

Students Reply to Chancellor Whidden W. G. Brown, B.A., Expelled from Residence

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, APRIL 8, 1926

No. 50.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WAS THE RESURRECTION BODY OF CHRIST IDENTICAL WITH THE CRUCIFIED BODY?

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Sunday Evening, April 4th, 1926.
(Stenographically reported.)

"How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?"—I Cor. 15: 35.



HOW are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" This is the question of an objector who is not complimented by the inspired writer for his question; but when the Word of Inspiration answers foolish questions, we do well to follow that example. "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" Some of us have long assumed that the foundations of Christianity, of the Christian gospel—and there is no other—have been so firmly laid and so generally explained, that they are thoroughly understood. But we live in a day when we need to examine the foundations again. It is said of Isaac that he "dugged again the wells of water, which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father; for the Philistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham." Isaac was not an originator: he did over again what his father had done before him, and reopened the old wells and got down to the underlying and upspringing waters.

Many of the wells of evangelical truth have been stopped by the Philistines, and we need to follow Isaac's example and dig them over again, and go back to the first principles; instead of taking it for granted that we are preaching in a country where everybody is supposed to have heard the gospel, we need sometimes to preach as though we were missionaries in a foreign land, laying again the very foundations of the faith.

The truth of the resurrection, as we saw this morning, is central and cardinal to the whole Christian revelation: "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." And yet we find to-day that in many of our theological halls the plain fact of the resurrection of Christ is denied. The celebrated Dr. Glover, of England, writing on the resurrection, warns us that the sacred records are not to be taken without some consideration of the new philosophy which possibly may explain many of the "alleged" appearances of our Lord!

I speak this evening from the standpoint of one who knows absolutely nothing about the resurrection of Christ beyond what the Bible tells me. And the Bible, to me, is the Word of God, to be always accepted as such; it is the final court of appeal; we need not seek further for evidence. The Word of God tells us that our Lord "shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs". I think there is no doubt that the resurrection of Christ is the most thoroughly attested fact of human history; but I want, in the simplest way this evening, to remind you of what is said in the record respecting the resurrection of Christ. I think we may take the fact of His resurrection for granted, as the New Testament plainly declares it; the apostles believed in it, lived in the power of it; and the very existence of the Christian Church is itself an incontrovertible proof of it.

There is the negative side of the argument: the tomb was empty. I remember to have read of someone who said, "I believe in the empty grave"—mark you—"I believe in the empty grave on the first resurrection morn." But the empty tomb proves nothing respecting the resurrection: it only proves that the body of Jesus was not there. And if you study the records, you will find that no one was convinced of the resurrection of Jesus by an examination of the empty tomb. The women saw that the tomb was empty, and Mary said, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." She said, "He is not here, I know that; but I do not know where He is. They have taken Him away." Peter and John came to the sepulchre, and one of them went into the sepulchre; he examined it in detail; saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that was about His head folded in a place by itself: they knew that the sepulchre was empty, but they were not thereby convinced; they knew that He was not there, but where He was, was another question. The angel said, "He is not here: for he is risen."

If you examine the Scriptures I think you will find that even some of the disciples were not convinced by the testimony of angels. The angels told them He was not there. The disciples were interested in their testimony, sufficiently interested to pass it on to others; but they were not, as yet, absolutely convinced that the Lord was alive.

Even the enemies of Christ acknowledged the emptiness of the tomb,—they prepared for it; they asked that the sepulchre should be guarded, lest His disciples should come by night and take Him away. And when they found the sepulchre empty, "they gave large money unto the soldiers", and paid them to circulate the lie that while they slept the disciples came and took Him away.

I remind you, therefore, that an acceptance of the fact of the truth that the grave is empty does not necessarily commit a man to belief in the reality of the resurrection. It is purely negative.

But we are told that He "shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs". What were the "infallible proofs"? I read to you this morning the opening verses of the chapter from which we read this evening, and there the apostle appeals to the fact that he was "seen of men". He was "seen" of Cephas; He was "seen" of five hundred brethren at once; He was "seen" of James and of all the apostles; last of all He was "seen of me also, as of one born out of due time". He appeals to the sense of sight: Christ appeared to His apostles and disciples; He "shewed" Himself alive after his passion. We have a proverb to the effect that seeing is believing,—but not if you adopt the new psychology. The modernists will explain away the things you see, and they will explain to you that you do not see the things you think you see. But here is the fact that Jesus was "seen" of a great company of people. "That which we have seen with our eyes . . . of the Word of life", the Apostle John says, "that which we have seen . . . declare we unto you." He actually saw Christ.

But that is only one element in the proof, one item in the argument. He was not only "seen" of men, but He was "heard". He appealed to the sense of hearing: they heard His voice; Mary recognized His voice. Personality is, perhaps, more clearly expressed in a voice than in any other way. There is something in the tone of voice which represents the man or the woman. I sometimes think I can measure people by talking with them over the telephone—if I can but hear their voice. There was something about Jesus which Mary

failed to recognize at once in His physical appearance; but as soon as she heard His voice calling her by name, she recognized Him. But after the resurrection He was "heard" by His disciples,—not Mary only, but by two disciples walking gloomily on the way, who were overtaken by a Stranger Who asked them, "What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad?" And instantly they replied, "Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth." They told Him the story of the crucifixion. Then the Stranger answered, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." And after He had made Himself known to them in the breaking of bread, when the testimony of the ear was reinforced by the evidence of the sight, they knew Him, and He vanished out of their sight. But afterward they said, "There was something in that voice, was there not? Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?" They "heard" Him.

And then they "touched" Him. Mary touched Him. Our version has it, "Touch me not"—but, literally, "be not touching Me. Not yet, Mary!" As soon as she knew who He was, instantly she desired to touch Him. But He said, "No; do not touch me; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God." And you remember that while some of the disciples went to tell the story, Jesus met them and said, "All hail." And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. They "touched" the risen Christ.

Then, of course, you will not forget that on one occasion when they were affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit, He said unto them: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." And you remember the absent Thomas who said, "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." And the risen Christ gave him his opportunity and said, "Thomas, here I am. Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. You have seen Me, you have heard Me. If the sense of sight and of hearing must be reinforced by the sense of touch, then touch Me. Put your finger into the print of the nails." Thomas never did it; but fell at His feet and said, "My Lord and my God."

And then, I venture to believe, not because He needed food, but in order that He might show that He was alive, He took a piece of broiled fish and of an honeycomb, and ate it before them. Not a spirit, but a real body had our Lord Jesus. "Oh, but", you say, "did He not appear in the presence of His disciples when the doors were shut for fear of the Jews—how was He able to come through the shut door?" He made the door, didn't He? Admit the miracle of the resurrection, and you can believe anything. Peter came to the iron door, and he had no key; but it opened to him of its own accord, and he walked out into the street. Have we not read of Jesus, "These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth." He has the key to all doors, and He can enter when and how He will. But He came, and it was after He had thus come through the shut door that He said, "Handle me and see." You say, "I cannot understand that." You had better not try to understand it. You cannot understand anything in this Bible except on the principle of faith. It is the most absurd book in the world unless it is the Word of God, unless it is a record of miracles from Genesis to Revelation, unless it be a revelation of the God Who is the Source of all law, and above all law,—unless it be all that, it ought to be burned and destroyed. It is full of impossibilities everywhere; it stands apart from all other books as a record of God's disclosure of Himself.

