

THIS ISSUE 10 CENTS PER COPY

# 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. 23.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 14, 1926.

Whole No. 233

## The Tragic Story of McMaster's Drift Toward Modernism

### *The Purpose of This Issue*

We have endeavored to bring together in one number of *The Gospel Witness* the salient points in the indictment against McMaster's Modernism. We believe our readers will appreciate having it put together in this form. The index has been prepared with a view to rendering the material accessible for purposes of quotation.

*See Index pp. 50-51.*

**TO OUR NON-CANADIAN READERS.**

The Convention of Ontario and Quebec will meet in Toronto October 15th to 21st. This Convention will witness probably the greatest conflict for the "faith once for all delivered" ever known in this country. We are confident that God is with us, and whatever the Convention vote may be, the result will be victory for the truth.

This issue is wholly occupied with Canadian affairs; notwithstanding we think it will be of interest to all our readers, for it will give them some idea of the intensity of this Canadian battle for the Book. Moreover, the principles operating in this conflict are the same as those which operate everywhere, for the war is one, although battles are fought on many fronts. We hope in a week or two to be free to give space to happenings in the United States and elsewhere. We do not think we need to ask our readers to be patient, but rather to join with us in prayer.

**CIRCULATE THIS ISSUE.**

An abundant supply of copies of this issue can be obtained at *The Gospel Witness* office, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto. It has cost a lot of money to publish this issue, and we think our Toronto readers, at least, who get extra copies, will not begrudge 10c. a copy. But we put no price on it, for we are chiefly anxious to have it circulated, particularly among the delegates of the Convention. In the Convention church the Book Room will be operating, and every opportunity will be afforded to disseminate information respecting the other side of the controversy, but we assume no opportunity will be given for the distribution of *The Gospel Witness*. We therefore ask every sympathetic reader to join with us in our effort to give the widest possible circulation to this number.

**GOSPEL WITNESS FINANCES.**

The work of *The Gospel Witness* has been carried on as a venture of faith from the beginning. Since last Convention we have been at enormous expense publishing the larger issues necessary to give information to our people. One brother, a day or so ago, anticipating the cost of this issue, sent us a cheque for \$25.00. We shall appreciate the co-operation of all our friends throughout the world in the great battle in which we are engaged. To be relieved of all anxiety respecting printers' bills will, of course, be of great assistance; but more than their money, we covet the sympathy and prayers of our readers.

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF BAPTISTS.**

The following letter will explain itself. At this writing, no reply has been received:

Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto.  
October 6th, 1926.

Rev. C. E. MacLeod,  
Secretary, Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec,  
223 Church St., Toronto.

Dear Mr. MacLeod:

As it is practically certain that the First Avenue Church will not be large enough to accommodate some of the sessions of the Convention, I have been instructed by the Pastor and Deacons to offer your Executive the use of Jarvis Street building for any part of the Convention period.

We have every accommodation necessary for large Conventions, and the entire building is at the disposal of the Executive for the period of the Convention.

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) VIOLET STOAKLEY.

# McMaster's Drift Toward Modernism

## JOSHUA'S COVENANT WITH THE GIBEONITES.

"Then there was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year; and David enquired of the Lord. And the Lord answered, It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites."—II Samuel 21: 1. When Joshua led the people of the Lord into the land of Canaan, such great victories were wrought by their hands that the fear of them and the dread of them fell upon all the nations roundabout. And one day certain people approached him, a band of them, and he asked them whence they came. They said they had come from a far country. They said that they had brought their dough in their kneading troughs, and now, because of the distance they had travelled, it had become mouldy; their sandals were worn; their clothing was worn—they presented to him all the evidence to prove that they had come a long distance. They said that they had hastened to meet him because they were afraid of him, and they therefore proposed that he should make a covenant with them, permitting them to live, a covenant that he would not visit them with judgment as he had done the other nations of Canaan. So Joshua, believing all that they had said to be true, made a covenant with them that he would spare them, and respect their territory; but when the covenant had been made and ratified, he discovered that they were men from Gibeon near by, that they had not come a long journey, and that they belonged to that company which had been appointed to destruction. But he respected his oath; he had made the covenant, therefore, he told them that he would abide by it; and they were made hewers of wood and drawers of water unto the people of Israel.

### An Ancient Truce Breaker.

Perhaps about four hundred years afterwards Saul visited the Gibeonites with vengeance, he had slain many of them. Later, when David succeeded to the throne, the country was visited for three successive years with a severe famine; and, according to divine direction in such cases, David enquired of the Lord to know the cause of the famine. The Lord answered from heaven, "It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites", thus showing that there is a very close connection between the physical and the moral realms; that the violation of the moral law inevitably brings physical results; and though four hundred years had fled, and the body of Joshua had long since returned to the dust, and successive generations had passed, that covenant remained; and because Saul, as the representative of the nation, violated the terms of that agreement, the country was visited with famine.

In our day we have seen something of the results which follow the practice of treating a solemn covenant as nothing more than "a scrap of paper."

There is scarcely a theological institution in the land—I do not know of one Baptist theological seminary—that was not established by orthodox people; they were endowed by those who believed the faith once for all delivered to the saints. But it is common now for men to say, "We will not consent to be

ruled by a dead hand". Someone, a hundred years ago, or fifty years ago, or less, left some money for the propagation of the principles of the gospel—but they are dead and others think they have improved upon the faith of the fathers, and they propose now to take the proceeds of that estate, of that endowment, and use it for the propagation of that which is absolutely destructive of the thing it was designed to establish. And that is supposed to be ethically sound!

I disagree with men who are Unitarians, but I can respect them as men when they openly avow their Unitarianism and propagate their principles at Unitarian expense. I would contend for the freedom of a Unitarian, for the liberty of a Roman Catholic—I do not agree with them, but I believe in absolute liberty of conscience; and I believe a man must answer to God, and to God only in these matters. If he is wrong, he must give an account of himself to God. But if anyone wants to build a Unitarian college, he has a right to do it; if he wants to build a Unitarian church, he has a right so to do—I am sorry for him, I believe he needs a missionary, but I regard him at least as a straightforward man, as one who is not afraid to let the world know what he believes. But when Unitarianism endeavours to get possession of orthodox institutions, or when Modernism of any degree—for there are degrees of Modernism—I say, when this thing tries to take possession of orthodox institutions, and lays its sacrilegious hand upon property solemnly dedicated to the propagation of the principles of the gospel, I think it is time we call it by its proper name and declare it to be sheer theft; it is not ethically sound.

#### The Strange Ethics of Modernism.

A very agreeable young man, a former student of McMaster University, now of the University of Chicago, called one day to see me. He had entirely given up belief in any kind of supernaturalism,—he did not consider he had lost his faith, but that he had found a larger liberty. And he told me he had been brought to this position while a student in McMaster University, through his attendance at one or two conferences of the Student Christian Movement held outside of the University. He declared it to be his belief that inasmuch as his more liberal position had introduced him to a fuller liberty, it was his duty to communicate his liberalism to others. He expressed the view that in such circumstances a man would be perfectly justified in obtaining a position in a conservative institution, and in using that position to propagate his liberalism. I asked him if, entertaining his present views, it would be possible for him to accept a position on the staff of McMaster, whether he could subscribe to the articles of faith; he said that that would be rather a lot to have to swallow and he would rather not be asked to do it, but that if he could obtain an understanding with the head of the Institution, with certain mental reservations, he thought he could manage to justify his taking a position, even in McMaster. He could see nothing unfair or unethical in such a course; he seemed to have been taught to believe that such a course would, indeed, be the path of duty.

People should know something of this strange attitude of mind, for it is the prevalence of that idea which compels some of us to be cautious.

#### The Lord Jesus Was a Controversialist.

Much objection is taken in some quarters to religious controversy in general, but I would remind you that the gospel is the King's word to a rebellious

world; you cannot preach the gospel faithfully without controversy, because God has a controversy with every man: "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." Our Lord was Himself a controversialist, His whole public ministry was spent in controversy, in battling with the world, the flesh, and the devil; and because His ministry was so unacceptable with men, His controversy issued in the cross of Calvary.

#### The Gospel Essentially Controversial.

The Acts of the Apostles show that the church was founded in controversy, the apostolic ministers declared that the Jesus Who had been crucified was not dead but alive, and had been made Lord of all; and when the apostles preached the resurrection, the religious leaders said, "Ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us." The apostolic preachers were described as men who "turned the world upside down", as those who "exceedingly trouble the city". God's messengers have always been troublers of sinful men, for the whole message of the gospel, in the very nature of the case, is a controversial one. The New Testament preachers argued their case, they disputed in various schools,—and all because they had authority from God. The greater part of the New Testament was born in controversy; most of the epistles were written to set somebody right.

Now error is bad enough anywhere, but when it finds a place inside the church it becomes doubly necessary to deal with it. Personally, I am against burglars and burglary, on principle; but if the burglar comes into my own house, I should find myself compelled to take a very personal interest in his operations! And so, when error comes into the church of which we are members, or into the Denomination to which we belong, when it seeks to use our very institutions to destroy the things we believe, only a contemptible coward can remain silent.

#### Should One Resort to "Personalities"?

Again and again we have heard it said that we ought not to indulge in personalities. We do well in this connection to enquire, What was the apostolic method? Hear this, for example: "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare; holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning the faith have made shipwreck: of whom is HYMENAEUS AND ALEXANDER; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme!" And here is another word: "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is HYMENAEUS and PHILETUS; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." Again Paul says, "DEMAS hath forsaken me, having loved this present world." And again, "ALEXANDER the coppersmith did me much evil." Even the beloved disciple, John himself, observes this same principle in one of his epistles: "I wrote unto the church: but DIOTREPHES, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them

that would, and casteth them out of the church." And you are familiar with the incident in the epistle to the Galatians where Paul says, "But when PETER was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."

#### Who Are the Chief Sinners?

The fact is, it is not possible to deal with principles in the abstract,—but if it be wrong to deal in personalities, then surely in this controversy we are not the only wrong-doers; for so far as McMaster University is concerned, ever since the Ottawa Convention, it has conducted a campaign of personal abuse and vilification all through the Convention.

*Note:* The foregoing is taken from a sermon preached Sunday evening, October 10th; what follows is written especially for *The Gospel Witness*.

#### An Attempt to Prevent Personalities.

Recognizing the difficulty involved in contending against the errors of a particular person, while certain Chairs in McMaster University were still vacant we wrote as follows:

"Prevention is better than cure! When once a professor has been appointed, if his position is discovered to be unsound, it is impossible to raise opposition to his teaching without introducing personal considerations. In this article we are not discussing unsound professors but vacant Chairs, and dealing with principles in the abstract. It is to avoid the necessity of holding discussions involving persons this article has been written. We respectfully suggest to the Senate and Board of Governors that the utmost care should be exercised in even considering men to fill the vacancies referred to, to see that they are in cordial agreement with the great doctrines of supernatural Evangelical Christianity."

