

"THE CANADIAN BAPTIST" DEFENDS PROF. MARSHALL.....	Page 8
"PRIVATE" CONVERSATIONS	" 12
PROXY DELEGATES	" 20
BAPTIST BIBLE UNION CONFERENCE	" 21

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. 22.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 7, 1926.

Whole No. 232.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

JESUS AND JONAH.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, Sept. 19th, 1926.
(Stenographically Reported.)

"Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee.

"But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas:

"For 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.

"The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here."—Matt. 12: 38-41.



HE book of Jonah occupies a central and a very important place in the canon of Scripture. Unfortunately, it has been made the subject of many unseemly jokes. Let me give this little bit of advice to you young people particularly: beware of any man who uses the Word of God to point a joke. I have in my mind just now one or two hymns which have been ruined for me by the jokes which some people have made about them, parodies that have been written upon them.

There are some people who seem to take special delight in laying sacrilegious hands upon holy things. The time will come when you will desire to find refreshment and comfort from these wells of Scripture, beware, lest you find that you have turned them into mocking and scorn.

Now Jonah has a place in the Word of God—it is not a book to be laughed at. Indeed, it sustains a very important relation to the Word of God as a whole. Moody used to say that he could measure any man's orthodoxy, any man's spiritual attitude toward the Bible as a whole, by his attitude toward the book of Jonah. Moody had a great deal of sanctified common sense, and I think he was right in this particular. I, in my somewhat limited experience, perhaps, have yet to find the man who is unsound in his attitude toward the book of Jonah, who is not unsound in his attitude toward the Bible as a whole;

because it enshrines, as we shall see, the great central truth of the gospel. History though it be, it is still prophecy in symbol; it found its fulfilment in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord.

We live in a day when it is popular to endeavour to discredit the Bible. Why ministers should thus occupy their time I am at a loss to understand. If they do not believe it, if, indeed, its teachings are repugnant to them, they might at least have the decency—or let me say, the honesty—to resign their position, and get out of the church. The man who thus treats the Word of God, who handles the Word of God deceitfully, can never, by thinking men, be regarded as an honourable man. Men are entitled to their opinions, but no man can justify his action in receiving support from a Christian institution, while he yet uses the very position in which he is maintained to destroy the faith he is employed to teach. There are many who are deterred from a careful examination of these matters by the vainglorious boasts of those who claim some superior intellectuality; there are phrases that have become almost hackneyed in the attacks upon the Bible: for example, “the assured results of higher criticism”; “the consensus of scholarship”; “the judgment of science”—and so on.

Being busy yesterday, I did not read, what I generally read with interest and profit, the religious page of *The Toronto Globe*, but someone handed me this clipping. I have observed that its theology is sometimes attacked. I remember being in a certain American city on one occasion waiting for a train, and I bought a paper. I glanced at it, and threw it as far from me as I could; having touched the filthy thing, I felt as though I needed a bath. An old journalist once said to me that in the great days of Horace Greely, he served on his paper in New York. One morning he called one of his proof-readers, or sub-editors into his office, and he said, “Mr. So-and-So, were you in charge of your usual department last night?” “Yes, sir”, he said. “And did you pass that article?” referring to a certain article that had appeared. He said, “Yes, sir”, “Well”, said the great man, “when I glanced at my morning paper and saw that, I took the tongs and put it into the fire. That is all.” And he said the man withdrew, but he had learned his lesson. I think we have great reason to congratulate ourselves in this city, altogether aside from any political consideration, that we have a dally paper that is not afraid to stand for God.

I described someone recently in *The Gospel Witness* as qualifying, if he intended to be serious, for a position on the staff of *Punch*. Someone wrote me enquiring whether I considered *Punch* a wholesome journal. Well, I frankly confess I have had many a good laugh over *Punch*—it is a bit of wholesome humour. But if you want to get something really funny, you must get the latest production of the biblical scholars. A certain American bishop, who said that when he was a little depressed, and when laughter seemed far from him, and he wanted to cultivate within him a merry heart that doeth good like a medicine, he sought out the latest book on Evolution—for he said he knew of nothing more ridiculous. I think he was right.

But to return to *The Toronto Globe*. Here is a story that yonder in the East, so the writer tells in the Outlook of the Church, they have discovered petroleum somewhere on the Jaffa coast, and the discovery of petroleum is held by these alleged scholars as the solution of a somewhat difficult scriptural passage. You remember the story of how Elijah summoned the prophets of Baal to Mount Carmel, and how he said, “The God that answereth by fire, let him be God.” And when the prophets had cried to their god and there was

no answer, Elijah built the altar that was broken down, and he dug a trench about it, and he put wood upon the altar, and the sacrifice upon the wood, and then he told them to bring water, and pour it upon the sacrifice. Then he told them to do it the second time, and the third time. Unsuspecting people, of course, credulous believers, had always supposed that Elijah did that to put the demonstration of supernatural power beyond all question, for he had said, "The God that answereth by fire, let him be God." But now the scholars have explained it!—Elijah was in advance of his contemporaries, and when they poured the water over the sacrifice, they really poured petroleum over it, and surreptitiously, somehow, just when he was about to pray, Elijah threw a light into it! I do not know whether it was a lucifer match, or a safety match, or what sort of a match it was—but the fire leaped up from the altar!

My friends, that illustrates only one thing, that "the carnal mind is enmity against God"; and that unbelief is really a manifestation of the attitude of the natural mind; that it is because men are, at heart, against God, that they thus endeavour to explain away the supernatural revelation, or the revelation of the supernatural, contained in the Bible.

I.

Look for a moment then at this book of Jonah. I want you, first of all, to consider THE RELATION OF THAT STORY TO THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE itself, the relation of the book of Jonah to the whole canon of Scripture.

Consider in that connection, first, *its relation to the knowledge and authority of Jesus Christ*. How did He regard this book? That has been called to your attention, I suppose, a hundred times, but let us refresh our memories for a moment. Our Lord Jesus obviously regarded the book of Jonah as an historic record. The only other place in which he is mentioned in the Old Testament is the fourteenth chapter of second Kings, and the twenty-fifth verse, where he is described as a prophet "to whom the word of the Lord came". Therefore we have Old Testament support for the assumption that Jonah was himself an historic figure—not a character in a parable, not a fictitious figure at all, but a real man who exercised the office of a prophet. You have that in the Old Testament, and if you read the story itself, in the passages I have referred to, you will find that it bears upon it the marks of an historic record. Our Lord Jesus so regarded it; for certainly the words I have read to you indicate that He believed that what is recorded in Jonah actually took place; that it was not a parable, but an historic occurrence. He points to the men of Nineveh as real persons, for they are to have a resurrection; they are to rise in judgment against the men of the generation He then addressed, because this real people of an ancient time repented at the preaching of a real Jonah—and, "Behold, a greater than Jonas is here". And as though to confirm that, quite incidentally, He refers in the same breath to the queen of Sheba, who came from "the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here." And certainly the characters in the Jonah story were no less real in His thought than were the queen of the south, and Solomon who was David's son. I think it is beyond question, if language means anything at all, that our Lord Jesus referred to the book of Jonah as a piece of history.

Well, then, the question naturally arises, Did He know? Did He actually know that that book was an historical record? Was He limited to the knowledge of His time? Did He know any more than His contemporaries? Or, if He did know more, did He allow them to go on in their misunderstanding? You remember the principle He laid down once when He said, "In my Father's house are many mansions: *if it were not so, I would have told you.*" It is inconceivable to me that Jesus Christ should thus have alluded to Jonah as an historical record, while Himself knowing that it was not history. If He did not know any more than His contemporaries, then He was something less than omniscient, and less than infallible; and if He did know, and allowed men to continue in their ignorance, He was not straightforward in His teaching. Had He known Jonah was not history, He would have told us. You have to take one horn of the dilemma—either He did not know, or He did know. If He did not know, then all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge did not dwell in Him; and if He did know, the difficulty is still more serious, for He was not truthful with those with whom He talked. I think we are without escape from this position, that if we believe in the infallibility of Jesus Christ we are compelled

to believe in the historicity of Jonah: the denial of the one involves inevitably the denial of the other.