"How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" He had

a real body. But was it the body in which He was crucified? Can we identify the post-resurrection body with the pre-resurrection body? Was it the same body which the women lovingly embalmed, as they wrapped it in spices and laid it in Joseph's tomb? Was it really the same body in identity? Well, let us see. When Mary saw Him first she did not know Him, she supposed Him to be the gardener; and when He said, "Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou?" She said, "Sir, if thou have borne him hence"—she did not even name Him—"tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." And then there was that wonderfully human touch in the story, so true to human experience, when He said, "Mary!" She had heard that voice before!—and she said, "Rabboni; which is to say, Master." It was the same Jesus; she knew Him instantly. I do not wonder that she did not know Him at once, for as yet she believed not that He was raised from the dead. You meet a person where you expect to find him or her, and it is easy to recognize that person; but if the meeting be in an unexpected place, and your mind is upon other matters, you are surprised, and at first you do not recognize even an intimate friend.

But there is another element there: "Their eyes were holden that they should not know him." When he walked and talked with the two disciples on the Emmaus road, He talked with two who had seen Him; but they did not recognize Him, because "their eyes were holden" for His own purpose. But when He broke the bread—when He broke the bread, they recognized Him: they had seen Him do that before; there was something so characteristic of Him about it that they instantly recognized the Lord—and He vanished out of their sight.

When He appeared within the shut doors, He said to His disciples, "Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself,—the same hands through which they drove the nails." And you recall the passage referred to a moment ago when He said to Thomas, knowing what he had said, "Here are the marks of the nails." It was the same body in identity, yet it was different.

It was not the first time that some of the disciples had seen Him in a different form, for three of them went up to the mount and He "was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Peter says that on that occasion they were "eyewitnesses of his majesty." The glory of His Deity within shone out through the veil of His flesh, and they saw Him for what He really was. Thus in His resurrection body the glory of His essential Deity must have shone through. There was no longer the necessity for the veil, for now He had come to "shew himself alive"—not to the world, He had done with the world; henceforth they should see Him no more until He should come down the skies with power and great glory. Now He remains these forty days to show Himself alive to witnesses who had been chosen before of God, and to them He will exhibit the "infallible proofs" of His resurrection.

But the body was the same, with the marks of the nails; His personality was the same, as indicated by their recognition of Him through hearing His voice. It was, indeed, this same Jesus who rose from the dead; and He carried, at last, that glorious body into the heavens with Him. I think we do not meditate enough upon that. Jesus did not leave His body behind Him. The Old Testament tells us of the translation of one who carried his body with him to the skies, of one who did not die, but who got into a chariot of fire and went up by the whirlwind. And centuries later Elijah appeared on that mount of transfiguration, and talked with Jesus. Now Jesus carried a body, a human body, with Him into the heavens—a pledge, a promise, of the time when even our bodies shall share in the fulness of His redemption.

Let me remind you of two or three other things in this connection. We have three instances on record of our Lord's raising the dead. We are accustomed to speak of them as resurrections. But I want you to think of them for a minute or two. In the first place, there was the daughter of Jairus. That little girl had been dead but a few hours and was still in her father's house; the professional mourners had come in and they were making a great ado and weeping. But as yet that precious body had not become repulsive to her parents, as yet the hour had not come in which they would be compelled

to bury it out of their sight: she is there like a little child asleep; but the moment life departed corruption began its work, decomposition set in—not immediately did it manifest itself without; but it was there, and needed the touch of God to make that body live again. But remember, the body had not crumbled into dust; and when Jesus said, "Damsel, I say unto thee, arise", she just opened her eyes like a little girl when mother calls her to get up to go to school. There was no great change at all; but the body was made alive by the power of God.

The case of the widow's son was the second. There, a longer time had elapsed, and the time of burial had come. They were carrying him to the place of sepulchre, they were going to bury him. Jesus stopped the procession, and raised the young man to life. Corruption had set in there too, because he had a corruptible body; and when life departed, decay began.

The other case is that of Lazarus. And you are familiar with the expression of the sisters when Jesus said, "Take ye away the stone"—they said such a horrible word that we are afraid to say it almost—they said, "By this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days." The flesh worms had already begun to corrupt his body. But Jesus said, "I am the resurrection, and the life", and He called him back to life.

These three were restored to healthy life, but the corruptible did not put on incorruption, and the mortal did not put on immortality; for, presumably, in due course, the ruler's daughter died, when the years were spent the young man went to the grave, and even Lazarus did not live for ever.

But let us consider the body of Jesus. It is expressly said that He did not see corruption; His body in the tomb was preserved from corruption: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." The body of Jesus did not decay. Oh, how could it! Where does corruption come from: but from sin? And when He had paid the penalty of sin, saying to His Father, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit", with His body holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, He was an example of what we should have been if sin had never entered. His body was not suffered to decay; and on the third day the same body was raised again. But now, as I have intimated, the glory shone through, and we read of His "glorious body".

Put that down beside the teaching respecting the resurrection of the dead in general, the resurrection of the body. That is the question that this man is supposed to be asking, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? How is it possible when a body has crumbled to dust, and its particles have been scattered over the earth, and perhaps incorporated in other bodies, and through endless transmutations made a part of the wide world—how is it possible to gather all these scattered particles together and give us back the same body? A body may be the same in identity without being exactly the same as to the materials that compose it. Men of science tell us that our bodies change every seven years; and that while you are the same person, yet you are not the same: you look the same, you talk just as you used to, your friends recognize you; and yet your bodies have been changed. You have had a new body this last seven years, some of you, yet your hair is just as grey as it used to be; it has not changed,—but it is the same body. I do not see that the Scriptures teach that we are to have precisely the same body as to the material which composes it. On the contrary, in answer to this question, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Paul here says, "That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him." If you sow one kind of grain, you get the kind of grain you sow: it is of the same nature, of the same quality; but "except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone", it decomposes; the life germ within it springs up; and God gives it a new body. It came out of the old body, and, in a sense, there is a connection between the new and the old; and yet while the same, it is essentially different.

And so he says also of the resurrection of the dead: "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption." I do not want the same body, do you? I know we are very careful of our bodies,—but do you want that tooth back

again that the dentist pulled out the other day?—it gave you a lot of trouble. (Some of you women cut off the hair God gave you. I hope you are sorry for that. Don't you wish you had it back again?) We do not want exactly the same bodies as to their material. We have gone to the cemetery sometimes, and we have said, if we were laying away the poor decayed temple of a child of God, and this tabernacle is now dissolved, "Well, he or she had a long time of suffering, and now it is a relief for such an one to be delivered." Do they want the same body back again? Oh, no! "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness"—do you ever get tired? Do you ever wish you had strength for a week's work in a day?—"it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body"; "the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." And we shall have the same bodies less the corruptible element in them, less the element of weakness, less the element of dishonour, less the natural with all its tendencies. It will be a spiritual body. "Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

And do you not think, dear friends, that the Lord has given us this revelation of the life beyond for our comfort? The passage I quoted to you this morning about the coming of the Lord and the rapture of the saints, concludes with these words, "Wherefore comfort one another with these words". And why are the words written? The apostle says, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep." Have you no interest in those who are asleep? Does it matter if we are left in ignorance concerning those who are asleep? O, we are longing to go where they are; we should like to know the prospects of meeting them by and by. The Bible is the only book in the world that can tell us. And when Paul has said, "I would not have you to be ignorant", he adds this, "for this we say unto you"—on what authority?—"by the word of the Lord. I am going to tell you something the Lord has told me about the future." And, by inspiration, the apostle tells us of the glorious coming of the Lord, and the certainty of the resurrection.

