

TWO YEAR OLD ARTICLE SEES THE LIGHT	Page 6
CONCERNING PROXIES	" 10
PROF. MARSHALL'S POSITION TO DATE	" 11

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY. TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS DURING 1926 \$1.00 FOR ONE YEAR. RENEWALS \$2.00.

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. 5. No. 20

TORONTO, SEPT. 23rd, 1926

Whole No. 230

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE CHRIST OF THE FIRST AND FINAL CENTURIES OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA.

By Rev. Joseph W. Kemp.

Delivered in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, Sept. 12, 1926.

Those who are familiar with the writings of Samuel J. Andrews will recognize the title of this study as akin to that of one of the chapters in his book "Christianity and Anti-Christianity." To that chapter I am indebted for much of the thought I am about to express.

Anyone who is alive to the trend of things in our time cannot fail to observe how minutely the predictive words of the Old Testament prophets, as well as the words of our blessed Lord, are having their fulfilment. The religious, political and social conditions alike point as with index finger to the hour when the present order of things will wind up and the end of the age come. There is nothing speculative in the assertion that at the end of the age, faith will be waning, for we read, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth" (Luke xviii. 8). As the end draws near the shadows will gather with everthickening folds. The love of many will wax cold because of abounding iniquity. Our Lord and His apostles foretold the final apostasy, and its rapid increase, which together with the determined hostility of the world will find its embodiment in the Man of Sin, who, as the representative of fallen humanity, will pit himself against the Son of God and become for a time the acknowledged ruler of the world. In nothing whatever is the apostasy of the last days more pronounced than in its attitude to the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, an attitude which strangely contrasts with that of the early Christians. "What think ye of Christ?" is the all-compelling question of the hour. That is the touchstone testing all our thought and activity.

Our present study is concerned with the Person of Christ. Wherein does He differ in the thought of the final century from that of the first?

First of all let us remind ourselves that our adorable Lord is very God. Probably one of the most daring of all modern translations of the English New Testament is that of the Rev. Dr. Moffatt. In many respects it may be regarded as illuminating and refreshing, but we must be careful not to allow ourselves to be carried away with the subtlety of some of the renderings. It is perfectly atrocious to be confronted with a familiar passage like John 1, 1,

and find it robbed of its emphatically correct meaning by a rendering which even those having the merest smattering of a knowledge of the Greek will recognize as being inaccurate. Unhesitatingly we affirm that the true rendering of the text is, "The Word was God," but Dr. Moffatt will allow only that the Word was "Divine." What we maintain is that here we have Deity and not Divinity only. When the centurion and those that were with him were calmly watching Jesus, as our Lord yielded up the Ghost, the earth began to quake, and the graves were opened and many bodies of the saints arose, causing the watchers to fear greatly and exclaim: "Truly this man was the Son of God." This He was, and this He is, and the heart of the whole body of Christianity is found here.

There are in the Scriptures several distinct lines of proof that Jesus Christ is God manifest in the flesh. A recent writer has stated that our conviction of the Deity of Jesus Christ does not rest upon "proof texts nor upon old arguments drawn from these, but upon the general fact of the whole manifestation of Jesus Christ, and of the whole impression left by Him upon the world." Rather might we say our conviction rests not more on the scriptural assertions than upon His entire manifestation. Both lines of evidence are valid and together give an assured testimony to His Deity. In examining the Scripture testimony, we find that certain names given to Him imply Deity. He is said to be the Son of God, the Lord of Glory, the Lord of All, and so forth. To Him, in the next place are ascribed Divine attributes. He is Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Immutable. Again, distinctly Divine offices are said to be His. He is the Creator, the Preserver, and by Him sins are forgiven. Let anyone carefully read Heb. i. 10-12, and he will find that things said about God in Psa. cii. 24-27, are taken to refer to our Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover we find in II. Cor. xiii. 14, the Name of Jesus Christ coupled with that of God, in a way that would be impossible to that of any finite being. And so one might go on, following similar lines of testimony, all of which bear unmistakable witness that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God.

Turning from the God-ward side we look at our Lord's manhood, and let it be remarked at once that universal testimony has conceded to Christ at least a perfect all-round, grandly complete manhood. Pilate, as the typical judge, says "Behold the Man." About the Perfect Man there were no narrow limits of individuality. Men stand out from the mass with sharp individual traits as amongst the apostles for instance; we think of Peter's impetuosity and rashness, or Paul's abounding and tireless energy, and John ardent love. In other spheres we find certain characteristics which place men in a niche by themselves.

Napoleon, for instance, suggests the warrior, Luther the reformer, Gladstone the statesman, Spurgeon the preacher, and so on. These traits both distinguish and separate certain men from others, but, may we ask, what peculiarities had Christ to isolate Him from other men? Every man, whatever his tastes or temperament, his type of mind or heart, finds in Jesus something answering to his need. Neither was our Lord limited to any narrow nationality. He was truly the "Son of Man." Paul could say, "I am a Jew." Jesus, too, was a Jew, but less a Jew than a man. Again, in Him opposites were most perfectly blended. In few human characters, if in any, have we the perfect blending of the sterner virtues with the milder graces, but in our Lord this is complete.

Then let us remember that the long test of twenty centuries, and the close, searching criticism of these days, have failed to find a flaw, not to say a vice, in the Christ. I do not say His opponents have not charged Him with weakness of one sort and another—they have done that—but that is a vastly different thing from the discovery of its existence. Two thousand years have passed since Jesus was on the earth, and His character and career have been open to scrutiny all the time, and what is the verdict? It is the verdict of Pilate, "Behold, I bring Him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in Him" (John xix. 4). The question rings out, "What think ye of Christ?" No man has dealt a successful blow at Him, and the more minute the examination the greater the disclosure of perfection.

It is evident, therefore, that our Lord was more than a man. When Napoleon, in his banishment at St. Helena, was conversing with General Bertrand, who contended that Jesus was simply a man of great genius and power

to command and control, the exiled emperor said, "I know men, and I tell you that Jesus Christ is not a man. Superficial minds see a resemblance between Christ and the founders of empires and gods of other religions. That resemblance does not exist." Christ stands absolutely alone in history, and somehow He sways the world. The man who from his dark chamber of doubt and unbelief sends out his assaults upon Jesus of Nazareth, unwillingly bows to His Lordship by dating his production, "Anno Domini," in the year of our Lord. Said Dr. Pierson, and that truly, "Even creation is forgotten as the epoch from which all is to be reckoned, since that Babe was born in Bethlehem of Judea."

Now what is the popular attitude to Christ to-day? The Church early embodied in her creeds the great central, throbbing and vital truth, that Jesus is the only begotten Son, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily—truth of such amazing significance as to baffle any one generation to comprehend. With that at the heart of her creed, ought not the Person of our Lord to have risen before the Church with ever-increasing glory and majesty? But may we not ask, "Is it so?"

Does the Church better understand the mystery of the Person of the Incarnate Son. If so, why all the controversy regarding the virgin birth? Does she more fully comprehend His teaching and work? Does she more highly exalt Him as her risen and living head, than did the Church of the first century? Is He not becoming dimmed and shadowy in the thought of many professing Christians as the Antichrist begins to loom before us? Is He not a receding figure? If we find to-day His Deity disparaged or denied, and He Himself brought to the rank of common men, what shall we say? Has He not ceased to be accorded the supreme place which the early Church gave Him, and has not Christianity, which cannot be separated from Him, fallen from its distinctive character? Recognition must be made of the fact that Christianity from its beginnings with a mere handful of men has become a dominant force in the earth. It has wielded an untold influence upon the civilization of the nations. Honour has been paid to it by the world. There has been a numerical increase in its believers, and it finds an expression in the holy lives of its children. In all this we find cause for gratitude, for it marks one aspect of the growth of Christianity, but we do not, in these things, find the true standard of measurement. We cannot separate Christianity from Christ. It lives only in Him, and we can find Christian progress in the highest and truest sense only when He, the Head of the Church, is better known and more honoured among those who bear His name. Progress, judged by such standards, would appear to be very slow, yea, almost imperceptible. Think for the moment of the place our Lord occupied in the thought and affection of the early Church. Then He was the centre of all the Church's love, hope and labour. He Himself no less than His teachings, was always before the eyes of His disciples. The burden of their preaching was Christ—Christ crucified, Christ interceding, Christ coming, His Person filled the future as well as the present with its transfiguring light. The prayers for His speedy return and for the glorious hour when they should be like Him were upon all lips. All eyes were upon Him. They endured persecution as seeing Him who is invisible. He was the Alpha and Omega. The First and the Last.

The Acts of the Apostles is a record of the perpetuity of our Lord's words and deeds through the Holy Ghost in the Church, but all that was done was in the true sense His own personal action. We turn to the Church of to-day and ask—Is He now as highly exalted, as devoutly loved, as profoundly worshipped, as zealously served? Do we give Him place, prominence and pre-eminence? Is He the centre of the Church's thought, love and hope? Do they who name Him seek to proclaim Him? Do they long for perfect likeness to Him at His return? I fear a negative answer must be given to our question. This is not, however, to say that multitudes of faithful souls do not live in personal communion with Him and make Him a blessed reality to themselves by loving obedience, but there are multitudes who bear Him no love and regard Him as little more than a myth.

Now He is worthy of our best, and we are traitors to our trust and recreant to our Lord if we perpetuate what amounts to a criminal silence concerning Him, for while the Church is silent other voices are crying loudly that "He is exalted overmuch," "Honoured too much," and that "He must be

brought to His proper level," which in the estimation of unsanctified critics is the level of a man. Let us then note "the successive downward steps by which the faith of the Church at the beginning in Jesus Christ as the One Incarnate Son, the Saviour of men, by His cross, now High Priest and Head over all to His Church, and to come again, has gradually decayed."

