 19 to 24, 1926.

At The Metropolitan Baptist Church.

Wednesday—7.30 p.m. Address: Dr. Geo. Ragland, Lexington, Ky. "Nothing Beyond That Which Is Written"; 8.30 p.m. Address: Dr. John Roach Stratton, New York, N.Y. "The Relation of a Church's Message at Home to Its Mission Abroad."

Thursday—9.00 a.m. Prayer; 10.00 a.m. Address: Rev. J. J. VanGorder, Butler, Pa. "Does God Answer Prayer?"; 10.45 a.m. Address: Dr. O. W. VanOsdel, Grand Rapids, Mich. "The Bible the Only Basis of Fellowship among Baptists"; 11.30 a.m. Statement of the Aims of the Union, and the purpose of the Convention, by the President; 2.00 p.m. Prayer; 2.45 p.m. Address: Rev. E. E. Shields, Chicago, Ill. "Lightening the Bear's Shadow." (An Address on Russia); 3.45 p.m. Address: Dr. W. B. Riley, Minneapolis, Minn. "Ministerial Loyalty and Comradeship in the Present War"; 4.45 p.m. Open Forum; 7.30 p.m. Address: Dr. W. B. Hinson, Portland, Oregon. "Evangelism as an Essential to the Church's Health and Happiness"; 8.30 p.m. Address: Dr. J. Frank Norris, Fort Worth, Texas. "The First Revival Based on Fundamentals."

Friday—9.00 a.m. Prayer; 10.00 a.m. Address: Dr. W. L. Walker, Elyria, Ohio. "How a Church May Grow by a Systematic Study of the Bible"; 10.45 a.m. Open Forum; 2.00 p.m. Prayer; 2.30 p.m. Address: Dr. W. B. Hinson, Portland, Oregon. "The Second Coming of Christ"; 3.30 p.m. Address: Dr. Geo. Ragland, Lexington, Ky. "The Menace of Modernism in the South"; 4.30 p.m. Discussion, Appointment of Committees; 7.30 p.m. Prayer and Praise Service; 8.00 p.m. Address: Dr. T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada. "The Lamb in the Midst of the Throne."

Saturday—2.30 p.m. Reports of Executive Committee, Secretary-Treasurer, and State Officers. Election of Officers and Standing Committees for the Year. General Business.

Sunday—11.00 a.m. Sermon by Dr. W. B. Riley, Minneapolis, Minn.; 3.00 p.m. Address: Dr. T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada. "Have Baptists Still

A Distinctive Message and Mission?"; 7.00 p.m. Sermon by Dr. W. B. Hinson, Portland, Ore.

Monday—9.00 a.m. Prayer; 10.00 a.m. Address: Rev. David Alexander, Grundy Centre, Iowa. "The Only Way a Denominational University in America Can Justify Its Existence"; 10.45 a.m. Address: Rev. H. H. Savage, Pontiac, Mich. "Should Baptists Who Cannot Surrender Their Principles Withdraw or Fight?"; 2.00 p.m. Prayer; 2.30 p.m. Address: Dr. John Roach Straton, New York, N.Y. "The Present Foreign Mission Situation in the Northern Convention"; 3.30 p.m. Address: Dr. Frank M. Goodchild, New York, N.Y. "The Amendment."

At Washington Auditorium.

7.30 p.m. Address: Dr. J. Frank Norris, Fort Worth, Texas. "The Beast of Modernism"; 8.30 p.m. Address: Dr. W. B. Riley, Minneapolis, Minn. "The Growth of Modernism in Baptist Schools."

Hotel Reservations: Members and friends of The Baptist Bible Union, planning to attend the Washington Meeting, are reminded of the importance of making hotel reservations. The Executive Committee have reserved rooms at the Raleigh Hotel (Pennsylvania Ave. and Twelfth St.). Friends are requested to write to this hotel direct, and make their own reservations, as it is impossible for Headquarters to assume this responsibility.