And O, the blessing of it, we shall know each other by and by. I have no doubt about that. Even in the Old Testament Moses was buried as a type of those who sleep in Jesus. Moses was buried. Elijah did not die: he went to glory in a chariot of fire, a type of those who shall be alive and remain at the coming of the Lord, and shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. These two representative, not only of the law and of the prophets of the entire Old Testament dispensation, but representative of the two classes of redeemed saints from Adam until the coming of the Lord—all of them saved; some of them dead, some of them alive as to their bodies—both met the Lord Jesus in the mountain of the glory; and even the disciples, by some strange intuition, were introduced to Moses and Elias. It was the same Moses who had lived centuries before; it was the same Elijah who had gone home in a chariot. There they were, separate and distinct from each other, and both of them talking with Jesus about the great subject which has interested heaven from the beginning, namely, the exodus, His decease, the exodus which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. They talked of the Cross, and He was transfigured before them. It was there Peter said, "We were eyewitnesses of his majesty", seeing Jesus in the glory, seeing those who had slept in Jesus, seeing those who were alive and remained, and all of them knowing each other; and, best of all, all of them knowing the Lord, a prophecy of the day "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired of all them that believe."

I wonder if there are any here who have no such hope? Are there any here who have never accepted Christ? You have heard of Him by the hearing of the ear, but you will not be convinced by anything I say: you must see Him for yourself. Read your gospels again and note this principle, that though angels reported His resurrection, though the sepulchre was empty, though the city was flooded with rumors, I cannot find that one solitary person believed in the resurrection of Jesus in pre-pentecostal days, before the Spirit came, who did not see Jesus for himself. No, no; they did not come to an apprehension

of that truth by hearsay: they saw Him for themselves ("Hallelujah!") Now He is gone, and we cannot see Him, but He says that when the Spirit shall come "he will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and you shall see me no more;—and nobody can persuade you of what I am, of Who I am, of your need of My righteousness, but the Holy Ghost. But I will send Him, and He will take of the things of the unseen Christ, and will reveal Him to you; and you will be able to see me just as though I were still on the earth." Oh, blessed be His name, though we cannot believe, cannot be convinced, by the testimony of men or of angels, we can be convinced by the testimony of the Holy Ghost Who speaks from heaven and makes us all to know that Jesus is really risen from the dead.

Do you believe it? How many of you believe it? How many of you believe that Jesus is risen from the dead? (A great host raised their hands).

Somewhere I heard of that great preacher, Dr. Daly, coming into a new experience of the truth of the resurrection. He believed for years in the resurrection of Christ, but one Saturday night in his study as he was pondering this great truth, the Holy Spirit took that truth and laid it upon his heart afresh, and he got up from his chair, and walked up and down saying, "He is alive! Oh, He is alive! My Lord is alive! He is my Saviour, He is alive!"

This glorious gospel, the record of the days of His flesh, is all true. He is alive, and He is ready to forgive all our sins, to adopt us into His family, and to make us heirs of glory in Him. Will you not come to Him? Will you not bow at His feet, my unsaved friends? I bring to you the greatest piece of intelligence that even an angel could bring. There is no fact of greater moment to you, that will have a richer influence in your life, than this simple and yet sublime fact, that Jesus Christ is no myth; that He is a reality. Jesus Christ still lives; He is on the throne; He is your Intercessor now; He will come again to be one of two things, either the Bridegroom of your soul, or your Judge—one or the other. Will you yield to His wooing voice, and accept Him this evening as Saviour and Lord?

Ere we bow in prayer, let me tell you of a testimony I heard a Jewess give in the lecture hall to the rear of this room two or three years ago. She said she was living with her husband in Constantinople, both of them Hebrews, of course. Her husband was converted, and he came home to her and told her that he had found Jesus of Nazareth, and that He was the Messiah. She said that from that moment she began to persecute him, and to do everything in her power to turn him away from allegiance to Christ, to win him back to the religion of their fathers. He was very kind and patient with her, and simply told her that he would cease not to pray that the great Messiah Who had opened the eyes of Saul of Tarsus, and Who had opened his eyes, would some day open her eyes. She said the weeks wore into months, and the months into more than a year; and one night she could stand it no longer. She said, "I went into my room and shut myself up, and got on my knees, and I said, 'O Messiah, if Thou art Jesus of Nazareth, and if Jesus of Nazareth be my Messiah, introduce Thyself to me.'" And then she said, "He came into the room; and by the voice of His Spirit He said it to me again, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.'" Joseph said, "Cause every man to go out from me. And thou stood no man with him, while Joseph made himself known unto his brethren." There is that in every true conversion: God must communicate Himself, and the Holy Ghost is the only One Who can introduce the risen Saviour.

Shall we bow quietly in His presence: O Lord our God, Thou didst come through the shut doors in the ancient times where Thy disciples were gathered; and we know Thou hast come here, although the doors are open—and we bless Thee that they are open—and as Thou didst show Thy hands, and Thy side to those who were gathered there, and the disciples were glad when they saw the Lord, so Thou canst show Thyself to unsaved men and women this evening. It may be there is some Thomas here who has said, "I will not believe. If He were in the days of His flesh and I could touch Him, I might believe; but I cannot believe in an unseen Christ." Lord, wilt Thou reveal Thyself to such an one to-night, until he or she shall fall at Thy feet and say, "My Lord and my God." Thou risen Saviour, reveal Thyself to us to-night, and may no man

or woman, or boy or girl, leave this building without seeing and receiving Jesus. Thou hast said, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Lord, hear the cry now that in this silence shall go up from many hearts, the cry of the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner." Help us so to pray. Some of us, O Lord, are not ready to acknowledge Thee. Oh, help every one who has thus prayed from his or her heart to the risen Christ, to receive His promise and dare to confess Him before men. May there be a great turning unto the Lord to-night, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

TWENTY-FOUR STUDENTS REPLY TO THE CHANCELLOR.

We feel compelled to make some few important corrections of certain statements made in the daily papers of Wednesday, March 24th, and in *The Canadian Baptist* of April 1 concerning the student protest against the retention of Professor L. H. Marshall.

Our procedure in publishing the protest in the secular press has been criticized, but we make no apology for our action. *The McMaster Monthly*, although it is supported by student funds, has denied to some of our number the right to speak through its pages, and since the last Convention has become an auxiliary organ for the defense of Professor Marshall. Before the protest was given to the secular press, a copy was offered to *The Canadian Baptist*, but the Editor would not promise publication for three weeks or more. Under these circumstances we published it in the daily papers. It will be noticed, however, that within a week from the time that it appeared in the secular press, space was found in the editorial columns of *The Canadian Baptist* for a criticism of the protest. The protest itself was appended in small type to the criticism, and followed by a further editorial note.

As space in *The Canadian Baptist*, outside of the editorial column, is very likely still at a premium, and since we do not wish to force our way into the denominational paper via the daily press, we turn to the only other available channel of communication with our Baptist people—*The Gospel Witness*.

In order that the issue be clearly understood, the article as it appeared in *The Canadian Baptist* is published below. Be it noted that the reply precedes the student protest.

STATEMENT REGARDING STUDENT PROTEST.

Regarding the protest signed by twenty-three McMaster students and published in the daily papers of Toronto last week, it seems necessary to give the following to our Baptist people.

The statement given to the public that "the protest, therefore, is the view of thirty-eight per cent. of the coming Baptist ministers of the Convention as represented by the body of ministerial students at McMaster," is quite incorrect. According to our records there are ninety-seven of our men now registered who *have to devote* their lives to the work of the Christian ministry at home or abroad. We are assured this mistake will be corrected by the Protest Committee.

The protest was published in the secular press of Toronto before any official of the University had seen it.

At least two of the twenty-three did not understand that they were signing a formal protest to be given to the general public and would not have signed if they had so understood the matter.