The steps of this fall began with the denial of the Deity of Christ. His unique place as the highest of created beings, His pre-existence and creative activity were allowed, His supernatural birth and offices as Mediator, Teacher of perfect truth, and the future Judge and King were accepted. Thus, through denying our Lord's Deity, a distinct place was granted below God, but above all created men. This was followed by others whose speculative intellects could not be satisfied with this intermediate position and so we find another school rising declaring Christ was only one of many sons and with no power to offer an expiatory sacrifice, thus easily paving the way for the nineteenth century school of thinkers among whom are classed the unitarians, who have robbed our Lord of all His supernatural features and mediatorial offices. They tell us He is divine but only as other men, and, being purely human, He therefore comes under the laws controlling human development, and His teachings cannot be regarded as absolute truth, for He Himself partook of the limitations of His time.

It is an easy transition to the blasphemous position held by Theodore Parker, who said that the "theology of Jesus seems to have had many Jewish notions in it wholly untenable in our day," and he crowns that utterance by another equally outrageous: "It is absurd," he says, "to maintain that He entertained no theological error in matters of importance." The same writer and thinker is bold enough to state: "Popular theology is the greatest evil of our time, and rests on two columns, one of which is the idea of a supernatural Christ." Another of the same school blatantly exclaims, "In displacing Him from the place given Him by the Church, we see only another idol shattered that the true God might be revealed."

Such daring infidelity must be abhorrent to every right-thinking man, and were it not that we have to deal with a God of patience and long-suffering, such teachers would be consumed with the breath of His mouth. But great as is the disparagement of our Lord and His Person, Place and Authority, few have dared to deny Him as a man, moral perfection, but now this is openly said: "That Jesus was a perfect man, it is impossible to prove. We know enough about Him to know that He was not intellectually infallible, yet without this He could not be absolutely free from actual wrong."

More offensive statements have been made by so-called leaders of thought, but we forbear reproducing them. These are sufficient to show that there exists in our time a growing depreciation of the Son of the Eternal God, and that He would seem to be passing out of the thought and life of the Church and nations. That His avowed enemies should have said such things, or that the heathen who lived nearer the days of our Lord's earthly life, should have attempted to malign His character, is quite a believable proposition, but to find His professed followers blasphemously assailing His immaculate Person is a sorrowful sign of the times in which we live and would indicate the looming up before us of the Man of Sin who will be the accepted representative of a humanity void of God.

These utterances, alas, are not confined to a few extremists whose words find little or no response in Christendom. There are certain so-called "Lives of Christ," which plainly declare Him to be a son of time, and not able to rise above traditions and superstitions. What can we think of Renan's "Life of Jesus" passing through many editions in many languages, in which our Lord's moral character is openly assailed, and He is charged with premeditated imposture. The pity of it all is that not only are those assertions made by learned and accomplished scholars, but they are welcomed by thousands of all classes high and low.

I received only yesterday this letter containing translations which reveal the unsound teaching in Christian publications in China. These publications are edited entirely by the Chinese. The first quotation is from *Life*, Volume V, No. 10:—

"Man's view of God will always be richer because of the large number of people who have come to think of God in terms of the character of Jesus

Christ. I do desire, however, to point out that Jesus was by no means infallible, and that in some of our ethical and religious thought we have gone beyond Him. Moreover, in making Him our God, instead of one of the great human leaders of our race, we have robbed Him of much of His vitality, and have done violence in all probability to His conception of His work and person."

Another quotation is from "Christianity in the Light of To-day," published by the Chinese Y.M.C.A.:-

"We must note that while we attribute to Him a great personality we must not think of Him as co-equal with the Divine, or one of the three persons in the Godhead. Jesus never thought of this Himself, for He said; 'The Father is greater than I.' Or again, 'Why callest thou me God?' It is natural that, given such a man as Christ, people should eventually come to regard Him as God. He was the great perfect, superb man, therefore to Him has been attributed divinity, and He has been worshipped by millions of people."

A third quotation is from the "Chinese Christian Literary Monthly, Volume 1, No. 2, issued by the Chinese Christian Literature Society (not the old Christian Literature Society).

In a review the Editor says: "The present editions" (of the Scriptures) "contain some passages which have a frowsy smell. These should be promptly expunged, and modern methods of emphasis should be used. All that is not regarded as important should be cut out, and forewords or prefaces should be added by scholars of literary ability. If this were done, the Chinese would regard the book with new favour."

These quotations are sufficient to show you that there exists in our day a growing depreciation of the Son of the Eternal God. My brethren, the situation is alarming, for it reveals the workings of a spirit of hostility to Christ, which, like the banked-up fires of some great ocean liner, are ready to break into fierce flame.

We come back to our first question, which resolves itself into the individual's relationship to this same Lord and Christ. "What think ye of Christ?" Our New Testament gives us three testimonies concerning Him: We have the voice from the Upper world saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." There is a voice from the under world saying, "I know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God." And we have the voice from many men, in Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

What is He to me? There can be no middle course. The claims of Christ are such that every man ought to be fighting Him or fighting for Him. There is no middle place for Jesus in Heaven, hell or earth, nor can there be in the heart. Let us—

"Bring forth the Royal diadem
And crown Him Lord of all."

BIBLE UNION PRE-CONVENTION CONFERENCE.

A pre-Convention conference of the Baptist Bible Union of Ontario and Quebec will be held in the Jarvis Street Church Thursday afternoon and evening, October 14th, and Friday morning and afternoon, October 15th. We hope that delegates to the Convention who are in sympathy with the Baptist Bible Union's protest against the modernistic tendencies so manifest in the life of McMaster University, will plan to reach Toronto in time for this Conference. Several of the churches in Toronto will endeavour to arrange plans providing billets for delegates to begin the billeting period on Thursday the 14th, instead of Friday the 15th. All members of the Baptist Bible Union, who will be delegates to the Ontario and Quebec Baptist Convention, as well as other delegates in sympathy with the Baptist Bible Union course respecting McMaster, and who will plan to attend the pre-Convention Conference, are requested to send their names at the earliest possible date to the Rev. W. E. Atkinson, 44 Grenadier Road, Toronto, Ont. Delegates should send their names to the Convention Billeting Committee besides; but we ask them, in addition, to send their names to Mr. Atkinson in order that we may arrange that those arriving on the 14th instead of the 15th, may be billeted with the hostesses who have agreed to receive them at that time.

Editorial.

A TWO YEAR OLD UNPUBLISHED LETTER.

Readers of *The Gospel Witness* will remember that the Ontario and Quebec Baptist Convention meeting in London, October, Nineteen twenty-four, witnessed a signal victory for evangelical truth. For nearly a year before the Convention had been agitated over the action of the University in conferring an honorary degree upon President W. H. P. Faunce of Brown University, Rhode Island. After a long discussion, lasting from two o'clock in the afternoon till about eleven o'clock at night, the following resolution was moved by the Editor of this paper, but seconded by Chancellor Whidden, and unanimously adopted by the Convention.

"Whereas discussions have arisen from time to time within this Convention regarding the action of the Senate of McMaster University in granting certain honorary degrees, therefore be it resolved, that, without intending any reflection upon the Senate, this Convention relies upon the Senate to exercise care that honorary degrees be not conferred upon religious leaders whose theological views are known to be out of harmony with the cardinal principles of Evangelical Christianity."

We returned from that Convention praising God and full of hope over the future. Although the officials of McMaster University had made a desperate effort to secure the Convention's endorsement of the University's action, a vote of confidence was refused them; and the resolution above quoted was the Convention's final expression on the subject.

We came home resolved to assume that the University would now at last endeavour to conform to the theological standards of the Convention, which, we believed, set out the essential doctrines of the gospel. We had an engagement in Kansas City, and had but an hour or so to prepare the copy for *The Witness* between the time of returning from the Convention and leaving for the West. We dictated a long article, giving an account of the Convention, and making certain proposals for the future. We had no time to wait until the article was transcribed, and so had to leave the details of the paper to other hands as we set out on our journey. After the article had been transcribed, before sending it to the printers, it was read by another from whom we received a telegram in Kansas City, saying that our proposals were too generous, and altogether dangerous. The telegram insisted that McMaster University had merely temporarily surrendered to the popular will for expediency's sake, but that the hearts of the men, who had repeatedly endeavoured to commit the Denomination to an endorsement of modernism, were unchanged, and that on the first occasion they would show their real disposition again. We telegraphed back, leaving the article for critical examination to two Editors, requesting them to delete anything they might feel it to be unwise to publish. The result was that they published only an account of the Convention, and deleted entirely the proposals we had made in the article looking toward the future.

Subsequent events abundantly justified the precaution recommended by our friends, and prove absolutely that certain men connected with McMaster University are determined to defy the Convention's will and make McMaster a modernist school, whether we will or not. Professor Marshall has been appointed, and the present situation in McMaster University is worse than it has ever been. But the McMaster authorities are defending their latest violation of their trust with the intensest zeal. We are now of the opinion that there are elements connected with McMaster with whom evangelical believers cannot possibly work. We have been accused of an endeavour to destroy McMaster in order to set up a rival institution. It has occurred to us that it might be informing to our readers were we to give them an opportunity of reading the article which was written for *The Gospel Witness* following the Convention in London. We therefore print that article below, but in doing so we want it clearly to be understood that we withdraw absolutely our proposals. The article has become entirely obsolete. The action of McMaster in appointing and retaining and defending Professor Marshall, has made it impossible, while the present state of affairs continues, for many of us to co-operate with McMaster in any way, whether official or otherwise. Until there is a change

the Editor of this paper would not give a five-cent piece to be used by the present governing bodies of the institution. We publish the following article only to show our own spirit and attitude following the London Convention. It was withheld from publication by another judgment and another hand than ours. We believe to-day that as McMaster University has forfeited our confidence it has also forfeited the confidence of thousands of other Ontario and Quebec Baptists. The article which follows may, however, serve a further purpose than merely to show what our post-Convention attitude was: it contains certain suggestions, and shows, we believe, what might be done if only the governing body of McMaster University could be brought into harmony with the churches of our Convention:

THE ARTICLE WRITTEN AFTER THE LONDON CONVENTION.