### OUR PROTEST TO THE SENATE

When it came to my knowledge that the Rev. L. H. Marshall, of Coventry, England, had been appointed to a Chair in McMaster, and when certain information reached me respecting Mr. Marshall's theological position, I felt it my duty to communicate such information as I had received to the Senate. In order to avoid all misunderstanding, I wrote in advance what I had to say to the Senate. My communication, which was presented to a meeting of the Senate of McMaster University held September 24th, 1925, was as follows:

"Toronto, September 4, 1925.

"To the Senate of McMaster University,

"Dear Brethren:

"With much reluctance I feel it to be my duty to lay before the Senate a communication which has reached me from England, relative to the appointment of Rev. H. T. Marshall, of Coventry, to the Faculty of McMaster University. And before doing so, I desire to put on record a copy of a telegram sent to the Registrar of the University from Los Angeles, California, July 13th, 1925, which was as follows:

"Mr. E. J. Bengough,  
Registrar, McMaster University,  
Toronto, Ontario.

"Notice Senate Meeting received to-day. Confident Convention would not approve any important action such as filling vacant professorships at emergency meeting called midsummer when some Convention-elected representatives known so far away make attendance impossible. Desire as such representative respectfully lodge protest against important action under such circumstances.

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS."

"I am aware that meetings of the Senate cannot be arranged to suit the convenience of all; but this telegram was sent in order that the

Senate might know that this important meeting was called when it was physically impossible for some elected representatives of the Convention to be present.

"The communication to which I refer has come to me without any solicitation. I was interested in the report of Mr. Marshall's appointment; and was hoping that the gentleman selected would be as much in accord with the views of the Convention as was the last appointee who was brought from across the water, Professor H. S. Curr. I made no effort to ascertain Mr. Marshall's position, and held no communication with anyone in England.

I have before me two letters: the first was addressed directly to a member of a Baptist church within the Convention; the second letter came to the same gentleman indirectly, and in response to someone's enquiry. I was out of the city at this time, and had no knowledge whatever of any enquiry respecting Mr. Marshall's position having been made.

"The first letter, addressed directly to the Toronto Baptist referred to, is as follows:

'17 Amphyll Road, Liverpool, August 19th, 1925.

'Dear Sir:

I am at present on holiday in Wales and have just learned of the appointment to the staff of McMaster University of Rev. H. T. Marshall, late of Princess Gate Church, Liverpool, and now of Coventry. I understand you are in a position to make your influence felt and I trust that even yet it may not be too late. Mr. Marshall is a Modernist and of entirely different stamp to Rev. Henry S. Curr whose place he is to take. The church of which he was pastor here is open membership. A few pointed questions on Inspiration, bodily Resurrection of Christ would reveal his position. I learn from Rev. Hughes, of Toronto, now in this country, that a fight has already taken place over Modernism at McMaster; and if this appointment is confirmed, Modernism has gained a great victory. Please pardon my writing, but knowing the facts I could not but let you know.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. M. ROBERTSON.

"The second letter, which is a reply to someone's enquiry, is in the following terms:

'Liverpool, August 19th, 1925.

'Dear Sir:

'Your letter to hand. The church at Princes Gate, Liverpool, of which Rev. Marshall was for some time pastor, is an open membership church. I cannot say as to his Coventry charge. He is a Modernist trained in all the arts of the Germans and his appointment in the place of Rev. Henry S. Curr, M.A., B.D., at McMaster is nothing short of a calamity. When I saw the announcement of his appointment I marvelled greatly, and sincerely hope that something may yet be done to frustrate such a colossal blunder. Let a few pointed questions in fundamentals be put to him and the position will be made clear.

'Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) W. M. ROBERTSON.

"I beg the Senate's leave to offer a few observations respecting these communications. In the first place, it will be obvious to all that it would be unfair to pass any judgment upon Mr. Marshall's theological position on the basis of either of these letters. I would call the Senate's attention to the fact that no word spoken or written by Mr. Marshall is quoted: we have only an opinion of a minister who laboured with Mr. Marshall in the same city. Everyone will agree that Mr. Marshall should be allowed to speak for himself. On the other hand, I would venture to point out that when such a communication is brought to the attention of the Senate bearing the name of a responsible and recognized Baptist minister who charges that Mr. Marshall 'is a modernist trained in all the arts of the Germans'; and that his appointment to McMaster is nothing

short of a calamity; and who expresses the hope 'that something may yet be done to frustrate such a colossal blunder', this Senate, charged to direct the teaching of a University owned and supported by a Denomination holding the strong evangelical position to which our Convention has repeatedly, by resolution, committed itself,—I say, in view of all these things, this Senate cannot afford to ignore such a communication as is here presented.

"My only desire is to safeguard the Denomination against the possibility of admitting to the teaching staff of the University one whose views are at variance with the things commonly believed among us; and in order that there may be no necessity for any public agitation on this subject, I respectfully ask the Senate to take such steps as will obviate the possibility of a mistake being made in this matter. It would seem to me to be a reasonable suggestion either that Mr. Marshall should come before the Senate, and that permission should be given to all members to question him touching the subject represented by these letters; or, otherwise, that a committee of the Senate should be appointed to interview Mr. Marshall with the same end in view.

"In the event of this report of Mr. Marshall's position being proved to be without foundation, and if from this own lips we learn that he is true to the faith once for all delivered, it will be my great pleasure to do everything in my power to make his ministry in this University a success.

"I venture respectfully to submit this matter to the judgment of the Senate.

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS."

#### No Public Word Was Spoken.

I neither spoke nor wrote a word about Mr. Marshall until this communication had been submitted to the Senate. The letters which had come to my hand were written by the pastor of the largest Baptist church in the city of Liverpool, a man of considerable influence in the Denomination; but at the time I received the letters I knew nothing whatever about him. But as we had had so much trouble in the Convention over educational matters, and as it appeared that we had reached an agreement at last at the London Convention, I determined not to say another word publicly until every effort had been made to dispose with this new difficulty in a private way. The Convention now knows how my communication to the Senate was received. One might have supposed that however baseless the rumours respecting Mr. Marshall's orthodoxy might ultimately prove to be, a wise Chancellor would at least have endeavoured to avoid further contention. But when admissions of the Dean in Theology respecting Mr. Marshall's appointment had been made, and I saw that the matter was far more serious than Mr. Robertson's letters had suggested, and when the Senate absolutely refused my suggestion that the appointment of Mr. Marshall be re-examined, there was nothing for me to do but to carry my appeal to the higher court—the court of the people, and to lay my case before our Baptist brotherhood. The responsibility for the publicity given to the Marshall matter must rest solely with the Chancellor and the Senate.

#### DR. FARMER'S ALARMING STATEMENT.

I felt convinced of the unwisdom of Professor Marshall's appointment when I heard Dr. Farmer in the Senate say that Professor Marshall held what might be known as the Driver view. I said in the Senate at the time that the remarks of the Dean in Theology respecting Professor Marshall's position gave me far more concern than the letters from England; and I asked the Dean at the time if he thought our Canadian Baptist people would approve the appointment of a man holding such views. It cannot be expected, however, that the rank and file



of our people would have any intelligent idea of what was involved in the Driver view, for it is not possible for the average man to keep himself informed on such technical matters. At this point, therefore, for the information of the rank and file we give the following illustrations of some of the implications of Dr. Driver's view:

### THE DRIVER VIEW.

What is the Driver or moderate critical view of the Old Testament? Let us answer in the words of Dr. Orr:

"Its distinctive and most plausible feature is the theory of THE THREE CODES—viz., the Book of the Covenant, the Deuteronomic, and the Priestly Codes—assumed to correspond with successive periods of the history. The Levitical Code, assigned by the Bible to Moses, is post-exilic. The order of 'Levites' takes its origin from the 'degraded priests' of Ezek. XLIV."

The Driver view is that the Hexateuch (the first six books of the Bible) is a composite: that the first five books were not written by Moses, but that their contents were obtained from several sources cleverly woven together. Dr. Farmer said in the meeting of the Senate as recorded in the minutes of that body:

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

#### Rev. John Linton's Speech.

That a great many of the delegates did not understand what was involved in dates and authorship is evident from the following extract from the stenographic report of Mr. Linton's speech during the progress of the debate:

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

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

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

THE VICE-MODERATOR: Order.

REV. MR. LINTON: dates and authorship.

SOME DELEGATES: That is right.

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

### The Bearing of "Authorship and Dates" on the Authority of Scripture.

For illustration of the bearing of this problem of authorship and dates upon the inspiration and authority of Scripture, we shall refer to what is known as the Priestly Code, usually represented by the letter "P". We select the most simple illustration: the twelfth chapter of Exodus in the main is supposed to be taken from "P". This is the Passover chapter, directly related to the closing days of our Lord's ministry, and to the whole scheme of redemption. Again, the twenty-fifth to thirty-first chapters of Exodus belong to the Priestly Code. These chapters record the reception by Moses of the divine direction given in the mount for the building of the tabernacle, and the setting up of the priesthood. Leviticus the sixteenth chapter bears upon the great Day of Atonement. The Scriptures we have referred to are, of course, only a very small part of the Priestly Code. The New Testament, as we shall later see, regards these chapters as an integral part of Moses' writing, and as describing the source of the pattern for the tabernacle and the priesthood, as given to Moses in the mount. But what does Dr. Driver teach respecting the date of the Priestly Code:

"The earlier criticism of the Pentateuch was mostly literary; and literary criteria, though they enable us to effect the analysis of a document into its component parts, do not always afford decisive evidence as to the date to which the component parts are severally to be assigned. A comparison of P, both in its historical and legal sections, with the other Hexateuchal sources, with other parts of the O. T., brings to light facts which seem to show that, though the elements which it embodies originated themselves, in many cases, at a much earlier age, it is itself the latest of the sources of which the Hexateuch is composed, and *belongs approximately to the period of the Babylonian captivity.*" (Emphasis ours.) (*Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 136.)

Among "the distinctive institutions of P" Dr. Driver enumerates "the Day of Atonement, the Jubilee year, the Levitical cities, the Sin-offering, the system of sacrifices prescribed for particular days", (*ibid* p. 137).