Then, observe *the relation of the book of Jonah to the other Scriptures*: the acceptance of the book of Jonah enables us to believe in the infallibility of Christ; or, contrariwise, believing in His infallibility, we accept, as a matter of course, the historicity of Jonah. Well then, if we have an infallible Interpreter of the Old Testament Scriptures, if we have the record of One Whose knowledge respecting these matters was absolutely complete, if, being the eternal Son of the Father, the Incarnation of infinite wisdom Who was with the Father from everlasting to everlasting—if that is what Jesus is, then we have a Standard, a Touchstone, to which all the Old Testament Scriptures may be brought. We need not now examine the university degrees of certain alleged scholars in order to assure ourselves of their competence to pronounce on certain matters, because we have another Teacher Who has received the approval of God Himself, Who declares that He spake the very words of God.

And, by the way, in connection with this Jonah story, remember He has just said in the same discourse, "Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." If He attached such importance to words, as to teach that they were a matter of record, and that for every idle or empty word at the day of judgment we shall give an account, it is simply inconceivable that He Himself should have used words lightly; He was speaking as God manifest in the flesh, as One Who knew what He was talking about, and Who uttered the sober words of finality respecting this matter.

Very well, then, *if you have such an infallible Standard, all your Old Testament problems are solved, for you can measure the Old Testament always by Jesus Christ.* There is not a part of it that He has not discussed; and there is not a problem of Old Testament criticism, I venture to say, nor is there an objection raised by the supposed scholars of the day, which has not been anticipated by the specific utterances of Jesus Himself. If you put Him at the centre as the Supreme Authority, you have an infallible Christ and an infallible Bible. Men who will not yield to the authority of Scripture find always the testimony of Christ across their path, so that the critics have long been telling us that it is vain to invoke the authority of Christ in matters of biblical criticism. Well, my dear friends, I am old-fashioned enough to believe that the authority of Christ is still supreme, and that it is for ever true that all authority is given to Him in heaven and on earth, and that there is nothing He does not know; and when He speaks we had better bow our intellects, our hearts, our wills, and say, with Thomas, "My Lord, and my God."

You see, therefore, my friends, the relation of Jonah to the Person and work of Christ, to the question of His authority, to the whole question of authority in religion.

II.

Look once again, and you will find another link in the chain of the **RELATION OF AN INFALLIBLE CHRIST TO A SUPERNATURAL RELIGION.** What is there in the book of Jonah to which the natural man so strenuously objects? It is the supernatural. That is the point, it is the supernatural. Jonah swallowed by a fish which the Lord prepared! Some good brethren for whom I have the profoundest respect have sometimes laboured to show that it is possible to find a whale, or the skeleton of a whale, whose throat was big enough to swallow man. It would not shock my faith at all if no such specimen could be found in all the museums of the world; and if all the experts were to go whaling for the next ten years and should discover that there is no whale or fish or monster cleaving the waters of the deep to-day large enough to have swallowed Jonah, I should say that that does not make any difference. I cannot for the life of me understand why those who claim to put the authority of Scripture above science, should in the next breath try to prove Scripture by science. I am not at all concerned whether this story has any scientific corroboration or not, for the simple record says that the Lord prepared a fish—and if there was not a fish big enough, He could make one, that is all. He had only to speak and it was done, the fish was ready; and it was no less a miracle to have Mr. Whale right on hand beside the boat than it was to make him. The whole book is a

record of the supernatural. Even the storm was a supernatural event, or at least it showed that there was a very close relation between the moral and the spiritual and the material worlds, so that a sin in the one realm disturbed the elements in the other; and the storm came upon the ship in judgment. But the whole record from beginning to end, from its opening words which say that "the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the son of Amittai", the whole record says God—God—God—God—it is all God, and that is what men do not like; they do not want God, they do not like to retain God in their knowledge. That is the explanation. But I say that that book of Jonah is shot through with the supernatural: the storm, the preparation of the fish—whether it was a special creation or an ordinary monster of the deep, it was at least brought conveniently near to the ship—and the Lord showed that He was a pretty good Fisherman, that He could catch a whale without killing it, and use that kind of submarine for a school in which to train a prophet. (I wish some theological professors could get in such a submarine, they might learn something!) Jonah learned a great deal through that experience. At last the whale vomited up Jonah, and he came forth a man raised from the dead by the power of God, and was sent off as a herald of the divine message.

My dear friends, that is all in Jonah, it is a gem of the supernatural in the Old Testament; and Jesus Christ stamped it with His authority, and He said, "I have come to reveal a God Who can do just that." And so He can. I know it is contrary to the theory of Evolution. He is supposed to be a God that is locked up in the machine that He has made—I am aware of that. I am aware of the rebellion of the alleged "scientific" mind against the assumption that God ever interferes with the processes of law—but He knows how to do it. He did it in Jonah's case—Jesus said He did it. Very well, then, if you can believe the supernaturalism of Jonah because the Lord Jesus stamped it with His approval; you can believe the supernaturalism of the whole Book; and if you reject the supernaturalism of Jonah, and reduce it merely to a parable or an allegory, and thus repudiate the authority of Jesus Christ, you have opened wide the door to rejection of the supernatural throughout the Scriptures and the authority of Jesus Christ in general, for the whole thing is locked up together. I do not wonder that that far-seeing, mighty man of God said, "I can measure a man's loyalty to truth by his attitude toward the book of Jonah." Very well, then, there is one other link in the chain.

III.

Have you followed me in the relation of Jonah to the authority of Scripture? First, the relation of Jonah to the knowledge and authority of Jesus Christ: from that we reached the conclusion that He is infallible; then the relation of an infallible Christ to the Scriptures in general: that gives us an infallible Book; the relation of scriptural infallibility to the supernatural: that gives us a supernatural religion—and THAT LAYS THE ONLY FOUNDATION FOR FAITH.

What is faith? It is belief in God, Who is not only the Author of nature, but Who is Himself above nature, supernatural, having power to do what cannot be done by natural means. Consider such a story as the supernatural birth of Isaac; it was contrary to nature. Abraham came up to that promise, it was a promise of the supernatural, of that which was contrary to nature, there was no corroboration for his faith in nature or in human experience; but the great statement is made that "Abraham believed God". Do you know what it is to "believe" God? To believe God is simply to recognize God as God. It is of no use to say that you believe God, and then drag Him down to the level of a man—that is not faith. Abraham said, "It is above all natural law, it is above all human experience—but God has said it." And so he faced the promise of the supernatural, and he hoped for the future. Mark you, his hope for the future was conditioned upon the supernatural, there was no prospect naturally; the child of promise must be supernaturally born. And the grand old record says—listen! Cannot you see him, cannot you see him coming up to that great promise, "God is going to do so." Something is promised him which only God can do, and Abraham with steady faith moves toward the promise—and the record says he "staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God." Faith gives glory to God, and there is no real faith that does not enthrone God as God. When you have laid the foundation in the acceptance of the supernatural Christ, testifying to a supernatural and infallible Bible, with the promise of a supernatural experience, you have a

foundation for the feet of faith to stand upon; and all things become possible to him that believeth.

You will see that I have said enough so far to show you that the problem of Jonah is by no means an insignificant one: it is a big subject, a big question.

IV.

Well what more? THE RELATION OF JONAH TO THE CENTRAL FACT OF THE GOSPEL. What is the central fact of the gospel? The death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The Pharisees came to him saying, "Master, we would see a sign from thee. Show us a sign, show us who you are, give us your credentials." And He answered, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas." Jonah a sign? Yes, *an Old Testament sign of what God is!* Please observe that particularly.

Time will permit me only to offer these suggestions. It was a sign that God is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and can not look on iniquity"; it was the sign of the certain judgment of God upon sin; and it was a sign, too, a revelation, of the mercy and abounding grace of God toward sinners, for Jonah was born from the grave. He died, so to speak, and was buried, and was raised again. He anticipated the request of the rich man in hell when he said, "If one went unto them from the dead, they will repent." And Abraham answered, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." But to leave men without excuse, in the person of Jonah—Oh, dare I say this—God anticipated the *cry of despair from hell for some authoritative message from God*; and He sent it, and they repented, and He forgave them, and the city was saved! What is the application? "Why," said Jesus, "you ask me for a sign. You heard all about my turning the water into wine; you have heard of My healing of the sick; and multiplying the loaves—but there is a greater sign than that: there is the sign which comprehends all other signs, there is the sign which eclipses in glory all lesser manifestations of divine power, 'for as Jonah 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'—as though He had said, "I have come to die for you, and to be buried for you, and to rise again and bring you a message from God from the other side of the grave. If it were not so, I would have told you: I have come to tell you; that it is so. I come as the Supreme Revelation of the righteousness, the truth, the justice, the mercy, the love, the holiness—to use the biggest word of all, that defies all measurement and all definitions, the revelation of all there is of God in harmonious exercise for the salvation of the lost, that great word, grace—Grace—GRACE." It is another word for God; it comes from heaven. Its idiom does not belong to the far country where "no man gave unto him": it belongs to the Father's house where everything is given away—and so Jesus said, "I am going to give you that sign: the supreme message of God to a rebellious world is to be given through the cross, the empty grave, and the path of glory to the throne, and the light that streams from the gates ajar, which promises that some day He will come back again." I do not want any better sign than that. That sign is enough for me.