Following is the article written for "The Gospel Witness" of Nov. 5th, 1924, by the Editor, which was deleted by the two friends above referred to. Let the reader clearly understand that the proposals it contains are now withdrawn, for the action of the University in appointing Professor Marshall shows that the present Governors are determined to convert McMaster into a Modernist school if possible.

We desire now to review the situation briefly, in order that we may set forth our views of what we think might be accomplished. In the first place we venture to say that the Chancellor and Dr. Farmer were undoubtedly right in their contention, that in conferring the degree in question, McMaster University merely followed the practice of other universities. But immediately the question arises, Was McMaster founded to be like other universities? We believe in Christian Education; we believe there never was a greater need for Christian colleges and Christian universities than to-day. But we must remember that when we speak of a Christian school of learning, we immediately differentiate that school from all others. A church, in the nature of the case, must resemble other organizations of human beings at some points, simply because it is an organization of men and women. And yet it is also different from every other organization or institution because it is composed of those who recognize Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. Similarly, a Christian university must resemble other universities in this, that it must conform to the highest standard of scholarship; it must, in every respect, be equal in its academic requirements to other universities—and yet it must be different. Our view of the ideal for McMaster is not that it should be like the State university—minus, but like the State university—plus: it should be all the State university is, and more.

We are disposed to believe that it is possible to be too much influenced by worldly standards in our ecclesiastical affairs; we may over-estimate the importance of our material equipment; we may, indeed, exaggerate the value of such human ability as a church may represent, and fail properly to recognize that it is by its spiritual quality that a Christian church is differentiated from all other institutions. We must not forget that great saints may be produced in humble mission halls, that a great linguist, like William Carey, may find his training at a cobbler's bench, and that one of the greatest and most thoroughly educated men in American history, called Abraham Lincoln, obtained much of his learning by the light of a wood fire in a little log cabin.

So the first consideration in matters affecting the life of McMaster must be that it keep true to Christ, always manifesting the spirit and doing the work of Christ. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that these are not normal days; that the Christian church is at war; and that on all hands the reality of a supernatural Christ and a supernatural Christianity is being denied. And just as it is necessary that the church should separate itself from "the counsel of the ungodly", so it is necessary that a Christian school-of-learning should hold no fellowship with any who are leaders in any one of the religious movements which so blatantly deny the supernaturalism of the Christian religion.

The resolution which was carried, does not suggest to the Senate that they should refrain from recognizing men of distinction in the world of letters, of science, of statesmanship; nor does it advise that among religious leaders, only Baptists should be recognized. It merely says that "this Convention relies upon the Senate to exercise care that honorary degrees be not conferred upon religious leaders whose theological views are known to be out of harmony

with the cardinal principles of Evangelical Christianity." We count it a privilege to have been associated with Chancellor Whidden in submitting this resolution to the Convention. It was our privilege to move a resolution which the Chancellor seconded; and on the basis of the principles expressed and implied in that resolution, and in the doctrinal standards set forth in the report of the Senate and Board to the Convention, we shall be happy to second what in the future the Chancellor may move.

We have long cherished a dream of what McMaster might become. We are writing this in a hurried hour on Friday night before taking a train to Kansas City, for a week's mission; and shall have no opportunity to read the manuscript. We should have preferred to take more time, in order to carefully select our every word; and yet we are anxious that our interpretation of what was done at London, and of what may issue from what was done, should appear in the first issue of *The Witness* following the Convention.

All over the Continent of America the Bible-training Schools which are springing up, give evidence of the fact that multitudes of people are hungering for the Word of God. Here in Toronto, and in other Ontario cities, there are hundreds of our Baptist young people who would welcome an opportunity to pursue courses of study in the English Bible under Baptist auspices. We should like to see established in connection with McMaster University a Baptist Bible-training College, and first, because our young people both need and desire it. Last spring, as an experiment, the Editor of this paper added to his already crowded duties, for two months, three weekly lectures—Friday from seven to eight, a preachers' class; and from eight forward, a class in Christian Doctrine; and Saturday afternoon, a class in Evangelism. What sort of an attendance might we expect at McMaster, in day and night classes, if all the Baptist churches of the Convention were behind it, and co-operating with it?

And, too, we should like to see such a school established for the reaction such a ministry would have upon the life of the University itself. It would bring to its halls hundreds of young people who would live every day, not with books about the Bible, but with the Bible itself. It would bring to the University a still more spiritual atmosphere than now obtains, (though we intend no reflection upon present conditions) for it is impossible that a great host of young people should engage in the study of God's Word without filling the place with prayer and praise. Thus, McMaster University would become more than ever a centre of evangelical teaching and evangelistic enthusiasm and effort. We do not, of course, suggest for a moment that the standards either in the Arts or Theological Department should be lowered; but we believe that if such a Bible-training School were established, the study of God's Word would enlarge the minds of the students and inspire them with a desire for higher learning; and that large numbers of them would naturally pass from the Bible course of the College into the regular university courses.

Furthermore; Gratifying as the attendance at McMaster is this year, only a comparatively small number of churches are represented in the student body; but with such a Bible course opened, we might hope to have practically every Baptist church in the Convention represented in McMaster by some one or more of its members. Who can tell what these links of connection with the church life of the Convention would mean for the University? It would not only insure a larger measure of financial support, but it would give the University a place in the hearts and in the prayers of the people such as nothing else could do.

The expense of such an extension would, of course, be large; and yet much of the instruction in the Bible department might be given without cost to the institution. There are many ministers of wide and rich experience, who would be quite competent to give instruction in Bible courses, who might be able to take certain duties with only a nominal cost to the institution. Would it not also be of great advantage to bring into these institutions men who are engaged in the practical work of the ministry, and who are in vital touch with human life at so many points?

But still the great question remains, How shall we increase our income for educational work? We believe the modest sum of twenty-five thousand dollars a year has been mentioned as being necessary to make up the loss of the apportionment from the Forward Movement which will shortly come to an end. But we are of the opinion that twice that amount should be aimed at, at least; and we believe it would not be impossible to increase the yearly

income of McMaster University by that amount. The thought of some would immediately turn to the raising of a great endowment which would yield such an income; but who that knows the present trade depression—and who does not know it—would dare to hope that the raising of a million dollars would be possible in the immediate future? Moreover, we say frankly we are disposed to question whether such an endowment is desirable. The principle of the daily manna and of the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread", suggests the divine method of supplying our need. We believe there would be a great advantage in bringing our educational work so close to the heart of our people as to lead them to support it year by year, in precisely the same way as we now support home and foreign and other missions. If only the spirit of the people is made willing, we believe the people of this Convention could raise fifty thousand dollars a year for Christian Education; and we believe, further, that such a programme as we have suggested would react upon the life of our churches in such a way as to produce such a wave of evangelism as we have never known.

We venture to give our testimony; we hope no one will misunderstand it. We have repeatedly been asked, "How does Jarvis Street find the money to carry on its work?" We have never had a canvass of our membership, nor anything of the kind, during the last three years. Our answer to that question is: "We do not find the money; the Lord finds it for us. The people pray; and people are converted. And they give their pocket-books, as well as themselves, to the Lord. And thus the increase in membership brings an increase of revenue." So would it be in the Denomination at large. In these days when Church Union is being effected on the basis of compromise; and so many churches are ceasing to emphasize the principles of evangelical faith; and, on the other hand, when so many are directly championing the subversive doctrines of Modernism, the denomination that will give a clear testimony, and, in its schools as well as in its pulpits, give the pre-eminence to "the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever", is bound to increase in numbers and thus to increase in wealth.

But is there anything that might be done immediately? Ought we to wait for better times? or ought we to dare to attempt the difficult and seemingly impossible now? In David's day some of his heroic followers crossed the Jordan flood when it had overflown its banks. There are some advantages in undertaking a difficult task at a time when perhaps prudence would counsel delay. In Joshua's day, God wrought a miracle, and made a path through the swollen flood; in David's day He wrought a still greater miracle, and inspired men with such heroic courage that they conquered the flood. And true faith still—

"Laughs at impossibilities;
And cries, 'It shall be done!'"

In the winter of 1920-21, it was our great privilege and honour to accompany the then President of the Convention, Dr. John MacNeill, in a tour of all the Associations of the Convention,—to which representatives of nearly all the churches came—in order to set before our people the claims of the Forward Movement. The entire Convention was covered in some four or five weeks.

Why should not a like effort now be made to lay our educational work upon the hearts of our people, in an endeavour to augment the University's income from the regular contributions of the churches by at least fifty thousand dollars a year? Our hands are very full: we have not been able to find time for a week's vacation for about four years; but if we could serve in this way, we would very gladly once again join hands with Dr. MacNeill and Chancellor Whidden and many others, in such a campaign as we have suggested. We believe the response would surprise the most sanguine; and give the University such a place in the thoughts of the people as it has never yet occupied.

We are sure, as we have already suggested, that it will appear to every one that the only basis of such general co-operation will be the basis upon which the Convention in London so heartily agreed. We have made these suggestions after years of thought. They are hurriedly and inadequately expressed because of the out-of-town engagement which prevents our writing more deliberately; but however clumsily expressed, we believe we have written with sufficient clearness to enable our readers to understand our purpose and spirit in this matter. Let no one suppose that our suggestion respecting the Bible-training department is in any sense a term of such co-operation. Others

may see difficulties which we have not seen: that part of our proposal may seem to some impracticable. But all that lies at the root of our suggestion is that the Convention having so clearly expressed its position on the fundamentals of the faith, all our churches should now be enlisted in the work of Christian Education.