It will thus be seen that that large section of the Pentateuch which relates to the Passover, the Tabernacle, the Sin-offering, the Priesthood, the Day of Atonement, which the New Testament writers unquestionably attributed to Moses, was not written until nearly a thousand years after Moses' death. The pattern for the tabernacle and the sin offerings was not received by Moses in the mount, but copied from the pagan worship of Babylon. Thus, the Pentateuch, bearing Moses' name is not what on every page it purports to be, the work of Moses, but is a forgery written nearly a thousand years after Moses was dead, to which the name of Moses was attached apparently to give it authority. Certain modernists are adopting the same principle when they dare to attach the names of men like Spurgeon and Dr. John A. Broadus, and in some quarters D. L. Moody, to their soul-destroying heresies.

### The Effect Upon the New Testament.

The question now arises, What bearing has all this upon the New Testament in general, and the doctrines of the gospel in particular? In first Corinthians the fifth chapter and the seventh verse, Paul says, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us". The Apostle Paul evidently regarded such passages as literal history, (see 1 Cor. 10: 1-11) declaring, "All these things happened unto them for types: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." The Epistle to the Hebrews is a New Testament commentary upon the Priestly Code. For example, in the eighth chapter, fourth

and fifth verses, "There are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount". But according to Dr. Driver Moses was never admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle, for he never saw a pattern in the mount. Furthermore, in Hebrews, chapter nine, reference is made to the tabernacle and to the law governing the day of atonement; and, referring to the fact that the high priest went into the second sanctuary, that is within the veil, only "once every year, not without blood" the writer says, "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." **THE DRIVER VIEW WOULD DESTROY THE VERY FOUNDATION UPON WHICH THIS TEACHING RESTS, AND WOULD INVALIDATE THE ENTIRE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.**

#### Driver's View in Relation to Authority of Christ.

What bearing has the Driver view, in its relation particularly to the Priestly Code, upon the authority of Christ? In Matthew twenty-six, verses seventeen to thirty, Mark fourteen, verses twelve to twenty-six, Luke twenty-two, verses seven to twenty-three, our Lord manifestly believed that that which was typically prophesied in the Passover, was fulfilled in Himself. But the Driver view would utterly destroy the foundation of the Old Testament priesthood, and, therefore, of the priesthood of Christ Himself. In short, "*the moderate critical view*" respecting authorship and dates invalidates the entire Old Testament Scriptures, and by thus destroying the root, it destroys the New Testament as well. To any logically constituted mind the Driver view leaves us without a Bible at all. As Dr. Leander S. Keyser, the able Lutheran Professor, says:

"Before me lies Dr. S. R. Driver's 'Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament' . . . we find only one reference to Divine inspiration . . . it is in the preface. All the rest consists of criticism, hair-splitting refinements, discussions of 'human sources', 'traditions', 'discrepancies', 'variations' . . . When the Book of Genesis recites events as if they were actual history *the critics of the Driver School declare that they were not history but mostly myths, legends, folk lore, and tradition invented and composed by writers long centuries afterward.* . . . *Will not the question of date and authorship affect the fact?* . . . We have not aimed to answer Dr. Driver's contentions and discrepancies; that has been done with ample scholarship and effectiveness by Robertson, Green, Orr, Bartlett, Redpath, Watson, Lins, Moeller, Wiener and many others. Dr. Driver's critical methods do, in spite of his assertions to the contrary, nullify the inspiration of the Old Testament and that is the chief reason why we are opposed to these methods; by a logical process they would practically destroy the evangelical faith."

#### QUOTATIONS FROM DRIVER.

The following quotations from Dr. Driver's "*Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*" show that he removes Christ as an authority respecting the authorship and dates of the different parts of the Old Testament:

"He accepted, as the basis of His teaching, the opinions respecting the Old Testament current around Him: He assumed, in His allusions to it, the premises which His opponents recognized, and which could not have been questioned (even had it been necessary to question them) without raising issues for which the time was not yet ripe, and which had they been raised, would have interfered seriously with the paramount purpose of His life. There is no record of the question, whether a particular portion of the Old Testament was written by Moses, or David, or Isaiah, having been ever submitted to Him; and had it been so submitted, we have no means of knowing what His answer would have been."

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

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

Of Jonah's prayer he says:

The Psalm (Jonah 2: 2-9) is not strictly appropriate to Jonah's situation at the time; for it is not a petition for deliverance to come, but a thanksgiving for deliverance already accomplished (like Ps. 30, for instance). Hence, no doubt, the book of Jonah was not its original place; but it was taken by the author from some prior source.

On Psalm 110 Dr. Driver says:

"This Psalm, though it may be ancient, can hardly have been composed by David. If read without proejudicium, it produces the irresistible impression of having been written, not by a king with reference to an invisible, spiritual Being, standing above him as his superior, but by a prophet with reference to the theocratic king."

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

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

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

Now, we are not responsible for attributing this view to Mr. Marshall. This is what Dean Farmer says.

### McMASTER AND PROF. MARSHALL.

We shall have occasion to refer to the various speeches made during the course of the debate at the Convention in Hamilton, but we come now to ask the question,

Is Professor Marshall a Modernist?

We cannot do better than begin with his own confession of faith.

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; I believe in the deity of Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord; I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and the final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour; I believe in the virgin birth; I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God; I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave—remember that—in the empty grave on the first Easter morn. I have already testified on that point. I believe that Jesus ever liveth to be the inspiration of all his followers. I am a fundamentalist in the New Testament sense of the term. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And nobody in the wide, wide world shall ask any other fundamentalism of me. I believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God from Genesis to Revelation; I believe in the life hereafter, as the trust deed says, both for the just and the unjust; I believe in the necessity of conversion, in the need of people being born again."

#### Modernism's "Weasel-Words".

Before analyzing this confession of faith, it is necessary to remember that Modernism has appropriated the language of orthodoxy. Such words as "inspiration", "divinity", "deity", "vicarious", "atonement", "redemption", "resurrection", and many others, are often heard from modernist lips, but a careful analysis of their speech will show that they empty these words of all their evangelical content, and use them to express ideas which sometimes are exactly opposite to those which they originally contain. Like the Jews of Nehemiah's day, who had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon and of Moab, and whose children could not speak in the Jewish language without using speech which was half of Ashdod, so modernists put a Philistine content into the speech of a spiritual Israel. Once there was a day when at least a part of Professor Marshall's confession of faith would have been accepted without further enquiry, but it cannot be so accepted now.

#### THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

Let us take the first clause.

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; I believe in the deity of Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord;"

As illustrating the need for caution, let us see what Professor J. Gresham Machen, in his *"Christianity and Liberalism"*, pp. 109-112, has to say:

The liberal preacher, it may be said, is often ready to speak of the "deity" of Christ; he is often ready to say that "Jesus is God". The plain man is much impressed. The preacher, he says, believes in the deity of our Lord; obviously then his unorthodoxy must concern only details; and those who object to his presence in the Church are narrow and uncharitable heresy-hunters.

But unfortunately language is valuable only as the expression of thought. The English word "God" has no particular value in itself; it is not more beautiful than other words. Its importance depends altogether upon the meaning which is attached to it. When, therefore, the liberal preacher says that "Jesus is God", the significance of the utterance depends altogether upon what is meant by "God."

And it has already been observed that when the liberal preacher uses the word "God," he means something entirely different from that which the Christian means by the same word. God, at least according to the logical trend of modern liberalism, is not a person separate from the world, but merely the unity that pervades the world. To say, therefore, that Jesus is God means merely that the life of God, which appears in all men, appears with special clearness or richness in Jesus. Such an assertion is diametrically opposed to the Christian belief in the deity of Christ.

Equally opposed to the Christian belief is another meaning that is sometimes attached to the assertion that Jesus is God. The word "God"

is sometimes used to denote simply the supreme object of men's desires, the highest thing that men know. We have given up the notion, it is said, that there is a Maker and Ruler of the universe; such notions belong to "metaphysics", and are rejected by the modern man. But the word "God," though it can no longer denote the Maker of the universe, is convenient as denoting the object of men's emotions and desires. Of some men, it can be said that their God is mammon—mammon is that for which they labor, and to which their hearts are attached. In a somewhat similar way, the liberal preacher says that Jesus is God. He does not mean at all to say that Jesus is identical in nature with a Maker and Ruler of the universe, of whom an idea could be obtained apart from Jesus. In such a Being he no longer believes. All that he means is that the man Jesus—a man here in the midst of us, and of the same nature as ours—is the highest we know. It is obvious that such a way of thinking is far more widely removed from Christian belief than is Unitarianism, at least the earlier forms of Unitarianism. For the early Unitarian no doubt at least believed in God. The modern liberals, on the other hand, say that Jesus is God not because they think high of Jesus, but because they think desperately low of God.

\* \* \* \* \*

It may well be doubted, however, whether the assertion, "I believe that Jesus is God," or the like, on the lips of liberal preachers, is strictly truthful. The liberal preacher attaches indeed a real meaning to the words, and that meaning is very dear to his heart. He really does believe that "Jesus is God." But the trouble is that he attaches to the words a different meaning from that which is attached to them by the simple-minded person to whom he is speaking. He offends, therefore, against the fundamental principle of truthfulness in language. According to that fundamental principle, language is truthful, not when the meaning attached to the words by the speaker, but when the meaning intended to be produced in the mind of the particular person addressed, is in accordance with the facts. Thus the truthfulness of the assertion, "I believe that Jesus is God," depends upon the audience that is addressed. If the audience is composed of theologically trained persons, who still attach the same meaning to the word "God" as that which the speaker attaches to it, then the language is truthful. But if the audience is composed of old-fashioned Christians, who have never attached anything but the old meaning to the word "God" (the meaning which appears in the first verse of Genesis), then the language is untruthful. And in the latter case, not all the pious motives in the world will make the utterance right. Christian ethics do not abrogate common honesty; no possible desire of edifying the Church and of avoiding offence can excuse a lie.

#### PROF. MARSHALL ON CHRIST'S AUTHORITY.

The next clause in the Professor's confession is as follows:

"I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and the final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour."

That, at first blush, to the undiscerning, would seem to be satisfactory, but it is carefully phrased. It is only on matters of morals and religion the final word is with Christ. What about the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the whole plan of redemption there set forth? An examination of Dr. Driver's view, as above set forth, will show that Christ must not be appealed to in matters relating to what is called "historical criticism". Christ is not the authority, for example, on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or on the historicity of Jonah, or on the Messianic character of the 110th Psalm. An infallible Christ is the Rock upon which the whole philosophy of higher criticism splits. The position of Driver and his school is absolutely untenable if the infallibility of Christ be admitted. Reference to our quotation under the head

of Dr. Driver's view from Dr. Driver's own works will show that he removes Christ out of his way as an authority in critical matters. And as every one informed on the subject must know, that is the favourite resort of the modernists; therefore Professor Marshall's statement respecting the authority of Christ is anything but satisfactory. Our own view is that Jesus Christ is Lord of all realms; "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." And on every subject of which He speaks, to the genuine believer, the Word of God is final. But Professor Marshall's statement leaves the door wide open to all the principles of Modernism.