And that is all in the book of Jonah. Did Jonah really go down into the depths, and come up again? Did Jesus Christ really die? Yes, but was He raised again from the dead?—that is the question. I want no parabolic, allegorical, resurrection, if you please. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins"; and there is nothing in the Christian religion. You have never known a man who denied the historicity of Jonah who did not endeavour to explain away the resurrection of Christ. It is all the same thing,—antagonism toward the supernatural, and to the revelation of God in Christ. So you see it is not only the Bible that is at stake, but it is the message of the Bible; and the message of the Bible is the cross, and the empty grave—from Genesis to Revelation—and it is all involved in a man's attitude toward the book of Jonah.

V.

Then THE RELATION OF THE BOOK OF JONAH TO LAST THINGS: there is a big word that theologians use—they speak of *eschatology*, the doctrine of last things. The evolutionists know no last things: to them there is a gradual progress

toward something by and by, but they object to the cataclysmic principle; it knocks their theory into the proverbial "cocked hat". But the Scripture says there is a day of judgment, and Jesus invokes the authority of Jonah to establish this truth, for He said, "Jonah preached, and men repented". He declared that there is a day of judgment coming when even the men of Nineveh will be there; they sleep in the dust, but their bodies shall rise, and in that final judgment the men of Nineveh will be there, and they will be called as witnesses. He said, in effect, "And you will have to be there too, for there is a day of reckoning when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him; then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." Do you believe that day is coming? Do you believe there is going to be a day of reckoning some time? Our Lord says—I had almost put it this way, that He has a stenographic report of every word you have ever spoken. Yes, that little family quarrel in the kitchen, that altercation down in the office, that secret word that was spoken somewhere, that poisoned dart that destroyed somebody's character, that deadly thing that came from the tongue under which the poison of asps is found—He says, "I have got it all written down, and for every word you shall give an account in the day of judgment." And it was on top of that, following that, He referred to Jonah and the Ninevites and says the Ninevites will witness against the men of His generation. Why? "Because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here."—"If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him: God also bearing them witness"—God says, in effect, "I sent you my Son: I had Him die for you, and be buried, and raised again, and ascend into the glory; I witnessed to His death as your Substitute by sending you the Holy Ghost; I bore witness that He came from God, and that He returned to God, and that some day He is coming back again; and when He comes you will stand before Him and give an account." Oh, dreadful day for those who know not Christ! Oh, blessed day for those who have believed in the "greater than Jonas"!

Can you trust Him to-night? Can you put aside all these matters and say concerning Jesus Christ, "He is to me the Lord of glory, my Lord and my God"? That is worth standing for, do you not think? This preacher does not mind saying that he believes that with all his heart; he only wishes he had power to tell you how profoundly he believes it, and that he is quite willing to be classed, as our new professor classes those who thus believe, as "an uneducated fool". "The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness", but, blessed be God, to us who are saved it is "Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Will you have Him to-night? Will you this moment bow before Him and yield to Him?

Let us ask His help: O Lord, Thou hast left us, through Thy Holy Word, without excuse for the judgment day. We thank Thee for the mercy that has spared us, for the love that would woo us, for the grace that would win us. Is there a man or woman here to-night to whom, up to this hour, Jesus has not been Saviour and Lord? In the quiet of this Sabbath evening we humbly bow, and we would pray, O Lord, for ourselves and others, and send up to Heaven this heartfelt cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner." This is our only plea, that Jesus died in our room and stead; and Thou has promised in Thy Word that "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved". Oh, let every heart be lifted to God, we beseech Thee. May the Holy Spirit unite our petitions; may the eyes of the unconverted be opened, their hearts unsealed, and may that cry ascend to the mercy seat, "Lord, save me." And then we pray that Thou wilt enable them to rest upon Thy promise, having called upon Thee, that "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." And if we are now saved, no longer doubting but happily believing, help us boldly to declare ourselves as being on the side of Christ. May there be many confessions of faith to-night. O Lord, send us a shower of blessing in this service that will be glorifying to Thy great name. For Jesus' sake, Amen.

(Many responded to the invitation.)

Editorial.

"THE CANADIAN BAPTIST'S" DEFENCE OF PROFESSOR MARSHALL.

In its issue of September 30th, *The Canadian Baptist* defends the teaching of Professor Marshall, and in doing so it quotes from a sermon of Spurgeon on "The Miraculous Darkness" as follows:

"This darkness tells us all that the Passion is a great mystery, into which we cannot pry. I try to explain it as a substitution and I feel that where the language of Scripture is explicit, I may, and must, be explicit too. But yet I feel that the idea of substitution does not cover the whole of the matter, and that no human conception can completely grasp the whole of the dread mystery. It was wrought in darkness because the full, far-reaching meaning and result cannot be beheld of finite mind. Tell me the death of the Lord Jesus was a grand example of self-sacrifice—I can see that, and much more. Tell me it was a wondrous obedience to the will of God—I can see that and much more. Tell me it was the bearing of what ought to have been borne by myriads of sinners of the human race, is the chastisement of their sin—I can see that and found my best hope upon it. But do not tell me that this is all that is in the Cross. No, great as this would be, there is much more in the Redeemer's death. God veiled the Cross in darkness, and in darkness much of the deep meaning lies, not because God would not reveal it, but because we have not capacity to discern it all."

See Fullerton's *Life of Spurgeon*, pp. 1814.

Fullerton adds this paragraph: "This breadth of heart was revealed on another occasion when in his prayer at a Thursday evening service he dared to go far beyond his creed, and in his passion for the souls of men he cried, Lord hasten to bring in all Thine elect—and then elect some more."

And of this it says, "Professor Marshall in conversation in Toronto with a friend makes his own this great utterance of Spurgeon's, and stated that when he read it of Spurgeon, had he been in the room, he would have risen and embraced him, so clearly had he expressed his own thought." To invoke the authority of Spurgeon's great name in support of Professor Marshall's teaching is little short of infamous; for by no kind of reasoning can Spurgeon's teaching respecting the atonement be made to agree with that of Professor Marshall. This trick of *The Canadian Baptist* is parallel to that of Professor Brown in his futile attempt to class the great Dr. John A. Broadus with those who had, "in later years," modified their attitude towards the Bible as the inspired and infallible Word of God. Any one familiar with the writings of C. H. Spurgeon, as the writer of this article dares to claim to be, must know that Professor Marshall's teaching at every point is the very opposite of every-thing Spurgeon taught.

The Canadian Baptist quotes also from Professor Marshall's sermon preached in Walmer Road Church, Toronto, on January 24th, 1926. The part directly relating to the atonement is as follows:

"What the world needs is redemption and salvation. What is that? In simple terminology, salvation is emancipation from the dominion of evil and power to do the will of God. There is no real life for us apart from the fellowship of God, and complete harmony between our wills and the will of God. As Augustine said so beautifully and so truly, "The vision of God is the life of man." What hinders this fellowship and har-

mony? There is a sin barrier between ourselves and God, and it is this sin barrier that Christ destroys. He destroys it in two ways.

"In the first place by His Cross and Passion He procures forgiveness for us. The Cross is the witness of God's redeeming love and forgiving grace. It is the pledge that no sin of ours can ever destroy God's love for us. However deeply we have sinned, however heavy the burden of guilt upon our consciences if we turn in repentance and faith to the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ we may be forgiven. The very worst—harlots, profligates, prodigals, murderers and criminals—when conscience awakens within them and they realize the enormity of their offences and are tortured by remorse, can through repentance and faith find forgiveness."

"He died that we might be forgiven."

"The guilt-bond that was against us, that was contrary to us, he hath taken out of the way and nailed it to His Cross."

"E'er since, by faith I saw the stream
Thy flowing wounds supply;
Redeeming love has been my theme
And shall be till I die."

"There is no pit of sin or guilt, or degradation from which the redeeming love of God in Christ cannot rescue us."