But we venture to add here what could more fittingly have been elaborated at an earlier stage in this article, and that is, that the great commission to teach all nations and to teach men to observe all things which Christ has commanded, puts upon us an obligation, not only to preach the gospel to the heathen, nor to teach the ignorant, but to set up a standard of Christian learning which may be used to enlighten even those who count themselves wise. In other words: our duty is not to follow the example of other universities in these dark days; but to set up a new standard of absolute loyalty to truth as revealed in Him in Whom all things consist. Hence it is our duty to evangelize the rationalistic university and to teach the rationalistic scholar.

We send this copy of *The Gospel Witness* forth with the earnest prayer that God may make some use of the suggestions it contains. We believe that the Educational Session of the Convention at London witnessed a great triumph of Evangelical Truth; and that that session proved once again that the collective conscience of a body of regenerated people never fails to respond to the truth when the truth is set before the people.

In the course of these discussions, strong things have been said. The Editor of this paper has been accused of many things. Doubtless he has made many mistakes; but he insists that he has fought with clean hands, and with a conscience void of offence, and with no other desire than to serve the truth at all costs. If anyone has any reason to complain of rough treatment, we think that we might find some sufficient ground for such complaint. But life is too short, and too rich in opportunity for doing good, for any one of us to be able to afford to nurse our little grievances as against the great issues which depend upon our loyalty to Christ and to His gospel. If we have hurt anyone, we are sorry. We have felt so many stones and clubs that at last we have felt almost benumbed. But from the beginning to the end, we have never for one moment felt any animosity or personal bitterness toward anybody. Those who have attacked us are freely and fully forgiven; and to-day, as throughout the conflict, we can sincerely pray, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." We have given our hand to the Chancellor as the representative of our educational work; and we are prepared to trust him, to follow him, and to rely (to use the term in the resolution which we moved and which he seconded) upon him to carry out in spirit and in letter, what we all know to be the Convention's desire. We therefore in this public way, and on the basis referred to, pledge our heart and hand to the support of our educational work.

PROXY DELEGATES.

The Gospel Witness has always taken the position that it would be advisable for the Convention to take action to prevent the appointment of proxy delegates to the Convention. McMaster University introduced the practice at the Guelph Convention, and it was by proxy votes McMaster was brought to Toronto. Whenever the educational authorities have had some programme they desired carried, they have resorted to the practice of securing proxies. Only because we knew of this have we been driven to make the suggestion we made in *The Gospel Witness* of September 2nd.

With characteristic unfairness the notice which we print below omits that part of our editorial which said that we believed delegates should come to the Convention uninstructed, and free to exercise their judgment in the light of the discussion. The following announcement appeared in *The Canadian Baptist* of September 16th. The only new thing about this announcement is that for once McMaster comes out into the open.

Concerning Proxies.

It has come to our notice that in *The Gospel Witness*, of September 2nd, the editor has asked for proxy votes at the Convention and has promised to furnish the names of those who will attend as delegates for churches opposed to the present course of McMaster University. His request is made in the following

words: "We therefore hereby frankly and openly request all churches who stand for the old faith, who believe the Bible to be the inspired and infallible Word of God, and who believe that salvation can come only through the shed blood of God's Eternal Son and by means of regeneration through the Holy Ghost—we ask all such who cannot send delegates to write *The Gospel Witness* AND FROM SUCH CHURCHES AS ARE OPPOSED TO THE PRESENT COURSE OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY NAMES WILL BE SENT OF PERSONS WHO WOULD BE GLAD TO SERVE AS THEIR DELEGATES."

In view of the above request, we the undersigned Toronto pastors, desire to notify the churches of the Convention which are not in sympathy with the spirit and methods of Dr. Shields and his propaganda, and are unable to send their own delegates, THAT WE ARE PREPARED TO SEND THEM THE NAMES OF PERSONS WHO ARE WILLING TO SERVE AS THEIR DELEGATES, PROVIDED THEY ARE LEFT FREE TO EXERCISE THEIR JUDGMENT IN THE LIGHT OF INFORMATION RECEIVED AT THE CONVENTION GATHERING.

A request addressed to any of the undersigned will receive immediate attention:

John MacNeil	J. M. Warner	Harold Lang
J. T. Marshall	W. T. Graham	W. A. Cameron
A. J. Vining	H. B. Coumans	Bowley Green

The Gospel Witness will be glad to hear from churches who desire proxies appointed.

PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL'S POSITION SUMMARIZED TO DATE.

Inspiration of Bible.

"In talking over this question with the Professor (Marshall) he practically said—and clearly implied—that any man who holds a view that the Bible is verbally inspired is brainless and blind, and will not use his God-given wit."

(Address of Mr. Gordon Brown, Pastor of Orangeville Baptist Church, a graduate in Arts, taking a course in theology, delivered Jan. 14, 1926.)

"Authority For Religion Is In Men's Souls".

"In a recent lecture in class the Professor declared: 'We do not find God in books but in the heart. Where is the seat of authority for religion? Would you be religious if the church and the Bible were gone? Experience is independent of these two factors. What we want to get home to people is that real authority for religion is in men's souls. The foundation of my religion is in my own soul.' Comment on such statements seems unnecessary. 'The real authority for religion is in men's souls'—not in God's Word! And this from the lips of the Professor who at the Convention so emphatically declared his faith in the Bible as inspired, as the Word of the living God. But he said this in the class room! It does not require much perception to discern that such teaching utterly repudiates the authority of the Word of God.

"Only the other day Professor Marshall took his senior class in theology into his confidence in a certain matter, and said to them, 'This is between you and me.' He did not want the parents of the young men to know what he was saying; he did not want the Convention to know it; he did not want *The Gospel Witness* to know it. What his secret was we do not know; but we do know a Scripture that declares of false teachers that they "*privily shall bring in damnable heresies*"—heresies of destruction.

"Why does not Professor Marshall come out in the open and say from the pulpit what he says in the class room? Why? He has the same reason for not doing so that Dr. I. G. Matthews had when he taught in McMaster University."

(Address of Rev. W. J. H. Brown at Brantford, Feb. 19, 1926.)

Religion vs. Theology.

"I think there is a tendency in Canada to forget the distinction between religion and theology. I think there is a tendency to be too much concerned with theology and not enough with religion. Religion is life in God, and that is worship. I think religion is spoiled when doctrine is almost thrust into one's face.

"I suggest a minimum of doctrinal preaching."

(Notes by students in Professor Marshall's classes.—"The Prophet," June 12, 1926.)

Agreement With the Driver Position.

(DR. DRIVER is the well known Modernist of Oxford University, the author of the book entitled "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.")

DR. FARMER: "I stated that his (Prof. Marshall's) general view was in sympathy with the general moderate, what may be called the Driver view, the moderate critical view. That has to deal *with dates and authorship and so on, I do not know just where to draw the line.* . . ."

Q. Does (he) take the DRIVER position?

DR. FARMER: "In general I think he takes that general view of the dating of the Old Testament Books."

(Report of Senate Meeting.)

Dates and Authorship.

"My friends, every well-informed person who has read the writings of the critical school knows that the *whole question of Modernism rests upon the matter of dates and authorship.* One of the greatest conservative scholars of England on that subject says this:

"The critics knew from the first that all depended upon late authorship. Late authorship means dependence upon tradition, or upon legend, instead of upon observation. Instead of testimony at first hand, (as that of Moses or of Joshua would have been), we have now, according to the critics, nothing at all that any sane man can regard as worthy of the name of testimony. Between the time of Moses and the reign of Josiah, about nine centuries elapsed"—may I say, in passing, that the higher critical school denies that the books of Moses were written by him, or written in his day. The critical school—Dr. Driver among them—declares that these books were written in their present form in the time of Josiah, nine hundred years afterward—"Nine centuries from our own time will take us back to the year one thousand of our era, to the time of Canute of England and Malcolm the second of Scotland. Let us suppose that someone was now to write the story of these ancient monarchs for the first time, and to do his utmost to gather everything that floating traditions and local legends could supply, who would dream of regarding the result as history? And who would ever think of quoting it as a record of facts? The late date is the critical mine dug under the citadel of truth. Let it once be fired, and the whole structure subsides into irretrievable ruin."

"Of course it does; dates and authorship are the pick and shovel with which Modernism undermines the authority of the Word of God! If Professor Marshall, as Dr. Farmer tells us, accepts Dr. Driver's position on 'dates and authorship,' then Professor Marshall denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, despite the fact that the five books of the Pentateuch declare themselves to have been written by Moses—and Jesus accepted that fact! It is on the ground of 'dates and authorship' that Dr. Driver denies that Hannah said what the Scriptures declare she did say in her inspired song of rejoicing in the first Book of Samuel. Dr. Driver says, regarding that beautiful, inspired, song, 'The song of Hannah is not early in style, and seems unsuited to Hannah's position!' It was an exalted song; and he could not understand how a poor woman could rise to such heights of worship and praise; he did not know that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God has perfected praise—so he denies that Hannah uttered this song, despite the fact that the song begins with these solemn words: 'And Hannah prayed, and said, My heart rejoiceth in the Lord.' It is on the ground of 'dates and authorship' that Dr. Driver denies that Isaiah wrote the prophecy which bears his name—despite the fact that Jesus Christ, in the twelfth chapter of John, three times declared that Isaiah wrote the book. Well does Dr. John Urquhart say, 'If this rag-basket is all that stands for the Old and New Testaments, will Dr. Driver and his fellow-critics tell us where we shall find the oracles of God?' It is on the ground of 'dates and authorship' that Dr. Driver denies the authority and the truth of the Old Testament Scriptures, and makes them a mass of unreliability. Dr. Farmer tells us that Mr. Marshall accepts Dr. Driver on 'dates and authorship.' Therefore Professor Marshall, by a hundred arguments from Dr. Driver's writings, is abundantly proven to be a Modernist."