Only three of the men who signed have been in Professor Marshall's classes. The other twenty are presumably not any better qualified to pass judgment on Professor Marshall than any other young men of comparatively limited experience in the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec.

Whether or not they had the right to prepare and sign such a document I am not for the moment concerned. That they should have been accurate in their statements and that they should have first consulted with some of their older brethren who have their greatest interests as

well as the interests of McMaster University at heart will be apparent to all of our fair-minded people—Howard P. Whidden, Chancellor.

PROTEST AGAINST THE RETENTION OF PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL.

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, Messrs. 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 authorship 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.

John F. Holliday, R. Allen Lewis, Wilfred M. Charlton, George A. Brown, E. C. Smith, G. E. Franklin, H. E. Buchner, A. Eikenaar, W. K. Batty, G. E. Downing, George Tranter, Oscar Boomer, Gordon D. Mellish, R. D. Campbell, G. W. Smith, E. E. Hooper, J. McGinlay, E. H. Young, A. C. Whitcombe, E. A. Pinkerton, Stanley S. Stock, O. J. Coupland.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—One name has been deleted from the signatures at the request of the student concerned.—L.F.K.

The Chancellor devotes a considerable portion of his article to a matter of minor importance. He draws attention to the fact that we have stated incorrectly the number of Baptist ministerial students in attendance at McMaster. His own statement, "According to our records there are ninety-seven of our men now registered who have to devote their lives to the work of the Christian ministry at home and abroad," should settle the matter.

Even a cursory reading of the protest will show the utter fallacy of the criticism printed in *The Canadian Baptist*. The writer merely sidesteps the issue. The text of the protest he does not even touch. Dean Farmer's statement concerning Professor Marshall's sympathy with the general Driver view, and the Professor's own confession concerning the book of Jonah remain unchanged in spite of the Chancellor's remarks.

In answer to the second charge let it be said that a full day before it appeared in the secular press, a copy of the protest was sent to Mr. Albert Matthews, Chairman of the Board of Governors, another copy was left with the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist*.

The suggestion that at least two of the students did not understand what they were signing is a reflection on their intelligence. One student, it is true, recanted, but on his own recent testimony to a fellow-student, he admitted that he read the protest carefully, understood it fully, and signed it six times. The other understood his position as a subscriber to the protest, but regretted its publication in the secular press. Let us explain the necessity for six signatures. The first document was prepared in triplicate and was stolen from the room of one of the students at McMaster Hall, after a number had signed it. Three other copies were then made and signed.

The Chancellor evidently considers that he has scored a big point when he observes that "only three of the men who signed have been in Professor Marshall's classes. The other twenty are presumably not any better qualified to pass judgment on Professor Marshall than any other young men of comparatively limited experience in the Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec." Would the Chancellor imply that only those who have attended Professor Marshall's classes are qualified to judge his theological position? What about his public utterances? This is a reflection upon the intelligence of our Baptist people.

The Chancellor tacitly questions the right of twenty-six Baptist Ministerial students to express their opinion. This liberty has apparently been reserved for those who favor the retention of Professor Marshall. Nothing but commendation was awarded those students who flooded the denomina-

tion with a pamphlet called "An Unfortunate Necessity." No word of admonition has even been whispered when sundry other students of scholastic attainments equal or less than our own have expressed their own or some one else's approval of Professor Marshall's views. What is sometimes called loyalty to the University is often in reality blindness to facts.

It is suggested that we should have consulted our "older brethren," but, inasmuch as three of our number, Messrs. W. S. Whitcombe, W. G. Brown, and A. J. Fieldus had already consulted them, we were fully advised as to their attitude toward any student protest.

We do not take ourselves too seriously, as has been suggested, but we recognize that the situation is not only serious but critical. Therefore we have ventured to express our fear that the results of the retention of Professor Marshall on the staff of McMaster will be far-reaching.

Student Evicted Because of His Stand.

That it takes courage to stand boldly for the truth will be apparent when the following letter is read:

Letter from Chancellor Whidden to Student Pastor W. G. Brown.

Mr. W. Gordon Brown,

March 31st, 1926.

McMaster Hall, Toronto.

Dear Mr. Brown,—In view of the situation which has developed among us I have been authorized to intimate to you that it will be inadvisable for you to continue in the Men's Residence after April the 5th.

It is not my custom to tell a student what his views should be regarding members of the Faculty or of the administration of the affairs of the University, but I wish to call your attention to the fact that in carrying on for months a form of propaganda which is against the best interests of McMaster you have persisted in using McMaster Hall, street number and Men's telephone number included, as your editorial headquarters.

I regret exceedingly that you have thought it necessary to employ some of the methods which you have employed in order to publish your personal views.

This would not be permitted in connection with any well organized church, much less in connection with a properly conducted business institution.

While reluctant to notify you of the decision as above stated, I am of the opinion that this course is in your own and your fellow-students' best interests.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) Howard P. Whidden.

The Chancellor assured Mr. Brown that his action had no connection with any student body resolution, but was authorized by the executive of the Senate. To be brief, Mr. W. G. Brown, B.A., now in his B.Th. course, pastor of Orangeville Church, and instrumental in bringing about the Alton revival, in which about a hundred and fifty people professed conversion, has been evicted from the men's residence of McMaster University by the executive for this reason, viz., that he dared to exercise his Baptist liberty in dealing plainly and openly with the denominational situation. The time has come when one may think, but dare not speak.

Signed April 6th, 1926.

WILLIAM K. BATTY.
R. ALLEN LEWIS.
JOHN F. HOLLIDAY.
STANLEY S. STOCK.
GORDON D. MELLISH.
E. C. SMITH.
E. H. YOUNG.
G. W. SMITH.
W. S. WHITCOMBE.
G. E. FRANKLIN.
G. A. BROWN.
A. C. WHITCOMBE.

H. E. BUCHNER.
G. H. TRANTER.
OSCAR BOOMER.
R. D. CAMPBELL.
E. E. HOOPER.
E. A. PINKERTON.
G. E. DOWNING.
J. MCGINLAY.
W. GORDON BROWN.
A. EKKENAAR.
A. J. FIELDUS.
W. N. CHARLTON.

Editorial

THE STUDENTS' REPLY TO CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN.

We very gladly open our columns to the twenty-four McMaster students in order that they may place their case before the Denomination. We are so generally held responsible for every kind of criticism of McMaster University that we think it is well to anticipate what may be said about the article published elsewhere in this paper, signed by the twenty-four students. These young men are not puppets but men. Evidently they believe in doing their own thinking, and in expressing their convictions. *The Gospel Witness* cannot claim any share of the credit for their action, which is exclusively their own so far as we are concerned. But we are glad to be of service in letting the Denomination know the spirit which presides at McMaster. We think it is appropriate that we should offer a few observations on the students' article referred to.