We confess that but for Professor Marshall's other utterances, both from the platform and in the classroom, we ourselves might have read such a passage without immediately detecting its subtlety; but when Professor Marshall implicitly repudiates Luther's view of the substitutionary death of Christ as being "crude" and "bold," and in sermon after sermon not only utterly ignores the atonement, but implicitly or explicitly teaches the very opposite of the truth that Christ died "the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God", it compels us to examine such a statement as is contained in the Walmer Road sermon, more especially as that sermon was what Mr. Patterson of Montreal described as a "dress suit" sermon, obviously designed to present an appearance of orthodoxy respecting the atonement.

We ask our readers to read the quotation we have given, over again. What is there in these words to suggest that Christ bore the penalty of man's sin? The atonement is wholly subjective: "The cross is the witness of God's redeeming love and forgiving grace." There is absolutely nothing to suggest that the righteousness and truth and justice of God were involved; that by the death of Christ a penalty was paid which was exacted by God's holy law. But by a vision of the love of God, as revealed in the cross of Christ, the sinner is moved to repentance and faith, on the ground of which he is forgiven! This is little more than the Example theory of the atonement. The Cross is vastly more than "the witness of God's redeeming love and forgiving grace." It is a revelation of His truth and righteousness, and justice, in a word, of His infinite holiness. A mother's love may win a wayward boy to penitence, but it cannot atone for his sin, or expiate his guilt.

Following the quotation from the Walmer Road sermon, we have an extended quotation from the pamphlet issued by Professor Marshall. In this pamphlet the Professor quotes certain passages of Scripture: I. Pet., 1:18-19; I. Cor., 15:14; Col., 2:13-14; Rom., 3:24-26; I John, 4:10; Matt., 20:28. If the Professor accepts these passages at their face value, how does it come to pass that he can get through sermon after sermon without even remotely suggesting the truth these passages contain? and that these are quoted without any attempt on his part to say what he understands them to mean, and only when he

is driven into a corner and issues a pamphlet in his own defence? This part of the pamphlet, however, one might have accepted, being led to the conclusion that we must have been mistaken in our understanding of Professor Marshall's theological position; but his palpably absurd attempt to extricate himself from the difficulty created by a sermon preached in England, convinces one that Professor Marshall belongs to that type of modernist who will stop at nothing which will enable him to hold a position affording an opportunity for the propagation of his views.

The Canadian Baptist quotes the following from Prof. Marshall's pamphlet:

CONCERNING THE CREATION.

Dr. Shields quotes the following sentence from my sermon:

"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 then declares that this is inconsistent with the declaration of my belief in the inspiration and general historicity of the first chapter of Genesis.

In dealing with the biblical account of the Creation we have to distinguish between two things, viz., (a) the real meaning and message of the chapter, and (b) the Hebrew tradition based upon an absolutely literal interpretation of the chapter. As all careful readers of the New Testament are aware, Christ drew a distinction between the "Law" (i.e., the Text of the Old Testament) and the traditions (i.e., the official interpretation of the Law). See for example Matthew 15:1-9.

According to the Hebrew tradition, the Creation was completed in six days, ordinary solar days, beginning, so to speak, on Sunday morning and reaching completion on Friday night. It is this conception of the Creation—creation out of nothing in six ordinary solar days—that no longer appears tenable either in the light of scientific investigation or of the true principles of Biblical interpretation. There is a great mass of evidence against the Hebrew tradition of creation in six days. As a concession to this clear witness of science, even the most conservative and orthodox interpreters of Scripture declare that the term "day" in Genesis I. must be regarded as signifying an age, (e.g., Scofield). This is a departure from Hebrew tradition, and in harmony with the teaching of modern science. It is a recognition of the fact to which I appealed in my sermon—that the Christian disciple is not bound to accept the Hebrew tradition of creation in six days, any more than he is bound to believe that the earth is flat because that was the general belief of the ancients, or that the earth is the hub of the universe because the ancients believed that too. People who do not feel their sense of truth in any way challenged by the idea of creation in six days may as well be left undisturbed. But for a Christian Minister to demand of a young biologist, for example, that he must accept the Hebrew tradition of creation in six days as a condition of admittance to the church, is tantamount to a demand that he should suppress his sense of truth and stifle the witness of his conscience on entering the Church of Christ. Hence the remark, "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."

There is no conflict between the teaching of Science and the real meaning and message of the sacred text. I do not go to my Bible for astronomy or biology because it is not the office of the Holy Spirit to reveal the secrets of astronomy and geology. I go to the Bible for a religious message. The concern of Genesis I. is not so much with the question as to how God made the world as with the fact that it was God who did make the world. I accept with all my heart the teaching of Genesis I, viz., that behind all the phenomena of the world there lies the creative power and purpose of the Living God. The new knowledge that

science has brought simply confirms for me the glorious message with which Holy Writ begins: "In the beginning God." To me Genesis is a divinely inspired document announcing to mankind the great religious truth that the world, with all that therein is, owes its being to the creative Spirit of God.

In addition to this religious message, it is well to note that the order of the various phases of creation as there outlined, viz., land and water, vegetation, fish, reptiles, birds, mammals, and finally men, is substantially the same as the order announced by science.

I find ample proof of the inspiration of Genesis I. when I compare it with the accounts of the creation which other peoples have given, e.g., Egyptians, Polynesians, Maories. Genesis I. towers above all these like Mont Blanc among sand-dunes, with a sublimity and a majesty which speak of the Spirit of God.

Let us now set over against that a quotation from Professor Marshall's sermon on, "What Baptists Stand For," preached at Queen's Road Church, Coventry, England. It will be observed that Professor Marshall, in his pamphlet, takes the quotation from his sermon entirely out of its context. We print it here with its context:

"Thus it comes about that in the Baptist Churches there is a remarkable spiritual unity in spite of a great diversity of thought. (7) 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. We are not in any way bound by the traditions of the past, but are perfectly free to welcome all light and truth from whatsoever quarter they come, in the sure confidence that all light is God's light and all truth is God's truth. Living in personal loyalty to Christ, we have at the same time open minds for all new truth which God vouchsafes to reveal to mankind through any channel."

Will anyone in his senses believe that when Professor Marshall uttered those words in England he intended only to say that the Christian disciple is free to interpret the six days of creation as "ordinary solar days," or as representing six long periods of time? What does he say? "Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad." Surely the broadest of the broad would include the most extreme modernists. To this, of course, Professor Marshall would offer no objection. Then he sets "the Hebrew tradition about the creation" over against "the teaching on that subject of modern science", and identifies these two views by saying, "He can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship". Thus he sets the method pursued by modern scholarship in opposition to the so-called orthodox method. Professor Marshall's statements at other times show clearly what he means by "the method pursued by modern scholarship" and by "the teaching of modern science." He has declared his disbelief in the historicity of the book of Jonah. He has declared that if the facts of science (a cautious man would speak of the alleged facts of science) should contradict the Bible, he would accept science. Personally we have not the shadow of a doubt that when Professor Marshall referred to "the Hebrew tradition about the creation," he meant the Genesis account of creation as opposed to the teaching of modern science. We challenge Pro-

fessor Marshall to disavow his acceptance of the evolutionary hypothesis. We do not believe that when the words to which we have referred were spoken from the pulpit of Queen's Road Church, Coventry, by Professor Marshall, he intended by the use of the phrase, "the Hebrew tradition about creation", merely an alleged Hebrew interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis. We believe he intended to characterize the Genesis account of creation as a Hebrew tradition; and to say that the Christian disciple was free to substitute for it the teaching of modern science.

NEWS FROM *THE PROPHET*.

[The following is reprinted from the latest issue of "The Prophet"
—W. Gordon Brown, Editor.]

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE WITH DEAN FARMER.

Box 517, Orangeville, Ont.,
September 27, 1926.

Dr. J. H. Farmer,
McMaster University,
Toronto 3, Ontario.

Dear Dr. Farmer:

I have often thought of a conversation which Mr. W. S. Whitcombe and I had with you in your own office some months ago and of something which you said at that time.

As I recall the conversation, and I have a vivid recollection of it, it was to the following effect:

Mr. Whitcombe: How do you account, Dr. Farmer, for the blessing upon the work at Jarvis St.? There is a man in my church who says that he is sure which is right, that Dr. Shields is right, because of the conversions that they have at Jarvis St. and the blessing of the Lord upon the work. I know that does not prove it, but how do you account for it?

Dr. Farmer: Well, Mr. Whitcombe, I wouldn't say this outside, but I have wondered if it may not be that * * * * (Dr. Farmer refuses permission to publish what he said at this point.)