(Address of Rev. John Linton, Jan. 14, 1926.)

Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch.

"In regard to the Old Testament, it is admitted that he holds substantially the Driver view, 'the moderate critical position.' In accordance with that he admitted to Pastor A. J. Fieldus that he does not believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. I have in my possession notes taken by a student in Prof. Marshall's class in Bible, a course taken by first year Arts students who are not going in for the ministry. There Prof. Marshall propounds the theory that the first books of the Bible were written by at least four different men who lived hundreds of years after Moses had been dead and buried."

(Address at Brantford, Feb. 19, 1926, by W. Gordon Brown, Pastor of Orangeville Baptist Church, a graduate in Arts taking a course in theology).

Historicity of Jonah.

"Another matter: when we were talking about the article which I had written in *The Prophet*, the Professor said that what I had said about his attitude on the question of the historicity of the book of Jonah was quite right—mark that—quite right! He believes that that book is only allegory, and not history. But what did Jesus say? He said, 'As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly: so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth'—and I do not regard Jesus as a myth! 'As Jonas was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth', that was what Jesus said. But suppose we grant, for the sake of argument, that that is only an analogy that the Jews knew about, and that Jesus did not necessarily mean that that was history?—grant that, but go on and read the rest of it. Do not stop with a little, take the whole dose,—that 'the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it'; that 'the queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it.' I suppose there were men who lived in Nineveh? that there was a real queen of Sheba? I believe there was a real Jonah who went down into the fish, and that by and by the fish vomited him out, and that he went on his way preaching the gospel as the Lord had given it to him. I prefer to take Jesus as an Authority on these questions: I would rather take His word than that of any theological professor."

(Address at Toronto, Jan. 14, 1926, by W. Gordon Brown, B.A.)

"The Laughing Stock of the World."

"Professor Marshall greatly astonished me when he stated in my presence, that any man who accepted the historicity of the book of Jonah, and its literal interpretation, would find very few churches open to him in the Old Land, because he would be considered an uneducated fool! I state again that is what Dr. Marshall said to me; and I am prepared to stand to-night by that statement. I would suggest to those who are in doubt about the question—do as I did: interview Professor Marshall.

"After such a statement coming from the Professor, I did not publish it from the housetops, but, instead, interviewed the Dean in Theology. I told him exactly what Professor Marshall had stated to me, for I was greatly disturbed,—who would not be? Do you blame me? I stated to Dr. Farmer that I could not accept Mr. Marshall's position; and furthermore, I could not conscientiously defend Mr. Marshall in this present controversy when he held such views. Again I ask, Do you blame me? My interview with the Dean in Theology left me sadly disappointed. I did not think that Dr. Farmer would adopt an attitude of tolerance toward a view of the book of Jonah which implicitly denies the authority of Jesus Christ. Our conversation was lengthy, and my confidence in the Dean was shaken when, in effect, he stated that he would rather fellowship with men like Dr. Faunce and Dr. Fosdick, than with men who are well known for their orthodoxy, but who manifest a bitter spirit. You can interpret that just as you like!

"In the course of my conversation I told Dr. Farmer that I would be present on this platform Thursday evening, since I was involved in this controversy—and I am not ashamed to be here to-night. He replied by saying that every man must face this issue for himself; but he did not think the issue important enough to split the Denomination. I faced the issue on my knees before God in prayer; and determined, before I lifted my voice in protest, that I would see Mr. Marshall once again.

"I interviewed the Professor Tuesday afternoon of this week, and asked him

in a straightforward way if he really believed that the book of Jonah was only an allegory and not an historical narrative; and he restated exactly what he said to me before, adding that the one who accepts the literal interpretation of Jonah becomes the laughing stock of the world."

(Statement read by Mr. A. J. Fieldus, Pastor of Fairbank Baptist Church, at public meeting, Jan. 14, 1926.)

THE MASTER SAID (Matt. ch. 12, vs. 40, 41; Rev. Ver. with marginal note reading.)

"For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here."

(In *Canadian Baptist* of March 4, 1926, Prof. Marshall publishes a statement as to Jonah; read it; it does not deny one word of the statement of Mr. Fieldus; the Professor, however, deprecates the ignorance of Canadian Baptists.)

Medley in the Theological Faculty.

"What a medley in the theological Faculty: One professor tells his class that he believes the story of Jonah to be true, and this new professor, in the adjoining room, says that any one who believes that 'becomes the laughing stock of the world.' Then the Dean in theology, referring to the matter of 'dates and authority,' upon which Dr. Driver founds his attacks on the Old Testament, adds to the confusion by saying: 'I do not know where you should draw the line.' This is a pitiable condition. What about the students? Are they to be left at sea without a rudder? We do not wonder at the perplexity of the Dean. Once get on the toboggan of modernism and there is no stopping place en route. The place of safety is to stand hard by 'Thus saith the Lord'."

(*Fides in Toronto Globe, Feb. 12.*)

Account of Creation—The Words of Modernism.

MR. MARSHALL in a sermon preached in Queen's Road Baptist Church, Coventry, before coming to Canada, entitled "What Baptists Stand For," and afterwards printed for distribution in England, said:—

"Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship."

Rev. Mr. Linton, in the "Message for Ontario and Quebec Baptists," says:

"How can any pastor or layman read that statement and fail to see that Prof. Marshall is a Modernist? The 'broadest of the broad' means the extreme radical, the most out and out Modernist in the Baptist ranks. Men who deny the Virgin Birth of Christ, His substitutionary death, His bodily resurrection, His personal coming; these men, Prof. Marshall declares, are one with Bible-believing Baptists in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ." * *

"Do Canadian Baptists want the coming generation to be taught that the most radical and destructive Modernist, the broadest of the broad, is personally loyal to Jesus Christ? Is not the attitude of our people the very opposite of that? How then can McMaster retain Prof. Marshall and still enjoy the confidence and co-operation of our people? * *

"Prof. Marshall says concerning the interpretation of the Scriptures—the Christian disciple 'can follow the so-called orthodox method, or the method pursued by modern scholarship.' * *

"The method pursued by modern scholarship in its interpretation of the Scriptures is the method that assails its integrity, destroys its authority, and denies the truth of its plainest statements. If Prof. Marshall teaches his students what he himself believes, he will teach them in McMaster classrooms that they are free to interpret the Scriptures by whichever one of the two methods they may care to take—they may follow the so-called orthodox method (this is the method of Canadian Baptists who still believe in the authority and inerrancy of the Scriptures) or they can follow the method pursued by modern scholarship (this is the method followed by Dr. I. G. Matthews, whose teaching filled young minds with doubts as to the truth of the Scriptures, whose teaching also if

received, would destroy the very foundation on which our Baptist Denomination is built). Prof. Marshall believes that students for the Baptist ministry are **FREE TO FOLLOW** that method if they like! * * *

"Is it possible that we cannot see that the teaching in that statement would bring to our Denomination in Canada that which has been a blight upon every church it has ever touched, and has made our Baptist work in England a veritable tragedy?"

"Coming to Christ".

PROFESSOR MARSHALL in a sermon at James Street Baptist Church, Hamilton, November 1, 1925, as reported in the *Hamilton Herald*, November 2, 1925, said:

"To really come to Christ we must get His view of life, His standard of values. We may have the simple wholesome pleasures of life and still be good Christians; but when we become selfish with these, that is when we do not belong to Christ. *When a young person chooses a vocation in which the powers God has given are used to the utmost; then he can truly say he has come to Christ.* We must have less snobbishness. We must learn to regard man as man; not as a mercenary standard. When we can give services to humanity and help any organization laboring in the cause of Christianity, then we can say we have come to Christ."

Hamilton Herald, Nov. 10, 1925, says:

"Speaking on Sunday morning in Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, from the text, John 5:40, 'Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life,' Rev. Clifford J. Loney said he felt that he could not be true to his conscience and to his Lord and allow Professor L. H. Marshall's sermon preached in James Street Baptist Church last Sunday morning, pass without comment.

"Just to think of it,' Mr. Loney said, 'a sermon on the coming to Christ without any repentance, and no word about the cross or the blood of Christ, or of the work of the Holy Spirit; it is a sorry thing that the man who is going to teach our young men practical theology cannot plainly point the way to Christ to his hearers.'"

PROFESSOR MARSHALL, in one of his lectures, said:

"William Wilberforce was as devoted a servant of Christ as any evangelist. What about Abraham Lincoln? . . . *I think a man is a Christian when he lays hold of a man who is filthy, gives him a bath, burns his old clothes and gives him a new outlook.*"

(Notes by Students—*The Prophet*, June 12, 1926.)

Professor Marshall's Attitude Towards Total Depravity.

Dean Farmer, writing in the *McMaster Graduate*, says:

"Before leaving England, Mr. Marshall was furnished with copies of the Trust Deed and the Charter, and he assured us of his hearty sympathy with the basis and aims of the University as set forth in them and in recent annual reports of the Senate and Board and in the actions of the Convention."

(But the Trust Deed speaks of "the total and universal depravity of mankind." Compare the following statements by Professor Marshall):

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S sermon, "*The Insight of Christ.*"

In his sermon preached at First Avenue Church, Toronto, reported in *The Canadian Baptist*, Nov. 26, 1925, Professor Marshall said:

"He (Christ) never despaired of anyone—not even of the prodigals and wastrels, and harlots. He had hope for all, simply because He knew what was in man. He knew that at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, beautiful, radiant, deathless, indestructible. It may be buried, hidden from view, ignored, forgotten, suppressed, but it is there in everybody, even in the worst, and there it remains incorruptible in all its corruptness, undefiled in all its defilement, awaiting the day of its manifestation, its expression, its diamond radiance, its power. . . . Beneath the ashes of collapsed human nature He knew that there were yet sparks of celestial fire.