These young men complain that they have been excluded from the pages of the University publication, and told by *The Canadian Baptist* that their protest could not be published for three weeks or more. Last week we issued a challenge to all the defenders of McMaster University who charge this paper with a want of candour, and sometimes with actual misrepresentation, to come out into the open and make these charges where they can be answered. Does anybody believe that the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* was sincere when he said he could not publish the students' protest for three weeks or more? Will not every honest Canadian Baptist in the Convention readily recognize that the Editor's plea of crowded columns was nothing but an excuse? Otherwise, how does it come to pass that he absolutely broke his word to the students, and opened his editorial columns to a letter from the Chancellor publishing the students' protest immediately following? Of course, the plain truth is the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* can always find room for what he wants to print. What is not in the interests of McMaster he either does not print, or postpones its publication as long as possible, as in the case of Professor Campbell's letter and Dr. Sowerby's letter. And while we are talking about this, can the Denomination not see that even the correspondence columns of *The Canadian Baptist* would be absolutely closed to all fundamentalists among us, were it not for the existence of *The Gospel Witness*? We call upon *The Canadian Baptist* to remember that it is expected to represent a Christian Denomination, and that therefore some degree of straightforwardness should characterize its dealing with the people. In this same connection we would call attention to the students' observation that "nothing but commendation was awarded those students who flooded the Denomination with the pamphlet called 'An Unfortunate Necessity'". Here we have a direct charge to make against *The Canadian Baptist*, and we challenge that paper to dispute it. From all parts of our constituency we have received information that every subscriber to *The Canadian Baptist* receives all the literature of McMaster University. The students' pamphlet entitled, "An Unfortunate Necessity", *The McMaster Graduate*, Professor Marshall's Walmer Road sermon, and nearly everything else issued by McMaster University, finds its way directly to every subscriber of *The Canadian Baptist*. What is the conclusion? Simply that McMaster University has not only commandeered *The Canadian Baptist*, and is using it as its special advocate, but it is also using *The Canadian Baptist* subscription list to flood the Denomination with its own special pleading. We are not complaining: we have not asked for *The Canadian Baptist* list; but we consider McMaster's action a mighty argument in support of the principle that our Publication Board ought to be independent of all other Boards.

Another item in the students' article records the eviction of Student Pastor W. G. Brown from residence in McMaster University. We offer Mr. Brown our most hearty congratulations. We call attention to the fact that this expulsion is ordered by the Executive of the Senate, an irresponsible body over which the Convention has no control. What are the facts? Who is this Mr. Brown? Only

last Summer Mr. Brown arranged for a series of special meetings in the village of Alton, and called his friend, Mr. James McGinlay to assist him. Alton was a village in which there was no Baptist church, and, so far as we know, no Baptists. But these two young men, full of zeal for the Lord, went into this village of four hundred people, and with only God to help them began to preach. Something like one hundred and fifty people in all professed conversion. A large number were baptized, and a new Baptist church was organized in Alton, of which Mr. James McGinlay is now the Pastor. Mr. McGinlay probably preaches to the largest Baptist village congregation in Canada. For the initiation of this movement, under God, Mr. W. G. Brown was responsible: he was God's instrument in planning the services. Does the Denomination want men like W. G. Brown, and James McGinlay to do again what the great fathers of the faith used to do: go out as flaming evangelists with the glorious gospel of the blessed God where no Baptist churches are established, and preach the gospel in such a way that new churches will spring up? Is that the kind of work the Denomination wants to have done? Is there any Baptist home in our Convention that would not count it an honour to have these earnest young missionaries as guests beneath their roof? We think we know the answer to these questions. But McMaster University has "no room" to entertain in residence W. G. Brown. The Master Himself said, "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord". We remember that when Jesus was born there was no room for Him in the inn; and we are increasingly convinced that so far as McMaster University authorities are concerned, there is no room in McMaster for any but a theoretical Christ. The Editor of this paper has been represented all over the Convention as a man of bad spirit and questionable methods. The "spirit" to which they objected is the spirit which refuses to be cowed by McMaster's intolerable would-be despotism; and the "methods" to which they object have been the methods of telling the truth in a straightforward way, and putting it in print where everyone could read it.

But the time has come for plainer speaking. We consider the ethics of McMaster University are not in any sense Christian. We are fighting a foe that is almost as destitute of any sense of fair play as the Germans themselves. They have expelled Student W. G. Brown from residence. Twenty-three other students stand by his side, and support him to the last ditch, and have set their signatures to their protest. What will they do with the other twenty-three? Not all of them are in residence. What is the explanation of McMaster's conduct. We remember that when Jesus sent out His disciples, He said, "Into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide". Can it be possible that one little glimmer of light has shone into the Chancellor's understanding, and that he has come to see that McMaster University is not "worthy" to have under its roof in residence one who thus faithfully witnesses for Christ as W. G. Brown has done?

Little by little McMaster University is disclosing its true spirit; and the Denomination is rapidly coming to understand that the scripture text which its representatives so piously quote as representing the McMaster ideal, has little relation to McMaster's teaching, and none at all to its practice.

WILL THERE BE A "SPLIT" IN THE CONVENTION?

We have been informed that McMaster's defenders here and there in the Convention are telling people that McMaster must be supported in the present crisis to avoid a split. Let us examine this matter. What are the facts? No one will question that there is a very considerable body of opinion throughout the Convention that is unalterably opposed to McMaster's present course. We have said over and over again that much more than ninety per cent. of the rank and file of our people are true to the fundamentals of the faith. We believe we should be well within the mark were we to say that ninety-five per cent. of our people are, in the Baptist meaning of the word, orthodox. Dean Farmer is reported to have stated that we were wrong in our estimate and that the better educated among our people are in sympathy with the liberal view. We

do not know what Dean Farmer calls "better educated" people, but of this we feel morally certain that the overwhelming majority, we believe ninety-five per cent., of our people, whether "better educated" or only "uneducated fools", still believe the Bible to be the very Word of God.

Every day we are receiving information of an awakening among our people. In practically every church in the land there are those whose eyes are being opened to the fact that McMaster's course is dishonoring to Christ and His Word and, if not corrected, must ultimately corrupt the whole denomination. We are convinced that that great body of orthodox Baptists will not surrender their principles. Elsewhere in this issue we refer to the Baptist Union Conference to be held in Toronto, April 22nd to 24th. We do not presume to predict what response will be made to the conference call. We believe it will be a very large one. But be it large or small we are convinced a company of men and women will gather in Toronto who will pledge themselves to absolute loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God; to the Lord Jesus as the Head of the Church; and to our Baptist churches as the best expression of the New Testament church they know; and will resolve to stand together for the cleansing of the denomination. If there is to be any split, we give notice in advance that we are not going to be on the outside of the denomination, but on the inside. We refuse to be put out. We challenge the enemy, for so we must regard them, to attempt to put us out. We are standing for the faith of Christ and are resolved to stand for it to the death.

Let us suppose that by some means or another McMaster should succeed in blinding the eyes of the people to the real issue, so as to secure some sort of endorsement at the next Convention. What kind of endorsement could it be? We are absolutely certain that if McMaster could secure a majority at all, it would be a very small one. What then? Will there be a "split"? Not on our side. We will stay in and fight the thing if we are in the minority. We will oppose the machinations of Modernism by every means in our power, and we give McMaster notice that there shall be no peace this year, nor next year, nor the next ten or twenty years, nor so long as some of us live, while it continues its present course. So far as fundamentalists among Baptists are concerned, we are sure there will be no surrender.

What then would a majority for McMaster mean at the next Convention? It would mean denominational paralysis, nothing else. This educational octopus, of small size we admit, has wrapped its tentacles around every Board and every denominational interest; and if it were given a majority at the next Convention, *The Canadian Baptist* would become more than ever the McMaster parrot, and all the boards, its instruments. What then? Who give the money to denominational funds? We suppose there are a few who give large sums, but our Boards cannot afford to ignore the spiritual, self-sacrificing men and women by whom our denominational funds are supported, and from whose pockets the greatest part of our denominational revenue must come. For McMaster University to obtain a majority at the next Convention would mean that nearly half the denomination would stop contributing to denominational funds, and with renewed determination would proceed to organize in every part of the Convention, in order that information may be carried to the last member in the last church in the land. Does not McMaster know that she is fighting witnesses to the truth? Does she not remember that "we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth"? We warn McMaster that she is heading straight for bankruptcy in every particular, and she is endeavouring to drag all the denominational boards with her.