#### PROF. MARSHALL ON THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

Again Professor Marshall says,

"I believe in the virgin birth."

We should be glad to be able to accept this statement at its face value. We do not believe that Professor Marshall has as yet gone to the end of the road in his acceptance of Modernist principles, but few, if any, evangelicals who have surrendered to this anti-Christian system have surrendered everything at once.

Of course, the argument from silence is sometimes a very dangerous one, but it does seem to us exceedingly strange that in the course of a consecutive study of the Gospels, all reference to the virgin birth should be omitted and that in a sermon on the text, "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman", this vital doctrine was not even remotely alluded to.

#### PROF. MARSHALL ON THE ATONEMENT.

The Professor continues,

"I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God."

What does Professor Marshall mean by "vicarious suffering"? Several sermons and addresses were delivered in which there was no reference to the death of Christ at all. Students W. Gordon Brown and W. S. Whitcombe report the teaching of Professor Marshall in the classroom as follows:

"The blood of Christ" in the New Testament is due to the influence of pagan religions.

"My point was that you have to remember that the world in the apostolic age was reeking with sacrificial blood. You have that in Mythraism, not only Jews but pagans were relying on blood. The Apostles naturally laid stress on the blood of Christ in opposition to this, but the Apostles never did think of the physical blood of Christ as being the cleansing agent. The idea that God has the physical blood is absurd. I hope my point is clear now. When the Apostles referred to sacrifice, they referred to His sacrifice. They could have referred to it without the blood had it not been that the world was full of it at the time. All the way through Paul's teaching his great thought is that the saving thing in his life, his fellowship, with a risen and glorified Saviour. Away with this crass physical notion! . . . Who wants to wallow in blood? It is spiritual, of course. I do not mind who knows what I say on that point."

Calls Substitutionary Atonement "Bold" and "Crude."

In one of his classes Professor Marshall mentioned Luther, and spoke to the following effect:

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.—The Prophet, June, 1926.

#### The Walmer Road Sermon.

For the Professor's views of the atonement as expressed publicly, so far as we know, we have only the Walmer Road sermon and his pamphlet. From the sermon we quote 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 harmony? 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 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, in *The Canadian Baptist* of January 24th, 1926, 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?

#### PROF. MARSHALL ON "COMING TO CHRIST."

Prof. Marshall preached in the James St. Baptist Church, Hamilton, on "Coming to Christ". The following report is quoted from *The Hamilton Herald*:

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. We must have good food, good clothes, and even amusements to enjoy life, but when we seek these in excess, that is when we do not belong to Christ. Even Christ Himself enjoyed luxuries on earth. He allowed His feet to be bathed in costly ointment; this giving Him great pleasure because it was a work of love. To prove to ourselves if we have really come to Christ, let us ask ourselves the question, 'Is my love of Christ so strong that I could refuse the benefit of ill-gotten gain for His sake?' 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. To really 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 service to humanity and help any organization laboring in the cause of Christianity, then we can say we have come to Christ.

In accordance with the above, in his classes in McMaster, touching on social work, the Professor spoke to the following effect:

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. We have read in the Scriptures, "For by grace are ye saved through faith. . . . NOT OF WORKS."—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Prof. Machen on "Liberal" Preachers on the Atonement.

In this connection let us hear again from Professor Machen. (*Christianity and Liberalism*, pp. 118-120):

Modern liberal preachers do indeed sometimes speak of the "atonement." But they speak of it just as seldom as they possibly can, and one can see plainly that their hearts are elsewhere than at the foot of the Cross. Indeed, at this point, as at many others, one has the feeling that traditional language is being strained to become the expression of totally alien ideas. And when the traditional phraseology has been stripped away, the essence of the modern conception of the death of Christ, though

that conception appears in many forms, is fairly plain. The essence of it is that the death of Christ had an effect not upon God, but only upon man. Sometimes the effect upon man is conceived of in a very simple way, Christ's death being regarded merely as an example of self-sacrifice for us to emulate. The uniqueness of this particular example, then, can be found only in the fact that Christian sentiment, gathering around it, has made it a convenient symbol for all self-sacrifice; it puts in concrete form what would otherwise have to be expressed in colder general terms. Sometimes, again, the effect of Christ's death upon us is conceived of in subtler ways; the death of Christ, it is said, shows how much God hates sin—since sin brought even the Holy One to the dreadful Cross—and we, too, therefore, ought to hate sin, as God hates it, and repent. Sometimes, still again, the death of Christ is thought of as displaying the love of God; it exhibits God's own Son as given up for us all. These modern "theories of the atonement" are not all to be placed upon the same plane; the last of them, in particular, may be joined with a high view of Jesus' Person. But they err in that they ignore the dreadful reality of guilt, and make a mere persuasion of the human will all that is needed for salvation. They do indeed all contain an element of truth: it is true that the death of Christ is an example of self-sacrifice which may inspire self-sacrifice in others; it is true that the death of Christ shows how much God hates sin; it is true that the death of Christ displays the love of God. All of these truths are found plainly in the New Testament. But they are swallowed up in a far greater truth—that Christ died instead of us to present us faultless before the throne of God. Without that central truth, all the rest is devoid of real meaning: an example of self-sacrifice is useless to those who are under both the guilt and thralldom of sin; the knowledge of God's hatred of sin can in itself bring only despair; an exhibition of the love of God is merely display unless there was some underlying reason for the sacrifice. If the Cross is to be restored to its rightful place in Christian life, we shall have to penetrate far beneath the modern theories to Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

Upon the Christian doctrine of the Cross, modern liberals are never weary of pouring out the vitals of their hatred and their scorn. Even at this point, it is true, the hope of avoiding offence is not always abandoned; the words "vicarious atonement" and the like—of course in a sense totally at variance from their Christian meaning—are still sometimes used. But despite such occasional employment of traditional language, the liberal preachers reveal only too clearly what is in their mind. They speak with disgust of those who believe "that the blood of our Lord, shed in a substitutionary death, placates an alienated Deity and makes possible welcome for the returning sinner" (Fosdick, *Shall the Fundamentalists Win?*, stenographically reported by Margaret Renton, 1922, p. 5). Against the doctrine of the Cross they use every weapon of caricature and vilification.

#### Dr. Fosdick on "Vicarious Sacrifice".

As a further illustration of how modernists employ the term "vicarious sacrifice", we quote from "*The Modern Use of the Bible*" by Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D., pp. 229-231:

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

sacrifice that he has become the unique representative on earth of that universal principle and law.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

But when in the supreme character it is supremely exhibited, it becomes uniquely significant. To multitudes it has meant alike a revelation of the divine nature and a challenge to sacrificial living of their own which they could in no wise escape. It has bowed them in gratitude, chastened them into penitence, wakened them to hope, inspired them to devotion. It has made the one who bore the Cross not alone a religious and ethical teacher, but a personal Saviour whom to meet, with whom to fall in love, by whom to be chastened, melted, subdued, forgiven, and empowered, has been the beginning of the noblest living that this world has ever seen.

We are still therefore waiting to find a single word of Professor Marshall's which indicates that he believes that Jesus Christ did actually bear our sins in His own body on the tree in the sense of being our Substitute.

**PROFESSOR MARSHALL ON THE RESURRECTION.**

Once more the Professor says:

"I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave—remember that—in the empty grave on the first Easter morn."

Is this sufficient? Mary and Peter and John believed in the empty grave when they did not believe in the resurrection. Read John 20: 1-16. Indeed, a careful examination of the record of the resurrection stories will disclose the fact that no one was ever convinced of the reality of the resurrection by the empty grave. The Pharisees believed in the empty grave and paid the soldiers money to declare the message of the empty grave with their own explanation. But we must not be unfair to Professor Marshall. What has he said elsewhere about the resurrection? Let us quote from students who have listened to his teaching in his classes.

**Does He Believe in the True Resurrection of the Body?**

The Risen Christ said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have". (Luke 24: 39).

What change was it that took place in the body of Christ? It was some kind of metamorphosis as Paul himself stated (speaks of) in I Corinthians 15, on the spiritual body.

\* \* \* \* \*

Personality must have some vehicle of expression. As we have a psychic body in the present life, so we will have a spiritual body in the next. The electrons of which the atoms are made up are always in motion, floating in ether. If we could very highly magnify the hand, we would find that it is made up of minute particles which are not even touching, but floating in ether. So 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. It is hard to think of a disembodied personality when thinking of the afterlife. How is this

personality to exist? Paul says there is an ethereal or spiritual body, which is the bearer of the personality.—Testimony of students in Prof. Marshall's Third Year Class in Arts Bible.

Once again we venture to disagree, and that most strongly, with Professor Marshall's theory of the resurrection body, tentative though that may be. We do not doubt that what the professor says concerning the nature of what we commonly know as "matter" is based on the scientific hypotheses of the day; but when he suggests that the resurrection body may be composed of ether, we are very much inclined to wonder, question, and ask, whether such a composition would be a body at all.

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 teaching 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 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, 1926.

#### PROF. MARSHALL AND DR. GLOVER.

Professor Marshall boasts of the fact that he enjoyed the confidence of such men as Dr. Glover. In his speech at Hamilton he said "I have the confidence of T. R. Glover". It is surely significant that Professor Marshall should boast of Dr. Glover's confidence. Prof. Marshall says he "does not agree with all that Dr. T. R. Glover says, that nobody does, but that he does agree with his main emphasis."

#### Dr. Glover's Emphasis.

There can be no question that the principal theme of the Bible is the person and work of Christ, and that that which is central to His ministry is His death and resurrection. Surely then we may expect to find Dr. Glover's main emphasis in his teaching respecting the cross and the resurrection and this is what he says:

#### Dr. Glover on the Death of Christ.

The metaphor of sacrifice is indeed found in the New Testament. It is used because it is a popular way of speech, because it is an easy symbol; and yet when one tries to define the idea of sacrifice and realizes the essence of Jesus' revelation of God, the more alien the two things become. The metaphor fails; the symbol will not do. It confuses the issues. The expression with which we started, "the Lamb of God," is peculiarly hard to grasp with any clear sense of its meaning; it suggests ideas but it eludes us. If some of us still love the old phraseology of sacrifice, it is because it has been filled with new meaning and has gathered new associations. But the new meaning is too much for the old words; the new wine bursts the old skin. The old conception of sacrifice makes our relation with God, which is so simple and so beautiful in the teaching of Jesus, indistinct again; it leaves the morality of the affair uncertain and difficult. It was never dominant until the adherents

of the mystery religions, the heathen, came into the Church, and brought, by sheer numbers, a conception to bear on the teaching of Jesus that was not there at the beginning. Then the wholesale adoption of the Old Testament, and the passion for matching everything in the Old with something in the New, and above all the legalism brought into the Church by converted Roman lawyers, changed the general outlook.