" . . . Some time ago a French professor tried a series of remarkable experiments on some seeds. His aim was to see if the germ of life could be destroyed without destroying the seed itself. He kept naked seeds of lucerne, mustard and wheat for three weeks at a temperature of liquid air and then for 77 hours at a temperature of liquid hydrogen, viz., 260 degrees below zero. He then put them in a vacuum for a whole year. He deprived them of their internal gases by subjection to an air pump; he kept them for a long time under mercury,

in nitrogen and in carbon dioxide. After all these hardships most of the seeds still sprouted when sown in the usual way! The germ of life in a seed seems, therefore, to be tough. So it is with the divine element in the human soul. Whatever the rough and tumble of life it abides indestructible. . . . How wonderful and how beautiful it is to think that in all of us, in you and me and in every human being, there are moral and spiritual potentialities, divine powers, which, under proper stimulus and encouragement from on high can develop into the excellencies of Christ."

The Editor of the Calendar of Talbot Street Baptist Church, Dec. 6, said of this sermon:

"A sermon in last week's *Baptist* has caused us great grief. He asserts, without a particle of proof, that 'Christ Jesus knew, that at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, 'sparks of celestial fire,' like 'the germ of life in some seeds, which cannot be destroyed, without destroying the seed itself.' This means universal salvation.

"Christ taught the necessity of the new birth, of being 'born of God,' of vital union with God by faith. That man has no life in himself—'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of the spirit is spirit.' That the believer in Christ only, hath passed out of death into life."

Rev. Dr. A. T. Sowerby, in letter to Chancellor, said:

"Now, as to the sermon preached by Prof. Marshall in First Avenue Church, and reported in *The Canadian Baptist*, let me say that I have gone over it carefully, and with fair-mindedness, and I must, here and now, record my holy protest against the teachings contained therein. It sounds to me like plenty of those Unitarian sermons that we used to get in Boston—develop the good that is in us—cultivate, cultivate, cultivate."

PROFESSOR MARSHALL, in his address on "Religious Education," delivered before the convention in Hamilton on October 19, 1925, said:

"I believe that just as it is natural for a plant to turn toward the light, or the mariner's compass to point to the north, or a new-born babe to suck nourishment from its mother's breast—so I believe it is, in the best sense of the term, natural for the spirit of man to seek illumination and strength and inspiration from the Spirit of God. I believe it is very important nowadays to emphasize the fact that religion is really and truly perfectly natural; and that Jesus Christ Himself said that when a man really comes to himself and realizes all he needs, and the powers and possibilities of his nature—what does he do? He says with the prodigal son, 'I will arise and go to my father.'"

"When you and I give children religious training and education, when we take the baby hands and put them together and teach the child to pray, we are not endeavouring to graft some alien growth into the nature, or force anything artificial upon child life: we are simply and solely helping the child to recognize the best and highest and noblest possibilities of its own nature; and we are seeking to initiate the child into the mystery of God."

The Teaching of Science vs. The Teaching of Scripture.

W. S. WHITCOMBE, *Pastor of Baker Hill and Second Markham Baptist Churches, a graduate in Arts, taking a course in theology, vice-president of the men's student body, in address Jan. 14, 1926, said:*

"In the minds of many the Bible and science stand in direct opposition, telling two conflicting stories; but in our opinion they are one. The findings of modern science only confirm the age-long statements of the Bible. All truth is of God; hence, it is harmonious, whether it is found in nature or revelation. But we must remember that the work of science is far from being complete, and on that account, contradictions between its teachings and the teachings of the Scripture arise from time to time. In such cases we place the Bible before science, and would accept its unchanging declarations rather than the varied pronouncements of scientific research.

"But what of Professor Marshall's view? In a case such as we have described, where the teaching of science and the statement of Scripture are in direct opposition to each other, we enquired from him what his attitude would be. He unhesitatingly replied that under such circumstances he would choose science. He stated that he believed that he must accept truth from whatever quarter it came. We recall that the phrase he used was that he could not go to God with a lie in his mouth.

"Most of our Canadian Baptist people will not believe that a man does go to

God with a lie in his mouth if he accepts the plain teaching of Scripture, even though that be in contradiction to the teaching of modern science. To the dogmas of modern science they would reply with the Teacher of teachers, 'It is written'."

Professor Marshall's Attitude Towards Certain Miracles.

"We should consider every miracle on its own merits alone. It is unscientific to say we will take all the miracles or none."

"MIRACLES OTHER THAN THOSE OF HEALING.

1. "Miracle of evil spirits entering into swine, Matthew 8:28-34. This cannot be fully explained by any known law; but is there anything in modern science which can give us a clue? The following story is told, not as an explanation, but as a possible clue to the situation:

"In an asylum in England there was a patient who was perfectly normal except for the delusion that his arm was glass. His doctor tried many means of persuading him to the contrary, but could not convince him. Eventually, once when the monomaniac was walking alone, the doctor crept up behind him, and, hitting the supposedly glass arm, he dropped a glass bottle at the same moment. From that time the man was normal in every way, for he believed his glass arm was broken, and so the delusion was lost. In this way Christ possibly scattered the delusion of the madman in the country of the Gergesenes by saying the demons had entered into the swine, for they saw them rush into the sea, and so the demoniac may have been cured by thus being made to believe that the evil spirits had left him.

2. "Christ walking on the sea.

"There has recently been psychic research carried on by Sir Wm. Barrett, dealing with the problem of levitation, meaning by levitation that in a certain psychic state the body loses weight. This is offered as a clue, not necessarily as an explanation, when speaking of this miracle." *The Prophet*, June 12, 1926, p. 2—notes from students in Prof. Marshall's classes.

The Resurrection Body.

"We have now an ethereal body or spiritual, and a physical body, and death will be merely the parting of the two. If this is so, Paul went right to the heart of the matter. Paul's conception is that the resurrection body is a spiritual body, not the fleshly resurrection of the Pharisaical teachings."

"Professor Marshall teaches that Paul rejected the Pharisaical teaching of the fleshly resurrection. We recall that Paul once greatly disturbed a meeting of the Sanhedrin by drawing those of its members who were Pharisees, as he himself had been, into sympathy with himself, when he said, 'for the resurrection of the dead I am called in question.' In that instance Paul showed that his doctrine of the resurrection was closely akin to that in which the Pharisees believed. We also recall the words of our Lord Jesus, Whom, after His resurrection, the disciples took for a spirit, but Who said to them, 'A Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' Evidently there is some disagreement between Professor Marshall's teachings and the New Testament.

"And just here we note another point of the Professor's remarks. He places the resurrection at death. Therefore, it follows, according to his theory, that if I die to-day, Tuesday, and am buried in some quiet country cemetery on Friday, I will be resurrected three days before I'm buried!! We doubt whether we should call this a resurrection at all." (*The Prophet*, June 12, 1926, pp. 2, 4.)

The Atonement.

"The church has no generally accepted theory of the atonement. There is no theory of the atonement in Romans. The church has put forward theory after theory. Origin, Anselm's, Luther's, theories are impossible, though they all have a bit of truth, . . . I have wrestled with this theory for years. I have certain clues that are very helpful to me. But at present the atonement plays a large part in my religion, but I have not got a complete theory."

Later, the professor says: "*Luther's theory is possibly the boldest, and I think (if I may say it without offence) the crudest statement of the substitutionary atonement; that sin could not be forgiven until it had been punished, and Christ endured the punishment of sin in man's stead.*"

Further on, in the same lecture, Prof. Marshall asked, "How did Christ regard His death? That is the starting point of all. The first is not, how did the Apostles interpret His death, but how did Christ regard it? . . . He regarded it as an act of service to humanity. . . It was to establish a new relationship

between God and man, and a covenant of fellowship with God. . . Our Lord regarded His death as a proof that He was living to do the will of His Father, whatever the cost or whatever the consequences." (Notes from students in Prof. Marshall's classes, published in *The Prophet*, June 12, 1926).

What Is Not the Issue.

"The issue is not Dr. Shields: it was not Dr. Shields who brought Professor Marshall to Canada! Dr. Shields did not examine Professor Marshall, and discover that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship! Dr. Shields did not, after making that examination and discovery concerning Mr. Marshall, commend Mr. Marshall to us in the columns of *The Canadian Baptist*! Dr. Shields did not refuse to re-open that examination in order that we, as a Denomination, might be saved from the very situation which confronts us to-night! Dr. Shields did not publish that sermon in *The Canadian Baptist*, entitled, 'The Insight of Christ!' Dr. Shields did not preach that sermon in James Street Church, Hamilton, entitled, 'Coming to Christ!' Dr. Shields did not declare that the man who accepted the literal interpretation of Jonah would be considered in England an 'uneducated fool!' Dr. Shields did not say that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship, which position has rendered the Old Testament a mass of unreliability—Dr. Shields did not do that!! It was not Dr. Shields who examined Mr. Marshall, and, with his eyes wide open to what Mr. Marshall believed, and well knowing that Mr. Marshall's views could not possibly find acceptance with our Canadian people, nevertheless brought Mr. Marshall with his family from England, and placed him in the humiliating position of coming to a strange country to be the storm centre of theological controversy in a Bible-loving Denomination—Dr. Shields did not do Professor Marshall that wrong! Someone else did; but I contend, in all fairness, that Dr. Shields was not that man. Let me repeat it: the issue before us is not Dr. Shields; it is the attitude of our Canadian Baptist Denomination toward Modernism."