But let us suppose, on the other hand, that McMaster is refused a vote of confidence as she was at London only nineteen months ago. What would follow upon such a victory for the truth as that? Inevitably certain reforms would be effected in the University, and this would have its effect upon our whole denominational life. Would there be a "split"? Do the supporters of Modernism and of McMaster University tell us that unless they can have their own way they will withdraw from the Convention? What if they did? That would not be a "split". It would only mean the removal from the Convention of those who did not properly belong to us. It would leave the Convention a Baptist body intact; the cancer which now threatens its life having been removed. Therefore the churches' co-operation on the basis of evangelical faith and to ensure the unity of the Spirit and the power of the Holy

Spirit in our church life, it will be necessary that we should do everything possible to bring out a great vote against McMaster. That is our task for the next five months. Let us take off our coats, roll up our sleeves, and get at it. So far as *The Gospel Witness* is concerned, we are just contemplating beginning to get ready to prepare to start something.

THE TORONTO BAPTIST BIBLE UNION CONFERENCE.

The Baptist Bible Union Conference will be held in Jarvis Street, April 22nd to 24th. The Conference Committee sent out many thousands of copies of the Conference Call last week. Other copies will be mailed to any addresses sent to The Baptist Bible Union Conference Secretary, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto.

This note is written to urge upon all our readers that earnest and unceasing prayer be offered in behalf of this Conference. There is only one way by which such a controversy can be settled, and that way is always on the basis of truth; and there is only one Person Who can lead men to an acceptance of the truth, and that Person is the Holy Spirit. That is to say, the principle of Elijah's challenge always obtains: "The God that answereth by fire, let him be God."

But here let us enquire, Why, and upon what terms, God answers by fire? We have had some communications suggesting that we ought to cease from contention, and pray. We believe in prayer: if there is one church in all the world that has reason to praise God for the privilege of prayer, and for abundant answers to prayer, it is the church of which the Editor of this paper has the honour to be pastor. But there are, surely, conditions of prevailing prayer. What did Elijah do? Did he contend for the faith? Did he fight against the enemy of the truth? Did he hesitate to accept the consequences of the long war which his testimony inaugurated? We must remember that Elijah prayed that it might not rain; and the answer of fire from heaven was preceded by three and a half years of terrible drought which brought the nation to famine and bankruptcy.

It may be that the Baptist denomination will have to pass through a similar experience. If so, we do well to emulate Elijah's example and pray that it might not rain; and that God may, by any and every means, preserve us from denominational apostasy. For three and a half years Elijah so wrought in Israel that the king regarded him as "the troubler of Israel", and called him his "enemy". But what was it that immediately preceded the answer of fire? Read 1st Kings, chapter eighteen. Elijah called a convention on Mount Carmel: he challenged the prophets of Baal to a proof of their religion. He laid aside all his soft speech; he mocked the false prophets; he ridiculed them; he held their god up to contempt, and challenged them to prove that their false religion had any power in it. And when the fire failed to come in response to the false prophets' cry, Elijah restored the altar that was broken down; and he put wood upon the altar, and a sacrifice upon the wood,—and it was not until he had done all that that he prayed that the fire would fall. So must we do: we must challenge the false prophets; we must expose their false religion; we may even mock the deafness and the impotence of their god, who is no god at all.

Let no one be shocked;—all false religions are the same. Modernism is no better than the worship of Baal. Every false religion displaces God, denies His Word, and refuses to submit to His authority. That was the religion of Baal: that is the religion of Modernism.

We, too, must restore the altar: we must insist upon the fundamentals of the faith; we must put the wood and sacrifice upon the altar; we must put the Cross in the central place; we must insist that there is no salvation but through the blood; and we must yield ourselves as living sacrifices, holy, acceptable unto God. Having done all this, then we may pray; or, rather, pray while we do all this, and after we have done all this. Then the Fire will fall; and, after the Fire, there will be heard the sound of abundance of rain.

Oliver Cromwell was right when he instructed his soldiers to trust in God, and keep their powder dry. We, too, must pray in recognition of the fact that only as our efforts are accompanied by the mighty power of God can they become effective. On the other hand, we must labour, yea, we must even fight,

as though all depended upon our fighting: "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty"; "The children of Ephraim, being armed, and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle"; "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil."

"IS THIS A BLIND MAN'S LETTER?"

We quote below a letter which appeared in *The Toronto Globe* of April 7th:

IGNORING SERIOUS ISSUES.

To the Editor of The Globe: I have been intensely interested in the discussions on the historicity of Jonah, the theory of evolution, the hours of our Lord's slumber in the tomb and similar questions. I have been wondering, however, why these good people are spending so much time and effort over topics on which men equally loyal to Christ and the Scriptures have always differed and always will differ, when there are so many and so tremendous problems waiting solution in the Province and the Dominion.

Do these contenders for the faith know that there are six distilleries operating in Ontario, and a seventh building in this town? Are they aware that liquor has been cleared through the Customs in a port on Lake Ontario, loaded on a boat fast in the ice and secretly removed in the night? Have they thought that the latest Custom regulations from Ottawa will hinder a single rum-runner from plying his trade?

Do they know that race-track gambling takes two dollars from us to one dollar paid in taxes? Have they noted any decrease in the sale of narcotics? If they know these facts, what have they to say about them? Why spend energy on themes that do not concern the salvation of a solitary soul, while thousands are lost for time and eternity by the above-named evils? Echo answers—Why?

P. K. Dayfoot.

Port Colborne, April 2.

We feel like apologizing for taking the space and using the ink to reprint a letter which is so near to nothing as this one. Of all the inanities we have ever seen in print, we do not remember ever to have seen any to surpass this.

The writer has been "intensely interested" in the discussion of subjects which he dismisses as having no value; and asks, "Why spend energy on themes that do not concern the salvation of a solitary soul?" What are the themes that have no relation to the soul's salvation? One he mentions is the theory of evolution. Does not the writer know that the theory of evolution involves the negation of everything essentially Christian? It denies the special creation of man, the fall of man, the redemption of man, the virgin birth of Christ, His Deity, His resurrection,—every single principle of revealed religion is implicitly denied in the theory of evolution. Has this nothing to do with the salvation of the soul?

What about "the historicity of Jonah"? Beyond all peradventure, the denial of its historicity denies the infallibility of Christ, and implicitly repudiates His authority, and represents Him as a mistaken man. Has this nothing to do with the salvation of the soul?

Again: "The hours of the Lord's slumber in the tomb"—is not this subject vital to the accuracy of Scripture? If our Lord declared that He would be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, and yet was buried Friday evening and raised from the dead Sunday morning, would not this invalidate His testimony?

Over against these tremendous issues which relate to the soul's destiny, the writer asks if we know that "there are six distilleries operating in Ontario, and a seventh building in this town," etc., etc. We should like to know what the writer himself is doing about these distilleries? If the matters to which he refers are the all-important matters which should engage the attention of Canadian Baptists to the exclusion of the great problems of revealed religion, he has a right, of course, to spend his energies in that direction. But when

we read Mr. Dayfoot's letter we could not help wondering if that represented the average religious intelligence of our Baptist people? If it does, the great need of the hour in our Baptist denomination is the opening of kindergarten classes all over the two Provinces, where people, including preachers, may be taught once again the first principles of the gospel of Christ, according to the Hebrews five and twelve: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which is the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat."

Yet the writer of this vacuous epistle writes the comments on the Sunday School Lesson in *The Canadian Baptist*.