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

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

#### Dr. Glover on the Resurrection.

For the early Christian one argument sufficed for immortality—Christ is risen. Men had seen him after his rising, had heard him, had spoken with him, had touched him. Stoics and Epicureans in Athens laughed when Paul came to the "rising again of dead men" (Acts 17: 32); educated people did not talk so; they laughed and dismissed the subject, and went away to thresh again the rotten straw of Zeno and Epicurus, for Athens was a university City.

Can we to-day say with Paul: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept" (I Cor. 15: 20), or have we to trim our speech to come a little nearer Athens? We have to consider the resurrection of Christ side by side with what we are coming to know of the facts of psychology, and we have to be as sure of our psychology as of the Christian story. We have to consider the tricks the mind plays upon itself and the part of the physical nature in suggesting them and joining in the play. We have to ask whether the disciples were not just at that stage of culture when the mind fails to realize it is playing such tricks; and whether we must say that Christ did not rise from the dead, but that certain psychopathic temperaments thought he did and suggested it to others. We cannot shirk such questions; and, in the present stage of knowledge, we shall not get, if we are in a hurry, any very encouraging answer.

Guesses have been made at what happened—guesses conditioned by our very slight knowledge of the soul and its way; and I shall not add to their number. Instead of guessing, we note that the group of men whom we meet in the epistles and the Acts are the same we met in the gospels, but in outlook, temper, spirit, and faith they are changed. That is history, and it must be recognized and then, if possible, understood. Something has happened; we may recognize so much; and if we are uncertain what exactly happened, we may note that it turned

defeat into victory, it put the hope of immortality on a new footing, and it changed the history of the world.

But in any case, Paul put the matter once and for all when he said: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." We may not yet be able to solve our difficulties as historians, or to construct the story of the risen Christ, but one thing is forever luminously clear—the Christian faith is bound up with immortality; both stand or fall together. °

#### PROF. MARSHALL ON THE PRESENT MINISTRY OF CHRIST.

Once more Professor Marshall says:

"I believe that Jesus ever liveth to be the inspiration of all his followers".

When he said that, perhaps ninety-five out of one hundred, catching the sound rather than the sense of his words, believed he had quoted scripture. Of course it is true that Christ is the inspiration of His followers. In running the race set before us, we are to look unto Jesus, we are to consider Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest we be wearied and faint in our minds. But this statement of the Professor's inevitably follows upon his view of the atonement, for, apparently to him, the atonement is inspirational, rather than expiatory, but the scripture says: "They truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." We should be glad to have anyone point out to us in anything that Professor Marshall has written, anything that indicates his belief in the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ. We have already observed that the Driver view destroys such priesthood.

#### PROF. MARSHALL AND THE SCRIPTURES.

The Professor also says,

"I believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God from Genesis to Revelation."

Let us examine the evidence.

##### Prof. Marshall Holds the Loose View.

At the Hamilton Convention it was frankly admitted that Prof. Marshall does not hold "the strong view" of the inspiration of Scripture, which is that it is infallibly inspired from cover to cover; but his is "what some would call the freer, looser view", which is that it is merely "the religious content of Scripture" which is "infallibly sure". This second view carries more implications with it than meet the eye. Yet Dr. Farmer plead for toleration toward it. Those who have followed events in the Convention for a number of years past will recall that in 1919 the Convention passed a resolution discountenancing "some new vague view of the Scriptures".—*The Prophet*, January, 1926.

##### Says Paul Did Not Know He Was Writing Scripture.

In his class in Arts Bible for third year students, Professor Marshall said in speaking of "how Paul's letters became Scripture", that Paul had no idea he was writing Scripture. Concerning the seventh chapter of I Corinthians the professor also said that many of Paul's remarks are made only from his own judgment: on some matters he claims inspiration, but not on (marriage), except in some points.

In connection with the first quotation that Paul did not think that he was writing scripture, we can hear by faith that great Apostle answer, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, putting spiritual words with spiritual ideas." (I Cor. 2: 13, free translation of literal part.)

Concerning the second quotation from Professor Marshall we remember hearing Dean Farmer, in discussing the same chapter, say: Paul "does not disclaim inspiration, but rather claim it." Certainly Professor Marshall's view on this subject is not that of truly believing and conservative scholarship.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Other Books Inspired.

"I believe the Scriptures to be inspired, but is not this great book inspired? (reference being made to Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*) is not Tennyson and the other poets inspired? Are not your sermons inspired? and could not my mother's letters be inspired?" Further in this connection Prof. Marshall said, "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 the people is that real authority for religion is in men's souls. The foundation of my religion is in my soul."—Quoted by Rev. John Dodds in a letter in *The Canadian Baptist*.

#### Would Give "Science" the Last Word.

We feel that Professor Marshall's attitude is that he would give the final voice in the settling of any matter to "science" rather than to the Bible. In conversation we spoke to the professor as follows: "Here is the Bible and here is science. We do not believe that there is any contradiction between the Bible and true science. Contradictions to the Bible are not found in scientific facts but in scientific hypotheses. And in such cases we accept the statements of the Bible before all else. Now what is your attitude?" The professor proceeded to say that was not his attitude. He stated that he would put science first.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Reflects on Intelligence of Those Holding to Infallibility of Bible.

In talking over this question with the professor, he practically said—and clearly implied—that any man who holds a view such as most of us here to-night hold, that such discrepancies can only be apparent and not real, and that the Bible is verbally inspired, is brainless, and blind, and will not use his God-given wit.—Testimony of W. G. Brown, given on January 14, 1926.

#### The Seat of Authority in Religion.

"Where is the real authority for religion? . . . We want to get home to people that religion is in their souls. If they are grounded in religion they can laugh at any alleged changes in theology. Religion is in men and not in manuscripts. The only real valid authority is the authority of experience. Matthew Arnold helps us there, it is inadequate but helps: 'God is a power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness'."—Notes of students in Prof. Marshall's classes, published in *The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### On the Book of Jonah.

The Master said (Math. Ch. 12, v. 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."

Mr. W. Gordon Brown says Prof. Marshall believes that the book of Jonah is only allegory, and not history.

#### Your Attitude to the Bible and Mine are Poles Apart.

*The Canadian Baptist* for March 4th, contains a statement by Professor Marshall. Speaking of his view of the Book of Jonah, the professor says: "I have been told that I ought to be prepared to believe that Jonah swallowed an eighty-ton whale if necessary."

The incident to which the professor doubtless refers was a conversation we had with him. The professor had been referring to the

difficulties connected with the miracle of Jonah and the sea-monster. Mr. Whitcombe then said: "My view of the book is this: if the Bible said that Jonah swallowed the whale, I would be prepared to believe it." The professor laughed and replied, "I cannot imagine you swallowing a ninety-ton whale." Mr. Whitcombe rejoined, "Well, neither can I, professor, but my God is the God of the impossible." Then the professor said, "Well, Mr. Whitcombe, your attitude to the Bible and mine are poles apart." He later explained that he referred to his attitude on such points as few have mentioned.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Dr. Keirstead Says to Make Jonah Fiction is Unreasonable.

Prof. E. M. Keirstead, D.D., LL.D., said: If I make Jonah a fiction, I knock the whole thing out of existence, getting a moral out of a thing that is a falsehood—I cannot see how that works, for that contradicts reason and experience and everything to me.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### What an "Uneducated Fool" (?) from England Said.

"Conservative scholars maintain that the representation of a distinguished prophet in such an odious light, as he appears in the book, as well as the testimony of our blessed Lord, make the traditional date the only acceptable solution, cf. Math. 12: 39-41; 16: 4, and Luke 11: 29, the prophecy being thus autobiographical."—Notes from the classes of Professor H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt.

#### "Hebrew Tradition."

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.—From Sermon in Queen's Road Church, Coventry, England.

#### Dr. Shailer Mathews on Inspiration.

We may well quote here the saying of a distinguished modernist:

"Modernists believe in inspiration rather than inerrancy. But in the inspiration of men, not of words. Men were inspired because they inspire. In this Modernists are one with writers of the Bible themselves, for inspiration within the Bible is always regarded as the experience of the Spirit of God on the part of some individual."—*The Faith of Modernism*, by Shailer Mathews, p. 62.

#### PROF. MARSHALL ON CONVERSION.

Professor Marshall continues,

"I believe in the life hereafter, as the trust deed says, both for the just and the unjust; I believe in the necessity of conversion, in the need of people being born again."

What does Professor Marshall mean by "conversion"? What does he mean by being "born again"?

No man believes in the necessity of "conversion" in the evangelical sense who does not believe that we are all by nature children of wrath. We give below quotations from Professor Marshall's addresses. He is of age, he must therefore speak for himself:



### On "Juvenile Human Nature".

In the past, the church, often enough, instead of concentrating on the spiritual care and culture of the young in the hope and prayer that, shall we say, quite naturally some day their spiritual awakening should come, and they should appreciate the beauty and the glory of Christ, and give themselves to Him in the act of personal surrender—instead of doing that kind of thing the church has too often let the young people drift, and then by spasmodic effort—by expensive missions held once a year—it has tried to bring them back again by forcing them through all the throes of a psychic revolution. Now, that is a wrong method. There is no need for a lad to go to the devil before he comes to Christ. I don't believe that. And this error in policy, I think, has been due almost entirely to a false view of juvenile human nature.

### Religion Really and Truly Natural.

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."

\* \* \* \* \*

Well now, that is important where the religious education of the child is concerned. 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.—Hamilton Convention Address, Oct. 19, 1925.

### Man's Natural State.

"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., 250 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."—Sermon on "The Insight of Christ" in First Ave. Church, Toronto.

### PROF. MARSHALL ON BAPTISM.

"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."—From article on Baptism and Church Membership, in *Baptist Times and Freeman*.

### ON THE SUPERNATURAL.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY A MIRACLE? A great change has come into the attitude of religious people to miracles. The old conception of a miracle was a juggling with the laws of nature. God when working a miracle suspended natural law in order to do some supernatural act. But no miracle is contrary to all the laws of nature. A savage would regard modern civilization with its radials and street cars as a miracle simply because he did not know the laws that controlled them. But to us such things are not miraculous because we understand them. So a miracle is an event due to the operation of a law unknown to ourselves. As no one knows what is possible, for continually new possibilities are opening up, we cannot draw the boundary line between the possible and the impossible. The greatest of the modern scientists only know very little of the laws of nature. As one of them said: "We believe all things not impossible, we hope all things not improbable." For knowledge is only a tiny islet in a vast sea of ignorance.—Testimony of students in Prof. Marshall's Third Year Class in Arts' Bible, published in *The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Offers "Clues" to the Miracles of Christ.