Rates: Rooms for one person (without bath), \$3.00 and \$4.00 per day. Rooms for two persons (without bath), \$4.00 and \$5.00 per day. Rooms with bath, one person, \$4.00, \$5.00 and \$6.00 per day. Rooms with bath, two persons, \$5.00, \$6.00, \$7.00 and \$8.00 per day. It is desirable that Baptist Bible Union members should take up these reservations immediately, as rooms may be difficult to obtain elsewhere.

THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA,
340 Monon Bldg., 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

No. 1.

Lesson 3

SECOND QUARTER

Apr. 18, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE CONDEMNATION OF FALSE TEACHERS.

LESSON TEXT: Fifteenth chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Mark 7: 1-37; 8: 1-10.

GOLDEN TEXT: "Then came she and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, help me" (Matt. 15: 25).

I. HUMAN TRADITION VS. THE WORD OF GOD.

1. *The Word of God was overlaid with human tradition* like the wells which Abraham had dug, and which in Isaac's day had to be re-opened because the Philistines had stopped them and filled them with earth. It has been ever the devil's plan to bury the Word of God beneath human tradition. It is so now. Mormonism, and Christian Science, and Russellism, are the Word of God plus human interpretation and tradition. 2. *Invariably the addition to the Word is ultimately made a substitute for the word;* and the tradition of the elders becomes more important than the Word of the Lord. 3. *Yet that which is added to the Divine Word always bears its refutation upon its face.* It is so superficial and so different. In this case these learned doctors of the law would have made an issue of profound importance over the question of washing one's hands before eating. There is a concern for the purity of the Word of God, for a recognition of its authority which is perfectly legitimate. But there is a striving about words, about mere human tradition, which is to no profit. We remember to have read somewhere of a lady, a formal religionist, who on a certain social occasion asked a distinguished scientist if he had heard of the serious news that her rector had adopted the Eastern position. To which the scientist replied, that science estimated that the nearest fixed star was so many million light miles removed from the earth; and that some one skilled in mathematical calculations had estimated the number of great ocean ships which would be required to hold and carry the number of peas necessary to measure

the distance, if the infinite spaces were an ocean, and these ships could sail in a straight line to the nearest fixed star and drop one pea at every mile limit. The figure the scientist used was absolutely staggering; and having said that, he said to his questioner: "Do you suppose, madam, that the Infinite Maker of the fixed stars is really very seriously concerned about this Eastern position of your rector's"? The story illustrates the littleness of the human mind, with what trivialities do men concern themselves when they substitute human tradition for the Word of Revelation! 4. *The Pharisees were supremely concerned about the disciples' transgression of the tradition of the elders.* They might break a thousand laws of God with impunity, but to transgress the tradition of the elders was unpardonable. Many applications of this principle will suggest themselves from our modern religious life. Even in Baptist churches, the by-laws of the church and so-called Baptist practice, which in some instances has no scriptural warrant, are practically treated as being of greater importance than the precepts and principles of the Word of God. 5. *Christ answers their complaint by citing an example of their own violation of the Word of God by their tradition.* The command to honor father and mother means much more than to pay them due respect. The meaning of the word "honor" as here employed, is suggested in the Scripture, "Honour the Lord with thy substance". Children are commanded not merely to honor or respect their parents, but to support them. But the Pharisees had taught that if a man would say, it is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me,—that is to say, that he had devoted certain things to the Temple, he should be free. In other words, they encouraged them to make over their goods to the Temple, just as some men make over their property to their wives and plead bankruptcy,—so if they made over to the Temple that by which they should have supported father and mother, they were regarded as innocent of wrong-doing. By this means they made the Word of God of none effect through their tradition. So it appears that the Divine command to honor father and mother, like every other command of God, was designed to serve human interests; but this was defeated by human tradition. 6. *Christ here teaches that God must be worshipped with the heart, and not merely with the lips.*