(Note.—In seeking an adjective to describe Mr. Dayfoot's letter the word "vacuous" came to our mind. To guard against any injustice we consulted the Standard Dictionary which defines the word as follows:

"1. Having no contents; especially, containing no matter; being a vacuum; empty; unfilled; void. 2. Lacking intelligence; being without expression; blank. 3. Idle; unoccupied."

Having read this definition we concluded the word *vacuous* was precisely the word required.)

CONGRATULATIONS, "SEARCHLIGHT".

The Gospel Witness heartily congratulates its contemporary, *The Searchlight*, of Fort Worth, on the new form the paper has taken with the last issue. It is published in what is known as "tabloid" form, and this issue has forty pages. The paid circulation is fifty-five thousand, and is increasing every day. A few weeks ago we were in *The Searchlight* office in Fort Worth on a Saturday, and the General Manager showed us a record of nine hundred and sixteen new paid subscriptions for that week. This has become the regular thing, and if it continues, in a short time *The Searchlight* will have the largest circulation of any religious paper on the American continent.

The new price of *The Searchlight* is \$1.50, and if it were multiplied by ten, it would be well worth anybody's money. We believe, indeed, there are a great many of its readers who can hardly be described as the friends of the Editor, who would not be without it for very much more than ten times the subscription price.

We do not believe there is a man in America who is doing as much for the cause of Fundamentalism as Dr. J. F. Norris.

DR. E. Y. MULLINS' MEMPHIS SPEECH.

Nearly a year ago the Editor of this paper was asked to write a criticism of Dr. Mullins' famous speech for "fair play" delivered before the Southern Convention last May. Pressure of other duties has delayed the fulfillment of the promise which we made at that time to essay the task. As time passed the request was extended to include Dr. Mullins' writings on the question of evolution throughout the year.

The long-promised article is now in the hands of the printer. The copy consisted of fifty typewritten pages. The article will appear in a week or two in *The Searchlight*. We understand Dr. Mullins will be invited to reply in the same issue of the paper. If any of our readers are not readers of *The Searchlight*, we recommend them to subscribe at once. Although this particular article was written by the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, we believe we can, without immodesty, promise our readers they will find it interesting.

GREAT REVIVAL IN LEXINGTON, KY.

A great revival is in progress at the First Baptist Church, Lexington, Ky., where Dr. J. Frank Norris is assisting Dr. George Ragland. Dr. Norris began in Lexington March 14th. For the first two Sundays the services were held in the church, from which they were to be transferred to the City Auditorium. Dr. Norris announced he would speak on "Rum and Romanism" and the city authorities refused to allow him the use of the building for that ser-

vice. The court upheld the city's action. This issued in the decision to build a tabernacle. Although the First Church already has a magnificent property, a new lot was purchased for a young people's building to house a department of the new Sunday School movement now in progress in connection with the revival.

Last Sunday, April 4th, an appeal was made for fifteen thousand dollars to pay for the lot and for the new Tabernacle. This resulted in a cash offering of eighteen thousand five hundred dollars, which was expected to be increased to twenty thousand dollars. Best of all, many are being converted and added to the church. Great crowds are attending, and the Sunday School attendance has already doubled.

We ask our readers to pray for a mighty victory in Lexington.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1. T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., Editor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada No. 2.

Lesson 5 SECOND QUARTER May 2, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE TRANSFIGURATION

LESSON TEXT: Seventeenth chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Mark 5:2-32.

Luke 9:28-45.

GOLDEN TEXT.—“He said unto them, But whom say ye that I am? Peter answering said, The Christ of God.” (Luke 9:20).

1. THE TRANSFIGURATION.

The three Apostles here mentioned as witnessing the transfiguration were being prepared for further revelation. They were among the witnesses who were chosen before of God. Though they would not understand all the implications of this wonderful experience now, it would all become clear to them when He should be risen from the dead. Thus often God in His grace stores up knowledge for us even as Joseph stored up the corn against the days of dearth.

1. God reveals by concealing; though a paradox, it is true. God was revealed in Christ, but the revelation had been impossible had not His glory been veiled in his humanity; for no man hath seen God at any time. And here on the occasion of His transfiguration, the veil of humanity became transparent, and the infinite glory shone through. The Incarnation is a veil; but on this occasion, as Peter tells us, the disciples were “eye witnesses of His majesty”.

2. You may learn something from the appearance of Moses and Elias on this occasion. They are not dead but alive; for God is not the God of the dead but of the living. And they were doubtless here in a representative capacity. Moses died and was buried; but Elias was translated without seeing death. Thus if this be the fulfilment of the promise of the preceding chapter that some should see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom, then the disciples were given a foretaste of what will be the experience of those who shall see the Lord at His appearing. And Moses and Elias were representative of those who sleep in Jesus, and of those who are alive and remain until the Coming of the Lord. But as the sleeping dead shall first be raised and then raptured with the living saints, so Moses and Elias greeted the Lord when He appeared in His glory.

3. Moses and Elias also were representative of the Law and the Prophets; for from Genesis to Malachi the Old Testament has but one subject—the subject of which Moses and Elias spoke as they talked with Jesus. 4. Incidentally and parenthetically, it may be observed that there is teaching here respecting the identification of personality beyond the grave. Moses was not recognized by the disciples as to his body, neither did they know Elias because of his physical form; but though the body of Moses had crumbled to dust, while that of Elias had been translated to the glory, each was separate and distinct from the other. Their personalities had persisted; and after the long lapse of time, they appeared alive, and talked with Jesus. Surely this should teach us that our loved and lost who have died in Christ, are not lost for ever. Were they to vanish into air, and never again be recognized, of what profit would it be for

one to write us as does Paul, "by the word of the Lord", saying, "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep"? This record of the transfiguration, among other things, is written for this same purpose.

5. Moses and Elias talked with Christ of His decease, which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. Literally, they spoke of His exodus. How interesting, how wonderful, that conversation must have been to Moses; for he had said, "A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you like unto me, Him shall ye hear". Now Moses would understand the meaning of the Exodus of which he had written so long before,—all relating to the exodus or the departure of the Children of Israel from Egypt, or typical and prophetic of all that the Law and the Prophets had spoken of, even the death and resurrection of our Lord. The suggestiveness of this passage challenges one to write a volume on the subject,—representatives of the Law and the Prophets discussing their fulfilment in the exodus of Jesus Christ.

6. We have here some teaching respecting the temporal and superficial value of the carnal mind's estimate of the sublimities of Divine revelation. Not knowing what he says, Peter speaks as though they were given to provide a good time for the disciples. And those who have no higher conception of the life and death of Christ than that it was designed to make life here a little more tolerable, know as little what they say as did Peter. Yet how many narrow the revelation of God to mere temporalities, to the making of tabernacles, with no higher conception of the universal and eternal sweep of the Divine purpose! It is unthinkable that Christ came from Heaven, and through all the ages talked with Moses and Elias and all the prophets, fulfilling all that He promised through them in His own death and resurrection, merely to make it "good for us to be here"! What was the purpose of it all? Was it not that the universe should hear and heed the Sovereign Saviour Jesus Christ? He is the full and complete revelation of God to man: "This is My beloved Son, hear ye Him". And even Moses and Elias will be understood only as we hear Christ.

7. At last the disciples saw "Jesus only". What else is there to see! A proper study of the Word of God will reveal "Jesus only". A thorough understanding of nature will disclose the fact that all things created came into being through "Jesus only". In our personal experiences as Christians, "Jesus only" sums up all our desire and reward. "Jesus only" is our present Authority; "Jesus only" is our Guarantee of future glory.