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 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 William 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.—Testimony of students in Prof. Marshall's Third Year Class in Arts' Bible, from *The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Says It Is Not Necessary To Be Converted To Teach In Sunday School.

On one occasion the professor advised: "Persuade as many of your elder scholars (in the Sunday School) as possible to work in the lower departments of your school." He was asked whether he thought they ought to be converted before they were thus given work in the Sunday School, or a question to that effect. He replied that he did not know that you could not have them teaching unless they were converted; to get them into the primary department, you may get them interested and get them for baptism.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### "Be Able To Preach Without Your Bible."

Prof. Marshall advised those ministers-in-the-making under his teaching to train themselves so to preach as to be able to preach without

appeal to any external authority. Which being interpreted means, "Train yourselves so that you can preach without your Bible." Someone wisely remarked that that was just what was wrong.—From *The Prophet*.

#### THE FRUITS OF MODERNISM IN STUDENT LIFE.

It is natural to find that Professor Marshall's modernistic teaching is bearing its evil fruit in the thinking of those students who are under his tuition.

Three examples which have come to our knowledge we give here.

The first is from a student pastor who has during the past year been studying under Professor Marshall. Sitting in the very room which I occupied at that time in the University residence, this student said to me, and I wrote as he talked, "Many of the students have not the same confidence in Scripture as they had when they started. To us at first a Scripture text ends argument. He has shown that would not be accepted in England, and most of the men in the class (that is, this student's own class) have taken that attitude, too."

The second example is that of a first year Art student who came to talk to me about certain views propounded to him by this professor. He wanted to know whether, if he accepted a certain "loose" interpretation of a part of the prophecy of Jeremiah, whether that would make him a modernist. It is quite evident that the boy was worried by the doubts which had been fostered in his mind by this professor's teachings.

But this lad was a professing Christian; no doubt many other students in the Arts classes taught by Professor Marshall are not Christians. How much worse that they should be given doubts about God's word by a teacher in a Christian university!

The third example concerns another Arts student. This boy has friends in Toronto University who are away off the track when it comes to the things of God. The influence of those friends no doubt instilled questionings in the mind of the student. Then he sat under Professor Marshall, and Professor Marshall's teaching upset him worse. His father and mother were very much worried about him. One whole night they spent in prayer for their boy, that he might recover his faith.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### DR. FARMER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MODERNISTS

Dr. Farmer plainly stated in the Senate that if a mistake had been made in Professor Marshall's appointment, "The Chancellor and I are supremely responsible for it." Dr. Farmer has long been looked upon by the Convention of Ontario and Quebec as a perfectly orthodox Baptist, and with many people anything he approves is accepted because he approves it; and many therefore find it difficult to believe that a man can be anything less than a sound Baptist whom Professor Farmer has endorsed. We believe the time has come when it is necessary that our people should clearly understand Dr. Farmer's attitude toward these matters; and in order to do this it is necessary to review a little history.

#### PROFESSOR GEORGE BURMAN FOSTER.

One of the most conspicuous unbelievers whose name has been connected with McMaster was the late Professor George Burman Foster. Professor Foster left McMaster in 1895, and when he left the following appreciation was passed upon him and printed in the Year Book of 1895:

"Dr. Foster did us magnificent service in his class-room work, and won for himself a warm place in the hearts of our students. The remembrance and the influence of his work and his rare personality will abide while life lasts, and many prayers will ascend from Canadian hearts for God's blessing upon his work in Chicago."

We have no record that Dr. Farmer in that day ever registered any sort of objection to Professor Foster. Certainly this eulogistic paragraph was passed without any public protest from him. But even so long ago as 1895 it would appear that rationalism had not only gained entrance to McMaster University through Dr. Foster, but if we are to credit the Faculty and Board of that day with sincerity, it was not without sympathy in the University as a whole. Yet Dr. Foster was subsequently known as a man who out-Heroded Herod in his Sadducean unbelief. One single sentence from his book on "The Finality of the Christian Religion" will suffice: "To the scientific understanding of the world, and to the intellectual aptitude superinduced by science, a miracle cannot be admitted."

Another quotation from Dr. Foster is as follows:

"The sum of what I have just been urging amounts to the profoundest change of (religious) thought known to history. One may say that not supernatural regeneration, but natural growth; not divine sanctification, but human education; not supernatural grace, but natural morality; not the divine expiation of the cross, but the human heroism—or accident?—of the cross; . . . not Christ the Lord, but the man Jesus who was a child of his time; not God and His providence, but evolution and its process without an absolute goal—that all this, and such as this, is the new turn in the affairs of religion at the tick of the clock."

#### DR. GEORGE CROSS.

Let us take again the case of Dr. George Cross who retired from McMaster in 1909. The Year Book of 1909 contains the following eulogistic reference to him:

"After eight years' service Professor Cross resigned the Professorship of History. This resignation is a serious blow to the educational work of our denomination, and is deeply regretted by all members of McMaster University. Dr. Cross's Christian character and scholarship, his excellent teaching ability, his faculty of arousing interest in his subjects and of inspiring devotion to study, his recognized leadership in our denominational life, all contribute to make the loss the more keenly felt. In the University he was not only strong in his class-room work, but was ever ready and able to help in the administration of affairs. In the absence of the Dean in Theology it was mainly due to Dr. Cross that the reorganization of the theological curriculum was so successfully carried out four years ago. Several of Dr. Cross's students, those who took special work under his direction, have already taken prominent places in post-graduate studies in other institutions, and have brought distinction to their teacher and their College. Dr. Cross has accepted the professorship of Systematic Theology in Newton Theological Institution, where he will have not only the opportunity of lecturing in his favorite department of work, but where he will also be brought into touch with the Harvard Divinity School. He will be greatly missed at McMaster, where he is much loved by both colleagues and students."

#### What About Prof. Cross?

We quote the following from his book, "Creative Christianity":

"It is doubted whether any absolute external authority in matters of faith has been provided or is needed. Similarly, it is doubted whether the series of events recorded as occurring at the beginning of the Christian faith, or at any stage of its progress, are to be considered as supernatural in the sense commonly intended hitherto by that term. Similarly, also, the question whether there was an original supernatural deposit, and, if so, what it was, is now open to perfectly free discussion, without prejudice to the Christian character of him who raises the question." (Page 30).

"The representations which the New Testament writers make of the personality of Jesus must be used with discrimination. The accounts of such scenes as his exorcism of demons, his transfiguration on a mountain top, his stilling of storms, his summoning of deceased persons back to life, his physical ascension into the sky before the eyes of men, picture him as exercising a kind of magical power and as having access to influences of a kind extraneous to our lives. To men of that time these might seem evidences of his high calling, but they make him in a corresponding degree a stranger and an alien to us. In all this our minds are drawn to the region of the mysterious, the unaccountable, the unknowable. With a personality whose native abode is there we can never be at home." (Page 75).

"It is even possible . . . that if all the teachings of Jesus were brought together in the exact form in which he gave them there might be found among them some that would not commend themselves as fixed, and final to the faith of the most intelligent and devout Christians of the present day. Men cannot be called upon to believe things simply because of the name that is attached to them." (Page 34).

In his book entitled, "What is Christianity?" (pages 4 and 5), Professor Cross says:

"And now after the lapse of all the intervening centuries, it is still an open question whether after all it was not misleading to call Jesus the Christ."

#### Dr. Augustus H. Strong on Dr. George Cross.

"Rochester Theological Seminary was built up into a powerful and useful institution by Dr. Augustus H. Strong, backed by a group of laymen, Messrs. Trevor, Milbank, Hoyt, and the elder Rockefeller. For many years it provided the Baptist churches with loyal pastors and missionaries. But a change has come over its teaching. In his unpublished autobiography, Dr. Strong lays this at the door of Prof. George Cross. "The result of the election of Dr. Cross," he says, "has been the resignation of some members of the committee and the withdrawal of others from active service. I regard that election as the greatest calamity that has come to the seminary. It was the entrance of an agnostic, skeptical, and anti-Christian element into its teaching, the results of which will be only evil. The election of Dr. Cross was followed by that of Professors Robins, Parsons, and Nixon, who sympathized with these views. These men, with Prof. Moehlmann, soon gave evidence in their utterances that a veritable revolution had taken place in the attitude of the seminary toward the fundamentals of the Christian faith."

That Dr. Strong has not overstated the facts, is clear enough from a casual reference to Prof. Cross's *Creative Christianity* (delivered at Yale on the N. W. Taylor Foundation.)! Dr. Cross has the reverence for the "young college people" which liberal theologians often exhibit. "We must make up our minds that their interpretation of the Christian faith, as of life in general, will be very different from that which was given to us by the Fathers." Does he have as great confidence in the sayings of our Lord? Hardly. "If all the teachings of Jesus were brought together in the exact form in which he gave them there might be found among them some that would not commend themselves as fixed and final to the faith of the most intelligent and devout Christians of the present day. Men cannot be called upon to believe things simply because of the name that is attached to them."

The great assumption of modernism runs through this book. "Every one so trained (i.e., scientifically) must place a note of interrogation after all the biblical accounts of miracles." "The scientifically trained college man of to-day" distinctly disallows the existence of miracles. This "youth of scientific training" would class the miracles of Christ "with the folklore, legends, or mythology he had already found in the traditions of other religious faiths."—*The Leaven of the Sadducees*, (pp. 189, 190.)

In another place Professor Cross says that the theology which he represents is to develop a new doctrine of salvation in which "questions of Christ's pre-existence and post-existence will be laid aside as unpractical and unprofitable."

So far as we know there came no protest from within McMaster, certainly not from the Dean in Theology, against such teaching as Dr. Strong describes here. The two professors named left our Convention without disturbing its peace—not because they were sound in their teaching, but because there was no one to challenge their error. Yet we are told McMaster University has always been conservative!

#### PROFESSOR I. G. MATTHEWS.

The next blunder in the University's record was the appointment of Professor I. G. Matthews. The man who was the responsible head of the University at the time of his appointment was Dr. O. C. S. Wallace. The history of the Harris-Matthews controversy is well known. That Dr. Elmore Harris was abundantly justified in his protest against Professor Matthews' retention has not only been proved by the Professor's subsequent record, and by his book, "Old Testament Life and Literature," but by the rationalistic and modernistic influence he exerted upon our denominational life. He voluntarily retired at the end of the session in 1919 to accept a position in the United States. But during all the years in which he did his deadly work, he was countenanced—if not, indeed, supported—by the Dean in Theology. Moreover, Dr. Farmer defended Prof. Matthews at the Bloor Street Convention and defends Dr. Matthews to this day.