II. THE INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC IN RELIGION—Vs. 11.

The meaning of this verse is parallel to another: "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost". God is not so much concerned with the externals of life as with its intrinsic quality. 1. *The disciples were concerned because of the effect the saying of Christ had produced upon the Pharisees, who came to Christ saying, "Knowest Thou that the Pharisees were offended after they heard this saying"? Preachers and teachers who are faithful to their trust may find comfort in this verse; for it is not infrequently the case that those whose religion consists merely in an outward form should be offended by a spiritual ministry. How often still do people speak after this fashion! If teachers or preachers who read these notes should ever have it reported by a deacon or officer of the church that somebody went out in high dudgeon because of the teaching in the sermon, let him remember that it is enough for the disciple that he be as his Lord.* 2. *Christ here teaches (vs. 13) that God can take care of His own truth.* In effect He says: "Do not worry about what I have said. Every plant that My Heavenly Father planted, will be able to endure My teaching; and if there are any who are offended by My words, it is only a proof that they do not belong to Me; that they are not plants which My Father hath planted". 3. *The disciples were very dull of perception, and requested the Master to explain His parable.* 4. *Men are defiled by moral issues, by that which issues from them having a certain moral character, not by physical receptions—by that which men eat and drink.*

III. AN EXAMPLE OF IMPORTUNATE PRAYER—Vss. 21-23.

1. *This woman's faith was born of a desperate need.* Many find themselves driven to Christ by personal or domestic trouble. 2. *Her faith was unhindered by a knowledge of her unprivileged condition:* she was a Gentile and not a Jew, and hence an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger to the covenants of promise. Yet she dared to believe that Christ would hear her prayer. 3. *Her faith was undaunted by the Saviour's silence:* "He answered her not a word". Our desperate need often gives urgency to our petitions; and a knowledge that none but Jesus can help us, will give perseverance to our

plea. Though she received no answer, she still believed. Our chief concern should be to be assured that God hears our prayer—not that He answers it. And faith will say, "If we know that He hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him" (1 John 5: 15). 4. *Her faith was undeterred by the disciples' opposition.* They bade her go away because she was troubling them. Multitudes of people seek to justify their irreligiosity by the carelessness and inconsistencies of those who profess religion. But a true faith will look to Christ no matter what His disciples say. 5. *This woman was unoffended by the Master's humbling word.* He told her that He had been sent only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. He meant, of course, that the Gospel must first be offered to the Jews—that the lost sheep of Israel's house would first be called; and intimated to her that she was without the pale. Yet she had such a large view of Christ that she could not believe that His sympathies would be confined to narrow, racial limits. Instinctively believing Him to be the Lord of all, she would not be turned away. 6. *Her faith found expression in a very brief prayer: "Lord, help me".* One does not need to write a long epistle as a prayer to the fire department,—the one word "Fire" will be enough. Often the briefest prayer is the most genuine, and therefore the most effective. What volumes of teaching are wrapped up in these three simple words: "Lord, help me". 7. *She was undismayed by the Master's stern remark which classed her with the dogs.* In our day men seek to class themselves with God Himself, and refuse to humble themselves under the mighty hand of God. Thus we may learn that true faith produces always humility of soul. We heard recently of a negro preacher in Kentucky who, speaking as a fraternal delegate before a meeting of his white brethren, remarked that it was important that the white brethren should walk carefully, because their colored brethren endeavored to follow in their footsteps. "And", said the negro preacher, "we have especially admired your pushency in financial matters". That is a good word, even though it is not in the dictionary. There are many people who are chiefly distinguished by their "pushency". But the Scripture says, "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth". The spirit that is not offended when classed with dogs will be sure to triumph in the end. 8. *Her ready answer shows that true faith is as intelligent as it is persistent: "True, Lord, yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table".* Oh, the wonder of it! She had come to Him who was the Bread of Life; and she had such faith in Him that she believed even a crumb of His mercy would be sufficient to satisfy her utmost need.

IV. THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF CHRIST—Vss. 29-31.

1. *Men found in Him their utmost need supplied,* and therefore they came to Him from every quarter. 2. *They recognized His Divine power;* and glorified God for the miracles which were wrought at His Word.