Mr. Whitcombe: Well, Dr. Farmer, I can hardly accept that.

I write to ask you if you can give me any good reason why this conversation, as given above, should not be given to our people through the columns of our paper; "The Prophet," which will in the next edition be circulated throughout the Convention.

You will be interested to know that the blessing of the Lord is upon the work here. Last night I baptized a fine lad of sixteen. We expect that still more will follow. The revival meetings here brought many to Christ. For this we praise Him.

Please remember that no matter how much we may differ on matters of policy, I shall continue to regard you as a true scholar and a good teacher.

As for the above question, I should be glad to receive a reply at your earliest possible convenience, as our paper goes to press very soon.

Yours very sincerely,

In the service of Christ,

(Signed) W. GORDON BROWN.

Stouffville, Sept. 27, 1926.

I have your statement re the conversation in the Sanctum Sanctorum with the Dean of Theology. Your report of the conversation is absolutely correct. You could have made it fuller so as to make the meaning of Dr. Farmer's explanation clearer, but as it is, it is true to what he said. His idea was that

* * * * (Dr. Farmer gave his reason in private, but refuses to divulge it in public. Hence this part is omitted.)

My reply to him was: "Well, Dr. Farmer, that may satisfy you, but it does not satisfy me." That conversation did more to lower Dr. Farmer in my estimation than all that has happened before or since.

(Signed) W. S. WHITCOMBE,
in a personal letter to the Editor.

Office of
Dean in Theology
McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Toronto, Canada.

October 1st, 1926

Mr. W. Gordon Brown,
Box 517, Orangeville, Ontario.
Dear Brother Brown—

There is the very good and sufficient reason that it would be distinctly dishonorable. I have always regarded conversations between friends and especially between teachers and students as sacredly private and not public. And it would not be fair to give to the public a report which I am not prepared to approve as exact and which might give them a very wrong impression of what my considered judgment is.

I am glad to hear of blessings on your work. Genuine conversions are of God and in themselves are always ground for rejoicing.

Yours sincerely,
JHF/AEM (Signed) J. H. FARMER.

The only reason we refrain from quoting the conversation above referred to in full is that Dr. Farmer definitely said, "I would not say this outside," thus making the matter in point specifically confidential.

But why should Dr. Farmer say things to students which he would not say to our Baptist brotherhood? Why?

It would be well for our people to know exactly what is the attitude of McMaster University professors and governors to the work of the Lord as it is carried on in power by those who stand out boldly and uncompromisingly for the Bible as the infallible Word of God. And why should they not know?

Is it the policy of frankness and fairness to say things about great men in private and then refuse to have them made public? Is this not the method of gossip and slander?

Is Dr. Farmer ashamed of what he said? We must confess that we ourselves were grieved at it, and that beyond words.

But there is a day coming when "that which is spoken in the ear shall be proclaimed from the house-tops."—Ed.

The above correspondence, taken from the latest issue of *The Prophet*, of which Mr. W. Gordon Brown is the Editor and Publisher, demands more than a passing reference. Dr. Farmer writes Mr. Brown to say that "it would be distinctly dishonourable" for him to divulge that which was privately communicated to him by Dr. Farmer. We readily grant that confidential communications between friends are sometimes absolutely necessary; but there is a type of "private" conversation which merits the severest censure and the utmost publicity.

The Scripture has somewhat to say about certain private and confidential matters. David said, "Whoso privily slandereth his neighbour, him will I cut off." What right has any man privately to slander another? We recall an instance where one came to us and communicated to us a very slanderous report respecting a certain person, and, having done so, he said, "Now, please understand I have told you this in the utmost confidence," to which we replied, "I absolutely refuse to respect your confidence. You come to me with this slanderous speech and endeavour to inject your poison into my mind in respect to another man, and then you would seal my lips so that I may not give that man opportunity to defend himself; you propose to poison my mind against him

—and make it impossible for any one on earth to eliminate your poison. I regard your action as utterly unfair and unchristian; and I shall go immediately to the person concerned and inform him of what you have said." Of all the wicked things of which men are guilty, there is scarcely anything to surpass this "confidential" practice of destroying other men's reputations.

This has been the method which the McMaster interests have employed all over this Convention: by private letters and personal conversations they have injected their poison into the minds of many, making it impossible for the persons slandered to defend themselves. But the Scripture has something else to say about this "confidential" habit. Paul speaks of "false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour: that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." And again, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not."

Thus the Devil accomplishes his purposes "privily"; after this fashion he steals our liberty and brings in "damnable heresies". It is written, "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God."

But what was this matter which Dr. Farmer objects to have published? It happens that these matters were communicated to us by Messrs. Brown and Whitcombe some time ago, and we now have before us this report from *The Prophet* in which Dr. Farmer says, "It would be distinctly dishonourable" to report what he said.

We are forced now to ask the question, Can there ever be justification for publishing a private conversation? When a crime has been committed, when a serious offence has been perpetrated against one's person or property, the police do not hesitate to take full possession of all private communications. We understand, indeed, that it is not uncommon for officers of the Law carefully to scrutinize letters passing through the mail, even though those letters are of the most private character possible. We regret to have to say that we are face to face with just such a situation in our Denomination to-day. Senator McMaster dedicated his fortune to the propagation of the great principles of the gospel of Christ, by which he himself had been saved and in which he rejoiced. The Convention accepted that sacred trust, and is under a solemn obligation to administer that estate in the interests of the Baptist interpretation of Evangelical Christianity. We deliberately affirm that the present management of McMaster University are guilty of a course which must inevitably pervert the gospel of Christ and turn the Denomination away from the faith. When, therefore, one has positive knowledge that men take contrary positions—one in private and another in public, and play a double game—surely the time has come to expose such a course, in order that the people may be informed of their peril. We, therefore, take full responsibility for publishing that which Messrs. Brown and Whitcombe have deleted from their communication. We have not asked their permission—they are not to blame. But we appeal to the Denomination to say whether the Dean in Theology can, by any biblical standard, be justified for what he said.

We ask our readers to go back in this article to the letter written by Mr. Brown to Dr. Farmer and read again the reported conversation between Mr. Whitcombe and the Dean, and complete Dr. Farmer's remark as follows: "Well, Mr. Whitcombe, I wouldn't say this outside, but I have wondered if it may not be that Satan has withdrawn his opposition there in order to gain a greater victory later." Then we ask our readers to turn to Mr. Whitcombe's letter to Mr. Brown, confirming Mr. Brown's report of Mr. Whitcombe's conversation with Dean Farmer, and where the asterisks occur, read as follows: "His idea was that Satan, by withdrawing his opposition at Jarvis Street, would thereby

allow the pastor of that church to gain a great name for himself and he would be known far and wide as a man who was doing a great work. He would thus be able to do great destruction to those whom he might attack. Thus Satan by allowing a great work to be done in Jarvis Street, would finally bring about greater damnation than if he had opposed the work there."

What have we here? Here are young men who express their belief that God is really blessing the work in Jarvis Street to the conversion of souls—but the Dean in Theology attributes such seeming prosperity to Satan: Satan has withdrawn his opposition, he has deliberately planned to make Jarvis Street prosperous, in order that some day he may effect a collapse, and thus work inestimable injury to the cause of Christ. The Editor of this paper has been slandered after this fashion all over the Convention, not, perhaps, in these exact words. But another gentleman came to our office reporting Dr. Farmer as having said to him personally, "Dr. Shields is either insane, or else he is a liar." We suppose this was also a "confidential" communication.

Much has been said about the "methods" and "spirit" of *The Gospel Witness* and its Editor. Our "methods" have at least been open and above board; we have said nothing in private; we have come out into the light; and we have openly challenged the Chancellor and the Dean and all concerned, in any public way, to convict us of having made one false statement. They have refused to accept the challenge; it has ever been their practice to avoid the issue.