### DEAN FARMER'S RELATION TO CONVENTION CRISES.

#### AT THE OTTAWA CONVENTION.

When the Convention met in Ottawa and a prolonged debate was held over an editorial in *The Canadian Baptist*, the Dean in Theology again exercised his influence on the side of the modernistic movement. We have before described the speech he delivered on that occasion as "colorless"; but the night before the debate Dr. Farmer personally did his utmost to prevail upon us not to introduce the subject into the Convention, but to consent to its being dealt with in committee.

#### THE INAUGURATION OF CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN.

In 1923-24, at the inauguration of the present Chancellorship, McMaster again showed its sympathy for Modernism by singling out for special distinction one of the most outstanding theological liberals on the Continent. In all this Dr. Farmer defended the action of the University to the last ditch; and consented to the resolution which was ultimately passed only after the Convention, at London, had refused a vote of confidence in the University, and it became apparent that the great majority was opposed to the University's action.

## DEAN FARMER AND PROF. MARSHALL'S APPOINTMENT.

In the appointment of Professor Marshall, Dr. Farmer played an important part. We have already quoted his own words to this effect. In this connection we must call attention to a statement made by Dr. Farmer in his speech at the Hamilton Convention:

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

We would venture here to examine this statement. What was this "crisis" which the Dean faced in his own room? Who was asking him to "turn down" a man like Professor Marshall? Certainly it was not the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, for he was far away in California. So far as is recorded, it was not a member of the Senate or of the Board of Governors; and inasmuch as Dr. Farmer tells us he faced this crisis "in my own room", it would appear that no human voice was challenging his anticipated action. With whom, or with what, was the Dean in Theology wrestling on this occasion? Was it with his Baptist conscience? Was it because he knew that he was about to recommend to the Senate the appointment of a man whose position was not in agreement with the theological standards of the Denomination and of McMaster? At the Convention Dr. Farmer pleaded for tolerance of the looser view of Scripture. He has even gone so far as to propose the adoption in educational affairs of an "inclusive" policy. We quote from an address by Mr. W. S. Whitcombe, B.A., in which he reports a conversation he had with Dr. Farmer as follows:

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

His claim is that since there is a number of not uneducated people in this Convention that hold a view which is different from his own (that is, Dr. Farmer's) view, we should allow them some voice in the management of the University. That is, there are two parties in this convention, and both should be allowed to have their representatives on the faculty of the University.

He went on to say that if we had two seminaries here in this Convention it would be a different thing. One of them could be just as orthodox and just as conservative as they pleased, while the other could be more radical, more modernistic, in its tendencies.

We think, therefore, that we have established the point that Dr. Farmer must bear the responsibility of thrusting our present educational problem upon the Convention.

### WHAT ABOUT THE REST OF THE FACULTY?

What about other members of the Faculty? In a speech at the Summer Session Professor J. G. Brown went out of his way to credential Modernism by implicitly giving to it the authority of the name of the great Dr. John A. Broadus. This was challenged by the Editor of *The Western Recorder* of Louisville, and utterly denied and disapproved. But Dr. Brown ought to be heard

for himself. Here is a quotation from his address before the Summer Conference, 1926. Surely this shows sympathy with Modernism:

"During the last half of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth, an enormous amount of attention has been given to the study of the Bible under the general terms of the lower and higher criticism—the former term applying to the minute study of the text of the Bible, especially in the original tongues in which it was written and the latter to the study of the scriptures in the light of the times in which they were written, by the application of the Historic Method. . . . During this period, the influence of science upon the interpretation of the Bible, and especially the evolutionary hypothesis which many believe is the true explanation of the development of all the great ethnic faiths has been deeply felt. There can be no question that the sciences of biology and geology have modified the old traditional interpretation of the story of creation in Genesis, and that the science of psychology has affected the views of many Biblical scholars on such subjects as demon possession, inspiration, depravity, regeneration and even the incarnation."

#### THE WESTERN RECORDER.

of Louisville, Ky., in its issue of October 7, makes the following pertinent enquiry:

#### Is the Entire Faculty Not Loyal to the Old Faith?

In the *Canadian Baptist* of September 9, the editor takes issue with Dr. T. T. Shields, in connection with the following utterance by Dr. Shields about churches sending proxy delegates to the approaching sessions of the Ontario and Quebec Baptist Convention: "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 by the Holy Spirit—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." The Baptist editor affirms that "the theological faculty would subscribe to the above declaration with as good faith as Dr. Shields." He also expresses resentment at the suggestion that McMaster University stands for any divergence from the historic Baptist position. Yet we were surprised and disquieted that the editor limited his assertion about the historic Baptist position to the "theological faculty." Why not all the rest of the faculty of this great Baptist institution? One does not wish to be suspicious. But clear utterance is desirable in these times of turmoil. We wonder if the omissions of others than the theological members of the faculty was intentional on the part of the editor. If so, why?

We do well to hear from the rest of the Faculty in McMaster.

#### THE DEAN IN ARTS SPEAKS.

Dr. Cross, profound thinker, teacher who trained his students to think for themselves, and sincere Christian who exemplified in his life the spirit of his Master, is Professor of Systematic Theology at Rochester. Dr. Matthews, one of our own graduates in Arts and Theology, who became the storm centre of theological controversy, but who, in my opinion, was misjudged, is expounding the Old Testament at Crozer. The churches heard him gladly when he preached to them, for his words were winged with comprehensive knowledge of the Bible, with veneration for its writers as prophets inspired of God, and with unswerving conviction of the moral and spiritual values of their messages."—From *The McMaster Graduate*.

What else an investigation would uncover we do not know, but we quote the following from Mr. W. S. Whitcombe, B.A., in *The Prophet* of July, 1926:



### How Many McMaster Professors Believe in an Infallible Bible?

In talking over the situation with Dr. Farmer during the last school year, he expressed his opinion that we were asking too much in demanding that every theological professor should hold to an infallible Bible. Comparatively few in these days would be able to subscribe to that doctrine. And then he asked me if I had ever thought what would happen at McMaster if the principle that we had just been talking over together were rigidly and thoroughly applied in McMaster. And then as nearly as I can remember he asked a question something like this:

"Have you ever thought how many of the present members of the faculty would have to go if we asked them all to subscribe to the doctrine of an infallible Bible?"

### THE McMASTER GOVERNING BODIES.

We have traced the responsibility for the nomination of Professor Marshall to Dean Farmer and Chancellor Whidden, but these men had no power to appoint him. The Chancellor is ex-officio a member of the Board of Governors, but the Dean in theology is not. Nominations to the faculty are made by the Senate; but all appointments are made by the Board of Governors, and they are directly answerable to the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, by which they are elected to their office. It becomes necessary, therefore, to examine the Constitution of these two bodies.

It should, of course, be borne in mind that the Governors are all members of the Senate, but the members of the Senate, other than the sixteen members of the Board of Governors which are elected by the Convention, have no membership on the Board of Governors. The nomination of Professor Marshall would be made to the Senate, and the Senate would then recommend the appointment to the Governors. The Senate responsible for recommending the appointment of Professor Marshall is composed as follows: The Chancellor, Chairman; Members of the Board of Governors; Dean Farmer, Dean McLay, Prof. Brown, Prof. Smith, Prof. Ten Broeke, Major Wilcox, Principal of Woodstock College, Miss Whiteside, Principal of Moulton College; from the University Alumni, representing Arts, V. E. Gray, M.A., J. H. Cranston, B.A., Mrs. E. J. Zavitz, B.A., W. H. Firstbrook, B.A., J. B. McArthur, B.A.; representing Theology, A. P. McDonald, M.A., B.Th., N. S. McKechnie, B.A., B.Th., W. T. Graham, D.D., A. Imrie, B.A., B.Th., B. W. Merrill, B.A., B.Th.

It is interesting to note that seven members of the Senate were students in McMaster during the time Dr. I. G. Matthews was a professor in that institution. Thus Professor Matthews' liberalizing influence is still felt in McMaster's councils.

#### Board and Senate Largely Same as 1910.

An examination of the names of the persons composing the Board of Governors discloses the fact that eight out of the sixteen were members of the Board in 1910, and were responsible for retaining Professor Matthews in his position for the nine years following. Four members of the Board of 1910 are dead, one has resigned, and three others either resigned or failed of re-election. It would appear therefore that the Board of Governors is not unlike the Senate in Canada or the House of Lords in England: once finding a seat in that body, it appears one is expected to occupy it until the end of life.

But we call attention to these facts to show that the men at present administering the affairs of the University are the men responsible for the

course of the University at least since 1910; and through all those years the record of McMaster shows that it has maintained a very sympathetic attitude toward theological liberalism.

A comparison of the present personnel of the Senate with that of 1910 only confirms this view, since sixteen out of the thirty-four members of the Senate at present serving were on the Senate in 1910.

### 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, Jan. 14, 1926).

### PROFESSOR OF McMASTER FACULTY FOR OVER 36 YEARS SPEAKS OF MODERNISM IN THE UNIVERSITY.

[In order to refresh the minds of our readers we publish again the letter by Professor P. S. Campbell. Professor Campbell had nothing to gain, and everything to lose, by publishing this letter. After its publication he was interviewed by a committee of seven appointed by the Senate in an endeavour to persuade him to retract; and when they failed in this endeavour the axe fell.—Editor of *The Gospel Witness*.]

Editor, *Canadian Baptist*:

Dear Sir,—

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

I hold that the sound and helpful lectures of Dr. Farmer were being constantly counteracted by the erroneous instructions of his Biblical coadjutor, Dr. Matthews.

I am convinced, too, 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.

When a prominent member of the Central Baptist Church, after hearing him preach, made to an old friend of mine a remark to this effect, "The attacks made on Professor Marshall's theological position are justifiable," don't you see that we, as Baptists, should rise up and resist in the power of the Holy Spirit this incoming tide of Modernism. Not many years ago, the students in McMaster of that day were tremendously excited when Dr. Foster, a popular professor, left us and became a professor in Chicago University.