(Address of Rev. John Linton, 14 Jan., 1926).

Friends—Not Enemies—of McMaster.

"I want to tell you that I was with Dr. Harris in that great fight years ago. I am a graduate of McMaster. I never have been an enemy of McMaster University. I graduated in 1886, forty years ago this first of May. I have preached forty-one years and two months. I am a Baptist from conviction; and I would not be a Baptist five minutes if it were not that I am held by convictions that are as strong as steel cables. That is why I am a Baptist—and that is the only reason. (Applause). I am jealous to my boot heels for these great principles that I believe our God has written in this Book, and which have found lodgment in my heart. I am not a bigot, but I have convictions—I have convictions which mean everything to me. Therefore I must speak out when I see things going on which I believe are subversive of the very best interests of the Denomination and of truth.

"I say it in love, we are the *real* friends of McMaster, and of the Denomination. Listen: had the Governing Bodies of McMaster listened to her *real* friends fifteen years ago, we would not have had this present condition of things. Had they listened in 1910, at the Bloor Street Convention, when Dr. Harris (one of the most God-fearing men that I ever knew) and others of us, took action to remedy these matters—had they listened to him—shall I say 'us'—and us; and acted upon suggestions offered and demands presented, there would be a different story now. Two weeks after that Convention, Dr. Elmore Harris was in my study; and he leaned his head on the desk, and cried tears of bitterness—broken-hearted over the condition of things. I have never forgotten it."

(Address of Rev. Dr. Sowerby, Jan. 19, 1926).

"Baptists and Church Membership."

PROF. MARSHALL in the issue of the *Baptist Times and Freeman*, England, of Oct. 31, 1924, in an article entitled "BAPTISTS AND CHURCH MEMBERSHIP," under his own name wrote:—

"To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite a crucial importance for which there is no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common-sense."

(Mr. Marshall endeavours to explain away the plain import of the above by suggesting that he was referring to the Church universal; surely all saved

people would be in this mythical Universal church; that is covered by the first clause, and then he turns to the individual church. The language is too clear to be explained away, and its meaning is very consistent with his position in England in being pastor *only of open membership churches*.

PROF. MARSHALL, in addressing the Convention of Regular Baptists at Hamilton, in referring to the fact that the Churches over which he had been Pastor were open membership Churches, said:—

"WHAT HAS THAT GOT TO DO WITH YOU?"

THE CHARTER OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY GIVES THE ANSWER, and says:—

"No person shall be eligible for the position of principal, professor, tutor, or master in the Faculty of Theology who is not a member of a Regular Baptist Church."

What is Meant by a Regular Baptist Church?

This was determined more than 70 years ago when the Convention declared:

"That churches which restrict their communion to baptized believers, and administer the ordinances generally through ordained elders, should be considered *Regular*."

DR. TRUETT says: "May I say it modestly, my Baptist people keep this ordinance as is demanded by the Holy Word. They believe that God's Word does plainly teach that men must be born again, and then be scripturally baptized, and then maintain an orderly church membership, in order to be scripturally entitled to observe this ordinance. For these prerequisites my Baptist people unwaveringly stand."

Professor Marshall a "Liberal Evangelical".

W. S. WHITCOMBE, Pastor of Baker Hill and Second Markham Baptist Churches, in address at Brantford, Feb. 9, 1926, said:—

"In a conversation that he had with us, he spoke to the following effect: 'I do not like to be put into a class, and I hesitate to say this for fear of being misunderstood, but I am what is called in England a *Liberal Evangelical*. I have here in my hand a copy of the *Graduate*, and in this little magazine Dr. Farmer describes Prof. Marshall as a thorough going evangelical. Can a man who is in England A LIBERAL EVANGELICAL be in Canada A THOROUGH GOING EVANGELICAL? To me those two words, *Liberal-Evangelical*, seem to mix just like oil and water.'

The *Bible Call*, published in England, in issue March, 1926, says:

"We have been interested in the recent doings of the so-called 'Liberal Evangelicals.' In our judgment, *liberal* is a direct antithesis to *evangelical*. The latter term has ever been associated with most decided convictions relating to the supreme and final authority of Holy Scripture, and with persistent and consistent resistance to the encroachment of rationalism and Romanism. The term *liberal*, on the other hand, has always indicated that turn of mind which is prepared to give hospitality to loose views of Holy Writ, and which stands for an attenuated interpretation of the cardinal facts of the Gospel."

Dean Farmer Commends Professor Marshall.

In the *McMaster Graduate*, Dean Farmer says concerning Professor Marshall:

"He is a thorough-going evangelical, sound in the great verities of the faith, and a Baptist by hearty conviction. He has no doubts about the Deity of Christ, or His atonement or resurrection or virgin birth, or miracles generally. To him what Christ says is true always. He is emphatic on the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments."

Dean Farmer and Professor Marshall Differ.

DEAN FARMER says of Professor Marshall:

"He told me that the first chapter of Genesis was one of the proofs to him of the inspiration of the Bible and the general historicity."

DEAN FARMER:

To him what Christ said is true always.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL himself says:

"We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science."

PROF. MARSHALL:

Jonah is an allegory. (But contra Christ, Matt. 12:40).

Extract From Prof. Marshall's Confession of Faith.

"I believe that on all the great questions of *morality and religion* the absolute and final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour; I believe in the virgin birth; I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God; . . . I believe that Jesus ever liveth to be the *inspiration* of all his followers."

Professor Marshall at Hamilton Convention.

PROF. P. S. CAMPBELL, OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY, says:—

"I am convinced that Professor L. H. Marshall, whose attractive personality all recognize, is a supporter of Modernism. His sermons and personal talks, as given to the press and to others, clearly show that he is a Modernist. His appointment must, therefore, be regarded as a decided gain for Modernism."

(From article in Canadian Baptist, March 18, 1926).

Very Pointed Questions.

"In conversation with Dr. Farmer, he admitted that he knew that the coming of Prof. Marshall would cause trouble among us. Why, then, did they bring him? What was their reason for bringing this trouble on us?"

(Address of Mr. W. S. Whitcombe, a graduate in Arts, Pastor of the Baker Hill and Second Markham Baptist Churches, taking a course in theology, and vice-president of the Men's Student Body, at public meeting at Brantford, February 19, 1926).

Protest by Students of McMaster University.

(From the Toronto Globe, 24th March, 1926).

"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 Prof. 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 Prof. 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.' Prof. 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."

PROFESSOR MARSHALL AND MODERNISM.

By Rev. John Linton, B.A.

There are hosts of Canadian Baptists who believe that the greatest peril confronting the churches of this generation is the menace of Modernism. Modernism is that which denies the authority and inerrancy of the Word of God. Wherever it has been received and propagated, the church has lost its spiritual power, conversions have ceased, worldliness has come in like a flood, and empty pews have taken the place of a well-filled church. The message of

the modernist has never weaned the drunkard from his cups, nor the gambler from his cards. Our Canadian Baptist people know that if our pulpits were manned by modernists, our Denomination would shortly become spiritually bankrupt. It is because we believe this that our Baptist Convention at Ottawa, in 1919, voted overwhelmingly against "some new vague view" of the Scriptures; it is because we believe this that again in London, in 1924, the Convention refused to support the honouring of Dr. Faunce, a modernist.

And now the question is being raised as to the theological position of Professor L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University. We believe that Mr. Marshall's attitude toward Modernism is clearly defined in a sermon entitled, "What Baptists Stand For," preached in Queen's Road Church, Coventry, England. We are not aware of the reception accorded that sermon; but we are fully persuaded that it could not have been preached in the churches of this Convention without raising a storm of protest. That part of the sermon which indicates to us Mr. Marshall's attitude toward Modernism is as follows:

"Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship."

Let us make a fair and impartial examination of this passage: "Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ." Mr. Marshall believes that,—but certainly our Ontario and Quebec Baptists do not believe it. The "broadest of the broad" includes every modernist who denies the virgin birth of Christ, His substitutionary death on the cross, His bodily resurrection, His personal return; yet Mr. Marshall declares these men are one with Bible-believing Baptists "in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ." The Ottawa Convention did not believe that; the London Convention did not believe that; our Baptist people do not believe it to-day. Thus it is apparent that on such a tremendously important question, the views of Mr. Marshall are at utter variance with the views of our Canadian Baptist people.

Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "The scriptures cannot be broken." There are modernists—"the broadest of the broad"—who say they can be broken. Mr. Marshall says that they are loyal to Jesus Christ! Jesus Christ said, "Moses spake of me." There are modernists—"the broadest of the broad"—who say Moses never spoke of Jesus Christ. Mr. Marshall says these unbelieving men are loyal to Jesus Christ! Concerning these men Dr. Torrey well says, "Some people to-day claim to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. But when the Lord Jesus Christ says one thing, and modern scholarship says another thing, they accept the statement of modern scholarship and reject the statement of Christ. Gentlemen, I affirm that these men do not believe in Jesus Christ."

Mr. Marshall further says, "The Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science." We have just read Mr. Marshall's explanation of this statement, and we are bound to answer that not one in a hundred would ever have understood Mr. Marshall to have meant what he now declares he meant: when he sets up "Hebrew tradition about the creation" over against the "teaching of modern science", any ordinary reader would conclude that he meant the Genesis account of creation as against the teaching of modern science on that subject. If we accept Mr. Marshall's explanation of "Hebrew tradition", what have we then? "The Christian disciple is free to adopt the (erroneous) Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science." The answer, of course, is obvious. Thank God, we do not have to adopt either.