Last week, by the publication of an article from *The Western Recorder*, we exposed the inexcusable attempt on the part of Professor J. G. Brown to credential Modernism by attaching to it the great name of Dr. John A. Broadus. In another article in this issue we have shown that *The Canadian Baptist* attributes the same thing with the name of Spurgeon. What shall be said of such "methods" as these? What shall be said of Dean Farmer's "methods" in attributing such work as is done in Jarvis Street Church to the power of Satan? We challenge Dr. Farmer and all his brigade to come to Jarvis Street Church and we will take them to visit the homes of some who are now members of Jarvis Street. We ask them to inspect the lives of these men and women who have been saved from sin, whose lives have been transformed, whose homes have been sweetened and made houses of prayer and worship. We can give Dr. Farmer, and any who come with him, a week's excursion through the homes of Jarvis Street Church where they will hear testimonies from some who, for a score of years, had never darkened the doors of a place of worship, from others who had been mere formalists, knowing nothing of the vital power of godliness. But the Dean in Theology would tell two young men that the miracles of grace which God has graciously wrought, partly through our humble ministry and through the ministry of the church as a whole, are to be accounted for by the withdrawal of satanic opposition!

What do our readers think of Dr. Farmer's "spirit"? What do our readers estimate would be the probable effect of this "spirit" upon the ministers of the future? Do not our readers agree with us that such "confidential" slander as is here revealed ought to be made public? No further comment is needed on the venerable Dean's remarks other than the words of Scripture:

"Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, in so much that the blind and dumb both spake and saw. And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judge. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.

Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."

OTHER PRIVATE CONVERSATIONS.

Following the foregoing we venture now to publish two other conversations. They were, it is true, "private" in the sense that they were not held in any public place. They were not, at the time, labelled "confidential," and inasmuch as they referred to public matters, under the present exigencies we believe we are abundantly justified in giving the facts to the Baptist public.

Before his appointment as Chairman, the present Chairman of the Board of Governors informed us that he had been approached by the then Chancellor urging him to accept the Chairmanship of the Board. He said that the Chancellor complained of the moribund condition of the Board of Governors. The gentleman who was then Chairman was very ill and unable to exercise the duties of his office, while other members of the Board seldom, if ever, attended. We recall that the gentleman in question informed us that the Chancellor said he envied the Home Mission Board its efficiency, it was so well organized, and its work was so thoroughly done. He had named certain men as not giving attention to the work of the Board of Governors; and then we distinctly recall that our friend reported the Chancellor as saying: "As for Dr. Sandersson: I don't know whether he has any God left or not."

The second conversation we had was with the Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board, who is also a member of the Board of Governors. After the former Chancellor had resigned and before his resignation had been made public, some time in the spring of 1922, we had an interview with the Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board because he was a member of a committee of the Board of Governors of McMaster University appointed to nominate a nominating committee to select a new Chancellor. We communicated to the Foreign Mission Board Chairman our anxiety about the future, and we said to him that hitherto our difficulty had been that we had had no one inside the University who would oppose its departure from the faith; and we expressed the opinion that if a strong man were selected as Chancellor, he would be able himself to keep order in his own house without making it necessary to disturb the whole Denomination in order to effect reform. To this we distinctly recall Mr. Moore said, "I am afraid McMaster University is past redemption." He then told us that for an extended period he had not even attended the meetings of the Board of Governors because he could not give it his unqualified support. He said they had approached him with a view to his acceptance of the Chairmanship of the Board, but he had declined the position for two reasons: one, that he did not feel he could give the University the financial leadership it would expect of one in that position; and secondly, that he could not give the institution his unreserved support. He said, however, he had compromised by promising to endeavour to attend the meetings of the Board more regularly. We told Mr. Moore that we did not believe McMaster University was "past redemption"; that all that was necessary was to change the personnel of the Board year by year, and the needed reforms could be effected. To this he replied that to accomplish such a change would involve such an upheaval that he feared men could not be found who would be willing to pay the price. We then said to him that if McMaster University did not mend her ways we felt sure another educational

institution would arise to serve the Baptist Denomination; perhaps, of necessity, in the beginning at least, on a very modest scale; and that if no one else took action, if things continued as they were now, we would endeavor to start such an institution ourselves. To this Mr. Moore replied, "I have sometimes thought, Dr. Shields, that salvation will come that way."

Reason for Action Before the Walmer Road Convention.

It was because of these two conversations we took action before the Walmer Road Convention of 1922. At the close of the Educational Session of that Convention we went to the Chairman of the Board of Governors who had himself nominated Dr. Sanderson for the position of Governor and reminded him of our conversation. He said that he distinctly recalled someone's having said to him that he did not know whether the gentleman in question had any God left or not, but he did not remember who had said it. I then asked him, "What is an honest man to do in view of your action this afternoon in supporting the candidature of the gentleman in question?" We then crossed the church to the north side and asked Mr. Moore if he recalled the conversation we had had with him in his office in which he expressed the view that McMaster University was past redemption, to which he replied in the affirmative. We then said to him, "What is an honest man to do in view of your course this afternoon? I may be wrong in my methods. I have only done the best I could because no one else would move at all. But are you justified, because you disagree with my methods, in sacrificing the principles involved?"

When we delivered an address in Jarvis Street Church Thursday, January 24th, 1924, on the action of McMaster University in conferring a degree on Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, we related the conversation we had had with Mr. Moore, omitting two items. We said that Mr. Moore had declined the Chairmanship of the Board for two reasons, but we named only one of them: we did not say that he did not feel like giving the financial leadership he felt would be expected of the Chairman. The other item we deliberately refrained from mentioning was in connection with our remark about the likelihood of another educational institution being started. We did not report in that public address that we had said, "If no one else starts one we will start one ourselves." Our address was in proof Monday morning, January 28th, as we had planned to go to press Monday night, in order that we might take copies with us to Montreal, where we had an engagement to speak in Point St. Charles Church, Wednesday, January 30th. We therefore sent a copy of the proof containing our report of our conversation with Mr. Moore to Mr. Moore by special messenger Monday afternoon, and with that copy the following letter:

Mr. S. J. Moore,
Royal Bank Building,
Toronto.

Dear Mr. Moore:

I have been informed that there appeared in one of the City papers last week some comment by yourself on that part of my address on Thursday evening last in which I referred to you. I have been unable to obtain a copy of any paper in which this interview appears.

I have been informed that your statement was to the effect that my remarks were a half-truth. I venture to enclose a copy of the stenographic report of that part of my address in which I referred to yourself. I freely admit that two items I deliberately omitted from my statement; but I should be perfectly willing to include them when the address is printed.

The two matters, as I recall them, were as follows: You will observe that I have said that you said there were two reasons why you declined the Chairmanship of the Board of Governors. I stated only one of the two reasons. The other, as I recall, was that you felt that you were not prepared to give to the Institution the financial leadership which would be expected of the Chairman of the Board: the other item was that I said another Baptist educational institution would probably arise,—

"Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
January 28th, 1924.

I added: "If no one else starts one I will start it myself". With these two exceptions, as I recall, my statement covers the whole ground covered by our conversation.

I am sending you the enclosed proof merely to ask two things; first, whether there is anything in my report of our conversation which, in your opinion, is contrary to fact; and secondly, whether you would prefer that I should add the two items which I deliberately omitted.

I am sending this letter by the hand of Mr. Fraser in the hope that it may be possible for you to give him a note in reply. My address will issue from the press to-morrow, and, as I desire to exercise the utmost care not to misrepresent anyone in the slightest degree, I should be favored if you could conveniently let me have a reply by Mr. Fraser.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) T. T. SHIELDS."

Monday night we had to speak at Mimico, and returned from Mimico directly to the printers'. After revising proof, at about three o'clock in the morning, we had an hour's respite from proof-reading and ran home for a little lunch. On arriving there we found the following letter from Mr. Moore, which had been delivered in the evening, awaiting us. We had to complete the proof-reading in order that *The Gospel Witness* might go to press the first thing in the morning, and we were unable to consult further with Mr. Moore at that hour; we therefore decided to delete our report of the conversation.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.,
Toronto.

"142 Jameson Avenue,
Toronto, Jan. 28th/24.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I am in receipt of your letter of this date, delivered by Mr. Fraser, with the enclosed proof-sheet. Your statement does not record the conversation I had with you in March of 1922 as I recall it, and certainly does not represent my views at the present time.

I regard your reporting the conversation as a breach of confidence, &, therefore the report should not be published. If it is published this letter should also be published with it.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) S. J. MOORE."

WHY PUBLISH IT NOW?

Things have gone from bad to worse in our Denomination, and it seems necessary now to give to the Baptist public these facts. Surely it shows that the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* is not the only one who has felt alarm on account of the present trend of things in McMaster University. It will show that we took our public stand only after we had vainly endeavored in private to move influential men to take action. Could we then be justified, in view of this knowledge, in sitting idly by and allowing Modernism to capture the University, and, through the University, the Denomination? Dr. Farmer's explanation of spiritual blessing in Jarvis Street, made to Messrs. Brown and Whitcombe, shows to what terrible lengths men will go, like the Pharisees of old, to buttress up a dead and decaying system. We publish these facts that we may put the responsibility upon the people of this Convention. They must decide for themselves whether they will be partners in this official surrender to Modernism.