8. A suggestion respecting Wisdom's reserve. Why were the disciples forbidden to tell the vision? Partly because they did not themselves understand even the meaning of "risen from the dead" in advance. These were the witnesses chosen before of God; and what Jesus said they understood;—not at the time, but in the light of the resurrection, they remembered what had been done to Him and they believed the Scripture and the Word which Jesus had spoken.

9. Some practical lessons. Many a present vision can be thoroughly understood only in the light of some future experience for which it is a preparation.

10. An example of the opposite of this: The scribes knew the letter of the Scripture respecting the promise of the coming of Elias (Mal. 4: 5, 6); yet they did not recognize that that Scripture found its fulfilment in the ministry of John the Baptist.

II. COMING DOWN FROM THE MOUNTAIN.

1. The contrasts of life,—The glory and the gloom: they are always with us.

2. How we suffer through our affections!—parents for the children. We have here a picture of a commonplace in human life (vss. 14-16).

3. Observe the helplessness of the disciples in the face of humanity's great need. This applies both to individuals and to churches. How many weary souls are brought to us that we might cast the devils out; and we have to confess that we have no power to exorcise them!

4. Yet the power of Christ is always sufficient. A suggestive phrase for all who have failed in other directions: "Bring them hither to Me." Try Jesus, and in trying, trust; and in trusting, triumph!

5. This power is still available to true faith. That is implied in the Saviour's tender rebuke.

6. It is intimated that some evils needed greater power to expel them than others. This kind yielded only to prayer and fasting.

III. THE DEEPENING SHADOW.

Here again our Lord refers to the Cross, and gives to His disciples a prophetic detail of the great tragedy. Now He tells them He is to be betrayed into the hands of sinners. They were sorry, yet they did not understand.

IV. JESUS AND THE TRIBUTE MONEY.

1. The question and its significance. The enemies of the Lord are always on the alert to find occasion against Him; and they are also on the alert to find occasion against His followers. "Lead me in a plain path", said the Psalmist, "because of them that observe me". 2. Our Lord knew what they had asked Peter. What if "when we come into the house", we were always to bear in mind that Jesus knows all about our experiences for the day,—the questions which have been asked us, and the answers we have made? 3. Christ alludes to the practice of putting strangers rather than citizens under tribute. "Notwithstanding" He does not stand upon His rights, but goes the second mile. 4. The finding of the money in the fish's mouth was a miracle. No explanation was possible; we must merely accept it. Its significance, however, is to the effect that Divine power is available for every emergency in the believer's life.

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.

ORGANIZATION OF McMASTER GOVERNING BODIES

From time to time as the present war proceeds we may have occasion to refer to the various Committees of the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University. We therefore print the following particulars for the information of our readers. This is taken from a communication received from the Registrar of McMaster University, marked "Organization for 1925-1926, Effected November 12th, 1925", the communication being dated November 25th, 1925. We print it just now in order that our readers may know where to place the responsibility for the eviction of Mr. W. Gordon Brown from McMaster residence:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS: E. C. Fox; A. Matthews; W. E. Robertson; F. Sanderson; R. D. Warren; H. L. Stark; The Chancellor. **Investment Committee:** F. Sanderson; A. Matthews; James Ryrie. **Moulton Committee:** Rev. W. A. Cameron; R. D. Warren; Mrs. E. J. Zavitz; The Chancellor. **Committees on Property and Repairs:**—McMaster: W. E. Robertson; Moulton: A. Matthews, R. D. Warren; Woodstock: G. Matthews, Rev. R. R. McKay.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE: The Chancellor, Dean Farmer, Dean McLay, Principal of Woodstock College, Principal of Moulton College, W. H. Firstbrook, Rev. B. W. Merrill, E. C. Fox, Jas. Ryrie, R. D. Warren, J. B. McArthur.

EIGHTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD'S CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS ASSOCIATION

Toronto, Canada, April 25 to May 2.

The next great meeting of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association will be held in Massey Hall and Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, April 25 to May 2.

This will be the eighth annual convention of the association and its first meeting in Canada. Toronto is Canada's great city and for the entire North America most centrally located.

The programme this year will be one of the best yet presented since the association was born. The following men will appear as speakers on the programme:

Dr. T. T. Shields of Toronto; Dr. J. Frank Norris, Fort Worth; George Washburn, founder of the Christian Crusaders; Gerald Winrod of Kansas, head of the Kansas anti-evolution movement known as The Defenders; Prof. Harry Rimmer, secretary of the Science Research Bureau; a representative from "The Friends of Science vs. Speculation", from Los Angeles; Dr. Rood of Turlock, Cal., founder of the "Bryan Bible League"; Dr. C. H. Hadden of Los Angeles, head of the "Fundamentalist League"; Dr. W. H. Carter of

Houslaw, England, editor of "The Bible Witness"; Dr. Albert Sidney Johnson of Charlotte, N.C., leading Fundamentalist among Southern Presbyterians; Dr. Marion Hull of Atlanta, Ga.; Dr. Arthur I. Brown of Vancouver, B.C., famous surgeon; Dr. W. B. Riley, executive secretary of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, and others.

Meetings will be held in Massey Hall on Sunday and on Thursday and Saturday nights, and in Jarvis Street Baptist Church the rest of the time.

The Cleveland Colored Quintet, one of the most famous singing companies in the world, will be present to render special numbers and otherwise lead in the music of this great convention.

Those desiring entertainment should address T. T. Shields, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Canada.

The programme will be a constructive Fundamental programme. Every feature of the great controversy now raging between Fundamentalists and Modernists will receive attention. Report for the year will be one of the finest yet made since the organization was born eight years ago in Philadelphia.

Every active member of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association is privileged to vote and if elected to office to hold the same. Colleges, churches and Bible conferences holding membership, are entitled to send three delegates or representatives to this convention.

The fact that the fight against Modernism is at present more furious than ever before should mean the largest attendance yet known for this movement. Our conventions hitherto have ranged from three to six thousand in attendance.

THE EDITOR GOES TO TEXAS AND KENTUCKY.

Dr. Shields leaves Toronto for Fort Worth, Texas, April 8th. He will preach in The First Baptist Church, Fort Worth, at both services April 11th. The services are broadcast by a very powerful station. Fort Worth is on Central Standard Time, and the hour of the evening service is 8 o'clock. On Tuesday, April 13th, Dr. Shields will join Dr. W. B. Riley of Minneapolis, and Dr. A. I. Brown of Vancouver, B.C., in a Bible Conference at Paducah, Ky. April 14th Dr. Riley and Dr. Shields will speak at Lexington, Ky., in connection with the great revival campaign now being conducted there in Dr. Ragland's Church by Dr. J. Frank Norris. This will be the first time in which these four men, Riley, Norris, Ragland, and Shields, have ever been together on the same platform.

On Friday, April 16th, Dr. Shields will speak in Brantford, Ont., under the auspices of the committee which arranged the protest meeting some weeks ago in the same city. Dr. Shields' subject will be, "Will Canadian Baptists Surrender to Modernism?" Dr. Shields will preach in his own pulpit Sunday, the April 18th.

REV. H. H. SAVAGE IN JARVIS ST.

The Rev. H. H. Savage, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Pontiac, Mich., who so completely captured Jarvis St. people a few weeks ago, will preach again next Sunday, April 11th, at both services, and will teach the Pastor's Class, Sunday morning.

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

The attendance at School was 1,394. There was a great congregation each service, and a large number of conversions. In the evening the congregation was thrilled and moved to tears as many splendid young men walked down the aisles, indicating their surrender to Christ.

THE SOUND OF ABUNDANCE OF RAIN.

We have never had such prayer meetings in Jarvis St. as we are having now. The Holy Spirit's presence is being manifested in a marvellous way, and we believe we are on the eve of a great revival.