The second source of information is as untrustworthy as the first. Science changes its ground every year. Does any Canadian Baptist believe that a Christian is shut up to either an erroneous "Hebrew tradition", or "the teaching of modern science" for his knowledge of creation? Of course not! Our source of authority on that subject is the inspired and authoritative Word of God as

found in Genesis, chapter one, and other scriptures. Why does Mr. Marshall not mention the Scriptures in that paragraph as a source of knowledge? The Scriptures deal with creation! If the term "Hebrew tradition" was not used of the Scriptures, then why no mention of the Scriptures in naming the sources of knowledge on the subject of creation?

But further: Mr. Marshall says, "He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship." We know, of course, what Mr. Marshall means by the "so-called orthodox method",—it is that method which actually takes God's Word at its face value, and believes its solemn statements to be true. We also know what the method pursued by "modern scholarship" is: it is the method pursued by Dr. I. G. Mathews, in McMaster University, when he filled our young minds daily with doubts as to the integrity of the Word of God. Mr. Marshall believes the Christian disciple is free to adopt that latter method,—so does Shailer Mathews, Dr. Fosdick, Percy Stickney Grant, Dr. Glover, and every destructive critic in the world. Mr. Marshall's statement leaves the door wide open for the rankest modernist to enter, and still call himself a Baptist.

We venture further to assert that Mr. Marshall's own method of interpretation is not the "so-called orthodox method", but the method "pursued by modern scholarship". This is abundantly evident from the passage before us. Would Mr. Marshall deny that his method of interpretation is the method of modern scholarship? Is it the "so-called orthodox method" to deny the plain statement of Jesus Christ concerning the miracle of the Prophet Jonas as Mr. Marshall does? Is it the "so-called orthodox method" to declare the gospel narratives to be contradictory to each other, as he also does?

Since Mr. Marshall applies this method to Jonas and to the alleged discrepancies in the gospels, does he also use it in his interpretation of the death of Christ? Is this the explanation of his sermon preached in James Street Church, Hamilton, after the Convention, when he undertook to preach on the subject, "Coming to Christ", and failed to make even the remotest reference to the blood by which we are made nigh to God? And this in the Convention city!—and before the very people who had heard his position challenged concerning his silence as to the blood of Christ! If Mr. Marshall believes in the substitutionary death of Christ, and the cleansing efficiency of His blood, he very successfully concealed that fact when it would have been most timely that he should declare it! Multitudes of our people who have read Mr. Marshall's sermons will feel that it is not without significance that in all these addresses there is no mention whatever of the necessity of the cleansing blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that his first direct reference to the matter should be made only when he is driven to the necessity of justifying himself—and that after almost three months' silence upon the subject!

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

We are happy to record another good day in Jarvis Street. A number came forward in response to the invitation both morning and evening. The congregations were large, and the presence of the Lord was most manifest.

The attendance in Bible School was eleven hundred and seven.

TO OUR NON-CANADIAN READERS.

The Convention of Ontario and Quebec will meet in Toronto, October 15th to 21st. Matters of great moment will there be discussed. From now until after the Convention our readers may expect *The Witness* to be chiefly occupied with matters relative to that great meeting. We hope that our friends beyond the Canadian boundaries will not weary of our discussion of Canadian affairs. The truth is, the war is the same on all fronts, the same great principles are involved; therefore, the battle we are fighting here will not be without some relation to the battle being fought elsewhere. We ask our extra-Canadian readers to be patient with us, and we can promise them that we shall return to normal after the Convention.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 4.

Lesson 3.

Fourth Quarter.

October 17th, 1926.

THE RAISING OF LAZARUS.

Lesson Text: John, ch. 11.

I. THE SICKNESS AND DEATH OF LAZARUS.

1. The chapter introduces an ordinary human experience and relates it to Christ. It is the story of sickness in a family. Our Lord came to be the great burden-bearer. It is significant that here the Holy Spirit records how He intervenes in this common human experience. Thus it is our privilege to come to Him with all the common things of life. 2. It is natural for those who know the Lord to pray when they are in trouble: Lazarus' sisters sent unto Him saying: "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick." What a blessing that He is always ready to hear, that, indeed, He invites us to call upon Him in our need: "Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." 3. Our Lord declares His purpose to glorify Himself through the sickness of Lazarus. This is a profound saying, but it teaches that the Lord claims the right to glorify Himself even at the expense of human pain. 4. He did not answer the sisters' prayer at once: "When he had heard therefore that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was." We often pray impatiently, desiring and demanding an immediate answer; but often the Lord allows things to take their course and delays His coming until they have become much worse. But however bad the circumstances, He never arrives too late. 5. He answers the objection of His disciples by saying that the day is made for work (vs. 7-10); and implies that He is immortal till His work is done. So are all His disciples. "The sluggard will not plow by reason of the cold; therefore shall he beg in harvest, and have nothing." And those who consider the enmity of the Jews and other difficulties which stand in the way of the day's accomplishment will never fulfil their task. 6. We have here Christ's interpretation of death (vs. 11-14). He calls it sleep; it is only a sleep to Him because He has power to awake the dead. But His interpretation, whatever it may be on any matter, is always the true one. 7. Christ expresses his gladness that an occasion has arisen in which He may manifest His power: "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." It is a strange saying—to be glad when death has come; but anything that helps us to believe God may well be regarded as an occasion of gladness.

II. THE RESURRECTION OF LAZARUS.

1. The friends of the sisters could comfort them, but they could not restore life to Lazarus. How helpless we all are in the presence of death!

"One writes, that 'Other friends remain,
That 'Loss is common to the race'—
And common is the commonplace,
And vacant chaff well meant for grain.

"That loss is common would not make
My own less bitter, rather more:
Too common! Never morning wore
To evening, but some heart did break."

2. Martha's faith (vs. 21-27). She believed that Christ had power to prevent death, for she greeted Him with the words, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." But in His presence she dares to declare the possibility of his resurrection. The first word was probably what she had said in the Master's absence; the second was an expression of the faith which His presence inspired. It is not only what God says, but what He is, that inspires faith. 3. The Master's response (vs. 23-26). All life is in Christ, and all time is at His command; and if He wills it, the resurrection of the last day may take place today. He is always able to anticipate the future. 4. Martha's faith rises to great heights in the presence of Christ. It is impossible to question His word while in His presence (vs. 26-27). 5. Mary was of a different

disposition; notwithstanding, she was utterly devoted to Christ and to her brother. When, in response to Martha's call, she rose to go to meet Christ, the Jews who were with her in the house, not knowing of Martha's secret call, said, "She goeth unto the grave to weep there." Probably she had spent much of the time there since Lazarus died. And when the Lord came, Mary repeated Martha's words, doubtless because the sisters had said the same thing to each other many times during the anxious hours in which they waited for His coming. Though nothing further is recorded of any expression of faith on Mary's part, the implication of the story is that the presence of the Lord had the same effect upon her as upon Martha, and in His presence she believed. 6. The grief of the Lord Jesus (vs. 33-35). It could not have been for Lazarus' sake only, for He knew that at a word He would call him back to life: it is, we think, legitimate to assume that the death of Lazarus was typical of all other deaths, and of death in general, as the offspring of sin; and it was impossible for the Lord to look upon it without thinking of death as the enemy of humankind, and, at the same time, of the fearful price which He must pay to deprive death of his sting. Those who saw Him weep, said, "Behold how he loved him!" But it is not the tears of Christ, but the Cross of Calvary that is the measure of His love. 7. We see here how doubt would strangle our faith (v. 39): Notwithstanding her bold confession, Martha shrank from having the stone removed, because her brother had been dead four days. But her faith was not the less genuine because it trembled somewhat in the presence of death. 8. We may observe how faith is revived and invigorated by the word of the Master (v. 40): Faith always comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. When our faith languishes, let us listen to the Master's voice. 9. What a privilege it must have been to hear Christ pray (vs. 41-42)! What a blessing to have One on our side whom God never denies! He still prays for us: "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." There is comfort in the reflection that these words were spoken for us as well as those who stood by, that we also may believe and rest in the assurance that prayer offered in the Name of Christ always prevails. 10. Death flees at the word of Christ—"Lazarus, come forth." So must it always, for the word He speaks is ever spirit and life. It is by the word of God souls dead in trespasses and in sins are quickened still. 11. He comes to give liberty as well as life; He does not call us from the grave to leave us wrapped in grave clothes; He does not forgive the guilt of sin without giving power to deliver us from its domination (v. 44). 12. Seldom do we find unanimity of opinion respecting Christ. Seeing Lazarus raised from the dead, some believed. What wonder that they would? The wonder would have been if, in the face of such a miracle, doubt yet remained! And yet some were only angered, and saw in the miracle only a new occasion for hatred. How strange is this fact (v. 46)!

III. THE BLINDNESS AND BITTERNESS OF THE CARNAL MIND.

1. Religious officialdom cannot be convinced by any miracle. If we are used of God in any measure to bring blessing to others, we sometimes fancy that we have only to give ample proof of the spiritual character of the work accomplished to break down the opposition of men. Such is not the case: there was no question in the minds, even of the Pharisees, of the genuineness of the miracle—still they were determined to terminate His career if possible. "It is enough for the servant that he be as his Lord" (vs. 47, 48). 2. We see here how God sovereignly compels the high priest, even in his hatred, to utter a true prophecy. When he suggested that means be taken to accomplish the death of Christ, in order that the whole nation should not perish, he meant by that, that they should not, because of His popularity and prestige as a Jew, be brought as a people under the displeasure of Rome. But God overruled this expression of hatred, and being high priest, compelled him to prophesy that Christ should die, "not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad". 3. The insensate hatred which would seek to kill the author of life. One is staggered by the daring of unbelief. It might have been supposed that they would have reasoned that One Who could raise another to life would be difficult to destroy; yet in the face of His power "from that day they took counsel together for to put him to death." 4. But until His hour was come no man could take His life from Him (vs. 54-57).