CAN IT BE STIFLED IN COMMITTEE.

We have just received a report as we go to press that at the coming Convention a move will be made to appoint a committee to take the whole controversy out of the Convention, that it may be thus privately discussed and a report presented next year. We do not know whether this report is accurate or not, but as we mention no names in connection with it, we are justified in referring to what at least has been rumoured.

Would this be a wise plan? What would happen? The Committee would, of course, have to be composed of an equal number from both sides of the controversy, and that Committee would have to appoint a neutral Chairman. The Committee would then have a year to do its work. What would happen in the meantime? In the nature of the case, discussion of the subject would have to be suspended,—the whole matter to be *sub judice*. Meanwhile the false teaching would continue in McMaster University; the same wicked resolution would remain on the books of the Home Mission Board; of necessity, all our denominational funds would suffer; and we should reach the end of the year in a worse plight than we are at present.

We have a counter proposal to make. We approve of the appointment of a committee which would take the discussion of the whole matter out of the Convention, but it should be the business of that Committee to see that each side of the controversy should prepare a full statement of its case, each side, of course, being allowed equal space in which to state its case, and each side being allowed to prepare its case in its own way and by whomsoever it might appoint to do the work. These two statements should be published together in an official booklet by authority of the Committee. The Committee would then take steps to send that booklet to every church in the Convention in sufficient quantities for every individual member to receive a copy. Time should be given, ten or eleven months if necessary, for the careful study and discussion of the whole matter in the individual church. A certain date could then be set, covering a period, perhaps, of two weeks, within which time every church in the Convention should be brought together to vote upon the question and express its view. If thought wise the Committee could even prepare forms of resolution: one to the effect that the evidence supported McMaster's contention, and therefore it was deserving of the confidence of the Denomination; another, that the evidence supported the contention of those opposed to McMaster's course, and that therefore some change should be effected; and possibly a third form of resolution to the effect that the church was unable, with the evidence before it, to reach any verdict. All this, however, would be a matter of detail which the Committee could arrange.

If a majority of the members of the churches of the Convention should thus be found to endorse McMaster's present course, the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* would, under such conditions, pledge himself peacefully to withdraw from the Convention and continue his work as an independent Regular Baptist outside of the Convention. But we do not propose any such withdrawal until all the people have been given an opportunity, with all the evidence procurable before them, to pronounce upon the question in hand.

As for the reported proposal of a committee, we must frankly declare our opposition to it. This is a question for the rank and file of the members of our Denomination to decide.

DEAN CONDEMNS DISCIPLE DOCTRINE YET ALLOWS IT TO BE TAUGHT.

By Pastors W. S. Whitcombe and W. G. Brown, McMaster '25.

(This article also is copied from "The Prophet" of October 9th.—Ed. of "The Gospel Witness".)

One of the greatest mysteries of the present controversy is Dr. J. H. Farmer, the Dean of Theology of McMaster University. How a man who, in classroom and in public is absolutely orthodox, can support and defend others who are not, must remain an unsolved puzzle. Another example of the discrepancy between Dr. Farmer's belief and Dr. Farmer's practice is found in his sanctioning the establishment of a class in McMaster University to teach the doctrines of the people who are known as the "Disciples of Christ."

Negotiations with the Disciples Failed.

Dr. Farmer once asserted very strongly his opinion as to the teaching of this body. We remember the incident all the more clearly because Dr.

Farmer is not a man who is given to censuring those from whom he differs on matters of theology. The occasion was a class in New Testament Greek, of two years ago. In order to illustrate some passage which was under review, the Dean related to us his experience as a member of a committee appointed by the Convention to confer with the Disciples as to the possibility of bringing the two denominations together in some sort of union. He told how the joint committee had talked over a number of points and found themselves in agreement with one another. Dr. Farmer, however, felt that the real point at issue was being missed, and so he himself introduced the question of baptism. To make his point as clear and concrete as possible he asked the representatives of the "Disciples" what they would say about the salvation of a certain prominent paedo-Baptist who had just recently died. This man had been a sincere believer and of undisputed Christian character. Dr. Farmer asked the "Disciples" if they would say that this man was saved even though he had never been immersed. This they refused to do, since they believed that without being immersed it was impossible to be saved, and forthwith the negotiations were at an end.

View Differs from the Baptist.

The Dean then elaborated on the fact that a view of baptism, such as the "Disciples" hold, which makes immersion a prerequisite to salvation, has nothing in common with the Baptist view of salvation by faith alone, since their view makes salvation dependent on works.

After having expressed himself in such a way, how Dr. Farmer can turn around and sanction the very teaching which he condemned, by allowing it in the classrooms of McMaster, is more than we can understand.

LETTER FROM A SOUTHERN EDITOR.

The following letter received from Dr. J. W. Porter, of Lexington, Ky., is self-explanatory:

"248 South Hanover Avenue,
Lexington, Ky.
September 28/26.

My Dear Brother Shields:

I have just read article, 'Prof. L. H. Marshall's Position Summarized to Date'.

Please permit me to say, that if any given proposition can be proved, beyond the scintilla of a doubt, it has been proven that Prof. Marshall is a destructive critic of the rankest variety. Whatever comes of the fight, you have rendered a valuable service in 'smoking out' this unbeliever.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) J. W. PORTER."

ABOUT PROXY DELEGATES.

We have always taken the position that the practice, so long recognized in our Convention, of appointing proxy delegates, may easily lend itself to abuse. Personally we are opposed to it; and we are ready to support at any time at the Convention a motion requiring that churches shall appoint only their own members as delegates. The practice of appointing delegates was begun by the McMaster interests at the Guelph Convention in eighteen hundred and eighty-eight, at which time it was decided to establish McMaster University in Toronto. We understand that a very large part of that Convention was composed of proxies. Objection was taken to their voting, whereupon the Chair ruled that what the constitution does not prohibit it permits. An appeal was taken against the ruling of the Chair, and the Chair was upheld—naturally the proxies voted for themselves. It was by this means McMaster was established in Toronto instead of in Woodstock. From then until now whenever McMaster University has had a programme to get through the Convention she has resorted to the use of proxies. It was done on a wholesale

scale at the time of the great vote in Bloor Street Church in nineteen hundred and ten. Because we knew it was being done, before the nineteen twenty-four Convention we announced in *The Gospel Witness* our readiness to provide proxies for churches who could not send their own delegates. We did this only as a defensive measure. The question was raised some time at one of the Saturday Executive sessions of the nineteen twenty-four Convention as to whether the proxies supplied by Jarvis Street should be permitted to vote. We were told by a high official on the Executive that it was discovered that such action would throw the whole Convention into confusion. We smilingly replied that we should be glad to have our proxies disfranchised, for on that principle we should gain far more than we could lose. It was when it was discovered that there were far more proxies present in the interests of McMaster than in opposition that no action was taken against the proxies from Jarvis Street.

A very pious effort has been made to lay the responsibility for this matter upon Jarvis Street; but we have information that the most industrious campaign has been prosecuted endeavouring to get proxies from certain parts of the Convention. We know of one district where a Toronto pastor personally canvassed some of the smaller churches with this in view. We repeat we should be willing even at this Convention to support any motion that would abolish the practice for ever.

Since writing the above we have received information from a pastor, of a Toronto gentleman personally visiting a church, and persuading the church to authorize him to procure proxies—and this against the wish and influence of the Pastor. All that we have done in the matter of proxies we have done openly through this paper and from the public platform.

A MESSAGE TO JARVIS STREET HOSTS AND HOSTESSES.

The Billeting Committee has asked Jarvis Street Church to provide homes for forty delegates. This we ought to be able easily to do. The Convention opens Friday, the fifteenth; but the Baptist Bible Union of Ontario and Quebec will hold a pre-Convention conference beginning Thursday afternoon. We therefore ask all Jarvis Street people who will entertain visiting delegates, to open their homes for Thursday night, the fourteenth, and through to the end of the Convention, October twenty-first. All that is expected by any delegate will be bed and breakfast. We think it may be possible to provide tea on Thursday, and lunch on Friday in Jarvis Street for Baptist Bible Union delegates, but this we shall announce positively later.