V. THE SECOND MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF A MULTITUDE.

1. *The attractiveness of the teaching of Jesus.* It must have been an unspeakable delight to listen to the voice of Jesus in the days of His flesh. Notwithstanding, His Word when it is heard as the Word of God, is still as attractive as ever. 2. *The Master's compassion.* He recognized the physical need of the people. The Christian religion does not ignore the requirements of the body. Jesus knew that the people were hungry. 3. *How slow they were to learn the lesson of trust!* They had seen Him feed the multitude with five loaves and two fishes: they now know that they have seven loaves and a few little fishes; and yet they asked, "Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude"? It is a repetition of the story of Israel's journeying through the wilderness. Though miracle succeeded miracle, in every new emergency they doubted God: "Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel". 4. *The truth is, the Lord Jesus never exhausts Himself,* and can always repeat the miracle. 5. *A lesson may be learned from the manner in which the bread was distributed.* Christ gave to His disciples, and His disciples to the multitude. Thus He used His disciples as well as their supplies to perform the miracle. This lesson is written on the train; and but a moment ago a man passing down the aisle and seeing us writing at the table with a Bible before us, said: "I should like to shake your hand. I am a Sunday School superintendent". He told us that he regretted that he had so little time to give to the Sunday School. We asked

him a few questions, which we pass on to our reader: What if only ten per cent. of an office or factory staff worked while ninety per cent. went elsewhere to do their own pleasure? Any such business would rapidly become bankrupt. If those already in the church could be enlisted in the study of God's Word, and in service for the Lord, what wonders would be accomplished! We believe the disciples must have shared the blessing as the bread was put in their hands for its distribution to the multitude. That is why God calls us to be workers together with Him. He gives us the bread, and bids us distribute it to the multitude. Why should we not endeavor to bring every member of the church into the Bible school, and get everybody to work distributing the Bread of Life to the multitude?

Published quarterly in weekly parts by the UNION GOSPEL PRESS for the BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA—Publishing office, 2375 Thurman St., Cleveland, Ohio.

TERMS: Each set, a quarter, 4 cents; a year, 16 cents.

ADDRESS UNION GOSPEL PRESS, P. O. Drawer 680, CLEVELAND, OHIO

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

The Pastor returned from his Southern preaching tour for the Sunday morning service, March 21st. A large congregation was present and the attendance at the school was 1,332.

In the evening the Pastor preached on the McMaster controversy. The church was packed to the utmost capacity, the deacons being compelled to take seats on the platform. Four persons were baptized. The sermon will be published in a later issue of *The Witness*.

THE BIBLE LECTURES.

The seventh Bible lecture is published in this issue in place of the regular sermon. We promise our readers that the full course of ten lectures will be published between now and the end of April.

FOR ATTENTION NEXT WEEK.

The Canadian Baptist this week publishes a circular sent by the Executive of the Convention presumably broadcast through the Denomination, warning our Baptist people against a Conference being called in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, April 22nd to 24th, for the purpose of organizing an Ontario and Quebec branch of the Baptist Bible Union of North America.

We have not space in this issue to deal with that interesting circular. It is being dealt with by the committee which is issuing the call for the Conference. We are sure our Baptist people throughout Ontario and Quebec will find the booklet that will be issued, one of commanding interest. We shall ask the permission of the committee to publish in *The Gospel Witness*, perhaps next week, the reply to the Executive Committee's circular, which by that time will have been mailed to thousands of Baptists throughout the Convention.

Meanwhile we desire to express our profound thankfulness to the Executive Committee and to *The Canadian Baptist* for assisting us so generously to advertise the Baptist Bible Union Conference to be held in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, April 22nd to 24th. Watch for further particulars.

THE SHAMELESS PARTIZANSHIP OF THE CANADIAN BAPTIST.

A further proof that *The Canadian Baptist*, which is supposed to be the impartial mouthpiece of the whole denomination, is only the willing tool of McMaster is found in the fact that Professor Campbell's letter was printed in small type at the back of the paper, while Chancellor Whidden's reply is given first place on the editorial page. Moreover, we have been informed from several sources that Professor Campbell's letter had to wait for several weeks for publication while the Chancellor's reply appeared the next week. We are advised also that the students gave their protest to the public press only because they were told by *The Canadian Baptist* that it could not be published for three weeks or more. Simple sincerity forbids our believing the Editor's lame excuses for delaying publication of articles in criticism of McMaster, while most of that which is favorable is published almost before the ink is dry. Poor Editor Klipp! We supposed slavery under the British flag had been abolished.