Meanwhile, will all Jarvis Street people please accept this as a personal request: if you have a spare room you can command, to give your name to the church office—Elgin 3531—at the earliest possible date, saying how many you can billet, and whether men or women are preferred.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION PRE-CONVENTION CONFERENCE.

We publish below a communication sent to all members of the Baptist Bible Union of Ontario and Quebec. We hope that every member of the Baptist Bible Union will endeavour to attend, and especially such members as are delegates to the Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

THE ONTARIO BRANCH OF THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA.

Dear Fellow Member:

Toronto, October 2nd, 1926.

The Annual Meeting of the Ontario and Quebec Branch of the Baptist Bible Union of North America will be held in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Thursday and Friday, October 14th and 15th.

This meeting promises to be one of great interest and profitable inspiration to all. Every member is urged to be present whether you are a delegate to

the Convention or not. If you find it impossible to attend, and you are acquainted with the delegates appointed by your church, urge them to come one day earlier than the Convention, in order to attend the Baptist Bible Union meeting.

Please explain to delegates that it is not necessary for them to be members of the Baptist Bible Union to attend these sessions.

The hostesses of Toronto are being requested to extend their hospitality for the extra day to delegates wishing to attend the Bible Union meetings on Thursday. Others will be expected to arrange for their own entertainment.

We solicit your earnest prayers for this Conference, and the regular Convention sessions which follow.

Faithfully yours,

CLIFFORD J. LONEY, Pres.
W. E. ATKINSON, Sec'y.

PROGRAMME.

THURSDAY.

- 2.00 p.m. Opening Address: Rev. W. J. H. Brown—
"PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S THEOLOGY."
3.00 p.m. Prayer and Conference, followed by General Discussion.
7.15 p.m. Prayer and Praise.
3.00 p.m. Address: Dr. T. T. Shields—
"McMASTER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MODERNISM."
9.00 p.m. Conference and Discussion.

FRIDAY.

- 9.30 a.m. Address: Mr. Thomas Urquhart—
"THE EDUCATIONAL CONTROL OF DENOMINATIONAL BOARDS."
10.30 a.m. Prayer and Conference, followed by General Discussion.
2.00 p.m. Address: Rev. Morley Hail—
"THE HOME MISSION BOARD'S, INTOLERABLE RESOLUTION."
3.00 p.m. Prayer and Conference.

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

Last Sunday was another day of blessing. In the morning the Pastor preached from the text, "The Lord sat as King at the Flood". This sermon will be printed later. Twelve responded to the invitation.

The attendance at the Bible School was eleven hundred and ninety-two.

In the evening the Pastor preached to a great congregation on the Ordinances. Baptism was administered, but the service was very brief. More than seven hundred and fifty remained to the Communion Service, at which the Pastor gave the hand of fellowship to a number of new members.

BAPTISTS PLAN GATHERING OF 20,000 AT CHICAGO.

Work for Convention in May and June Starts.

By the Rev. W. B. Norton.

Editorial Note: The following article is from "The Chicago Tribune":

A gathering of 20,000 delegates in the Coliseum and annex is the plan of the Baptist Northern Convention which will meet in Chicago for eight days, beginning May 30.

Dr. Johnston Myers, pastor for many years of Immanuel Baptist Church, at 23rd Street and Michigan Avenue, now pastor emeritus, has been elected executive secretary. He has been authorized to devote all of his time to promoting the Convention.

Dr. Myers will visit the State Conventions and the various ministerial bodies in the 35 states which compose the Northern Convention. He hopes to induce entire congregations to come to Chicago with their pastors.

Dr. Myers and the other leaders declared the Convention will be the largest demonstration ever undertaken by Baptists in America.

J. L. Kraft is the chairman of the general committee on entertainment. C. J. Howell is chairman of the finance committee. The Rev. H. W. Virgin, D.D., pastor of the North Shore Baptist Church, is the chairman of publicity. The Rev. J. Whitcomb Brougher, Pasadena, Cal., is president of the Baptist Northern Convention, and expects to spend a month in Chicago and vicinity in promoting the work incident to the May meeting.

"We are planning to make this great gathering a harmony Convention," said Dr. Virgin. "The Convention which elected Dr. Brougher president last year was a harmony Convention as compared with recent previous Conventions, and the resolutions adopted were known as harmony resolutions. Our programme this time will be so inspirational we expect the fundamentalist-modernist controversy will be forgotten in trying to do big things for the kingdom of God."

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 4.

Lesson 5.

Fourth Quarter.

October 31st, 1926.

THE WASHING OF THE DISCIPLES' FEET.

Lesson Text: John, chapter 13. To be studied in harmony with lesson text:

Matt. 26: 21-35; Mark 14: 18-31; Luke 22: 21-38.

Golden Text.—"Ye call Me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am" (John 13: 13).

I. JESUS WASHES HIS DISCIPLES' FEET.

1. His foreknowledge is emphasized (vs. 1); and He is shown as seeing every step of the path in advance, and as loving His own even to the end. 2. The washing of feet was a service common to Eastern countries, a necessary but menial task. 3. Peter's reverent objection to the Lord's condescension and its sequel. He felt himself unworthy to receive such service until Jesus said, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me". The truth is, of course, Christ's washing of His disciples' feet was nothing in comparison with His condescension in taking away our sins. In this He stooped to become the sinner's Scavenger, and no one can have any part with [Him] who is not washed by Him. 4. "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet". Obviously the meaning was that the feet only, because soiled with the dust to travel, needed to be washed. Thus we do not need to be cleansed for the same sin more than once: we need to confess sin but once, but sins must often be acknowledged. The sinner's sin, in its entirety, is taken away the moment he believes, but individual sins are cleansed as they are confessed. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins". 5. Our Lord cites this act of His as an example, but we are not surely to understand, as some have done, that feet-washing is here instituted as an ordinance. There is nothing in the New Testament to show that it was so regarded by the Apostles, or even practised by them. Once the washing of the saints' feet is referred to as an evidence of piety; but we understand this incident to teach that we are to condescend to the most menial task, if that be necessary, to serve each other.

II. THE PREDICTION OF CHRIST'S BETRAYAL.

1. Again His full and perfect knowledge is exhibited, not only foreknowledge but omniscience (vss. 18-30). The idea that Christ was limited in His knowledge, as were His contemporaries, finds no support in Scripture. 2. Judas' betrayal of Christ was prophesied in the Scripture (vs. 18); and the Scripture was fulfilled. Nothing will strengthen a young believer's conviction of the Divine inspiration of Scripture like a careful study of the Word with a view to seeing how the Scripture fulfils itself. 3. Such confirmation

of faith was designed by our Lord. It was for this purpose He told them before it came to pass (vs. 19). 4. His knowledge of the particular person who was to betray Him, in contrast with the utter ignorance respecting this matter of the disciples (vss. 28, 29) is significant. See also John 6: 70, 71. It should be recognized that Judas had behaved himself so circumspectly that not one of the disciples ever suspected him of treachery. 5. The light which this chapter throws on the action of Judas is full of instruction: (1) The devil "put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray Him"; he made the suggestion; he instigated the idea, just as he did with the woman in the garden (Gen. 3: 1). (2) After the sop Satan entered into him (vs. 27). This is illustrative of the progress of evil. The mind that entertains the devil's suggestions will soon offer hospitality to the devil himself. (3) When Judas turned his back on the Light of the world, and "went immediately out" (vs. 30), "it was night". And they who thus "observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy" (Jon. 2: 8). To turn one's back upon Christ means to go into "outer darkness".

III. A FURTHER REVELATION OF CHRIST'S OMNISCIENCE.

1. He predicts His soon departure (vss. 31-33). 2. He gives a new commandment (vs. 34). 3. In the face of Peter's bold resolve (vs. 37), He not only predicts his denial before the cock shall crow (vs. 38), but also, by implication, his full restoration and glorious martyrdom "afterwards" (vs. 36).

The Gospel Witness

One dollar per year to all new subscribers during 1926. (Regular subscription, \$2.00 per year). This paper contains weekly a sermon by the Editor, an exposition of the Whole Bible Sunday School Course, and Editorial matter dealing especially with the battle between Fundamentalism and Modernism. (\$1.50 in Toronto).

Special Offer

A Volume of Sermons by Dr. Shields entitled "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man", being a series of eight sermons on Luke 15, The Prodigal and his Brother, will be sent with "The Gospel Witness" for one year for one dollar and a half.

Send your subscription to:

The Gospel Witness

130 Gerrard Street East - - Toronto 2, Canada