Dr. Rand, the Chancellor at that time, was censured by the students for not doing his utmost to retain Dr. Foster. But you all ought to know that it was fortunate for McMaster that Dr. Foster left us, for he became, as all know, a destructive Higher Critic. Not many weeks ago, many students and many professors of McMaster heard Prof. Kanamori speak in our chapel. He told us how through Higher Criticism, he lost his Gospel message and walked in spiritual darkness for twenty years. But in answer to the prevailing prayer of two consecrated women he was graciously restored to faith in God and His Word. To-day he is one of the mighty champions of orthodoxy in Japan. Thousands upon thousands have been swept into the Kingdom of God under his powerful ministry. Personally, I believe that it was the Living God who permitted Professor Kanamori to give this timely address in McMaster Hall. I am assured by those who know, that good results have already accompanied that message of this Spirit-filled prophet of God.

At this point may I ask a question: Do you know any Modernist who is being mightily used to-day as a soul-winner? I could name not a few, who, having embraced this heresy, have left the ministry, for they found, as did Kanamori, that they had no longer a message.

Do you know that two or three years ago one of our graduates drank in this poison and became a zealous Modernist? Thank God he did not get it from McMaster, but he hearkened to addresses given by Modernists at Muskoka, and was poisoned.

That young man is to-day a student in Chicago University. Why did he leave us? Dr. Farmer, Dr. McCrimmon and Dr. MacNeill were too narrow for him.

Did the representatives of our Home Mission Board, Brethren Schutt and Cameron and others, do wrong in refusing, as they did, to give a Home Mission field to this young man, when they knew that he held doctrinal views diametrically opposed to those held by us as Canadian Baptists?

Do we want McMaster to turn out men to fill our pulpits, to go forth as our Home Missionaries and our Foreign Missionaries who, when asked their doctrinal views, would reply in the words of Dr. Shailer Mathews, Dean of the Baptist Theological Seminary of Chicago University, "They stand for what are called Fundamentals, an inerrant Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the physical resurrection, ascension and return of Christ? It will be observed that none of these is in the field of morals." And yet, I am informed, that two honour graduates of McMaster University can even surpass Prof. Shailer Mathews in unbelieving heterodoxy and yet everyone has heard that Prof. Shailer Mathews, when addressing a country congregation, can be as orthodox as Paul. But he is not the only Modernist who can accomplish that feat.

Are you aware that Rochester Theological Seminary, an institution once as orthodox as McMaster professes to be to-day, has on its staff professors, graduates of McMaster, who support Modernism?

Does it give you pleasure to know that Crozer has on its staff professors or lecturers, graduates of McMaster, who are ardent Modernists? Is it encouraging for us as Canadian Baptists, to learn that in Chicago

University, that stronghold of Liberal theology, several members of the staff are graduates of McMaster and that they uphold Modernism?

I make bold to say that the greatest scourge that has visited our day and generation is Modernism. It paralyzes the pulpit, it paralyzes the pew, it paralyzes Home Missions, it paralyzes Foreign Missions. The Modernist is an enemy to himself, an enemy to his home, an enemy to his church, an enemy to his denomination, an enemy to the University, and an enemy to his Lord.

He who is disloyal to the standards of faith which we as Baptists hold vital, is disloyal to McMaster University.

#### BE WARNED!

Modernism has captured Brown University; Modernism has captured Newton, and Crozer, and Rochester. Modernism reigns in Chicago University. Are you willing, through an easy tolerance, to permit McMaster to fall into the hands of this enemy, both of man and God?

I am deeply concerned for McMaster and for all our educational work—this you all must know. I spent three years in the old Canadian Literary Institute when Dr. Fyfe, that great champion of Baptist principles, was at its head. It was from that Institute that I matriculated into Toronto University. I sent my only son to Woodstock College. My two daughters took full courses at Moulton College. My son and one daughter are honour graduates of McMaster University. My son was a professor of Latin in his own Alma Mater. I have laboured as Professor of Greek in McMaster for more than thirty-six years. It may not be inopportune to state that in addition to my work as professor, I joyfully toiled as a Christian workman in eight centres between Hamilton and Toronto, and six of them have become Baptist Churches.

I have humbly asked my God to forgive me the wrong I did in 1910 in supporting a motion for the retention of a Modernist. These words are written to let my fellow-Baptists know that I dare not repeat that wrong.

Baptists of our Convention, again I say—take warning!

Suffer not Modernism to capture McMaster. For if you do, Ichabod will inevitably mark its future history.

P. S. CAMPBELL,

McMaster University.

(From *The Canadian Baptist* of March 18th, 1926).

### PROFESSOR P. S. CAMPBELL SUPERANNUATED?

Elsewhere in this issue we reprint the letter by Prof. P. S. Campbell, protesting against Prof. Marshall's Modernism. Some time after the appearance of this letter (which had been held three weeks in *The Canadian Baptist's* office before publication), the Professor was advised that he had been superannuated! It is true that Prof. Campbell is not a young man, but he is physically and mentally as alert as many others on the Faculty. Few who know the "spirit" of McMaster doubt that the Professor was dismissed because of his protest. This action was in accord with the action of the Chancellor in expelling Mr. W. Gordon Brown from residence in McMaster because of his testimony.

It ought to be known that Professor Campbell was called before a Senate Committee of seven, and that it was only after it was found the Professor could not be persuaded to retract, the axe fell.

What will the denomination say of the action of the Board of Governors in thus penalizing this faithful witness of Christ for daring to testify his soul's deepest conviction?

## THE JESUITISM OF MODERNISM.

DR. SLATEN.

Dr. Slaten of the West Side Unitarian Church, New York, explains the method. He had been a Baptist minister for twenty-one years but during the last ten of them accepted the Unitarian position (i.e. without avowing it). During this period he was the Baptist pastor at the University of Michigan, professor in the Y.M.C.A. College in Chicago, and Bible instructor in William Jewell College. His Unitarianism became so obvious that the trustees of the latter institution requested his resignation. Whereat pandemonium in the press of that country. The Inquisition was again at work; Slaten a martyr in shirt of flame. What he says of his tactics is this: "In some of the churches at least, the very principle of freedom on which the denomination is based guarantees him (the crypto-Unitarian) his right to remain. *It is strategic to remain and work from the inside. Many others are doing it successfully and the gradual permeation of the orthodox denominations with liberal ideas disseminated by trusted leaders of their own appears to them the best procedure. Until recently this has been a procedure that was comparatively easy to follow. Now it is uncertain and dangerous.*"

—"The Leaven of the Sadducees", by Ernest Gordon, pp. 95-96.

THE REV. W. S. MORGAN.

In No. 223 of the official tracts of the American Unitarian Association, the Rev. W. S. Morgan described his passage to Unitarianism. "*A liberal brother from a neighbouring town came to see me. He had said some radical things from his pulpit to which objections had been made. Don't label your heresy, was my advice. Do as I do. Give them heresy in such a fashion that the very saints will not suspect it. Bad ethics, you say! I say, very bad! But this is the only way in which hundreds of orthodox pulpits can be held. When it was whispered abroad that in my ministry of three years I had not preached a sermon on the blood of Jesus cleansing us from all sin I saw clearly that I was discovered.*" Mr. Morgan was a Baptist minister educated at the Yale Divinity School.

REV. THOMAS CLAYTON.

In the same official tract the Rev. Thomas Clayton tells a similar story. When he became a Unitarian, he says, "I was advised to stay where I was and keep some of my opinions to myself, gradually to sow the seeds of liberalism and wait until the time was ripe for more aggressive agitation."

—"The Leaven of the Sadducees". by Ernest Gordon, pp. 96-97.

The following extract from "*The Leaven of the Sadducees*" will show how accommodating the ethics of Modernism permits a modernist's conscience to be. He has no difficulty in signing anything; and after he has signed it, at his own convenience he may tell you what he meant. Surely that which follows shows that the signature of a modernist to a confession of faith reduces such a confession to nothing more than a "scrap of paper":

Prof. Mitchell signed the declaration required of all theological professors, of his sincere acceptance of the Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church (which includes the Apostles' Creed) to teach in harmony therewith. On page 162 of his autobiography is published his interpretation explaining away the statement.

"I accept the Old Testament as divinely authoritative, recognizing a supernatural element manifested in miracles and prophecy.

"I accept the Gospel statement respecting Jesus' advent into the world. I believe in the Trinity including the deity of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

"I believe that the death of Jesus was necessary for the salvation of mankind. I have not and never had any sympathy with the doctrines of Universalism."

Of this trifter Prof. Sharp in a foreward to the autobiography says: "If Jesus had a brother and God a second son it was Hinckley Gilbert Mitchell."

—"*The Leaven of the Sadducees*", by Ernest Gordon, pp. 234, 235.

## WILL THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS PRESENT A STATEMENT OF FAITH?

We wonder how often the Board of Governors of McMaster University have made a statement of faith in their report? Every time some controversy is on, they dig up the doctrinal statement of the Trust Deed and incorporate it in their report; they draw long faces and look very pious, and tell the world that this is what they believe! As soon as the Convention is over, they go back to their work, continuing in their positions professors whose teaching is destructive of the faith they have professed at the Convention.

When they put one of their representatives forth to propose a resolution they usually couple an orthodox statement with the resolution so as to make it impossible to vote against the resolution without voting against their "professed" orthodoxy.

What McMaster will do this time, we do not know. At the present moment it looks to us that the day is not far distant when this whole matter will have to be fought out in the courts. The Andover decision is undoubtedly good law.

This issue of *The Gospel Witness* proves to a demonstration that the present Governing Body of McMaster has utterly betrayed its trust. There cannot longer be any doubt that it is high time we had a change. This paper goes forth with our earnest prayer that God may use it to enlighten those who are but half awake, and to awaken those who are still sound asleep. "While men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares"; "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

## MR. THOMAS URQUHART ON CENTRALIZED ECCLÉSIASTICISM.

### Chairmen of Boards.

In dealing more directly with the subject "The influence of McMaster University upon our denominational boards and organizations" I would first wish to point out as follows: Professor J. H. Farmer, Dean of McMaster University is President of the Convention; Mr. James Ryrie, a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University, is Chairman of the Home Mission Board, and Mr. Albert Mathews, Chairman of the Board of Governors, is Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Home Mission Board, the most important committee of that Board. Mr. S. J. Moore, President of the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board is also a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; Mr. Harry L. Stark, Chairman of the Board of Religious Education, is also a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; Mr. George S. Mathews, of Brantford, Chairman of the Board of Publication, is also a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University; Professor C. W. New, Chairman of the Ministerial Superannuation Board of the Baptist Convention is a Professor in McMaster University; Rev. W. T. Graham, D.D., Chairman of the Western Mission Board of the Baptist Convention is a member of the senate of McMaster University, and Mr. R. D. Warren, the General Treasurer of the Boards, is a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University. The only one of our general boards which is not headed by a member of the Board of Governors or by a professor or official, is the Church Edifice Board, of which Rev. H. B. Coumans is Chairman. I do not think it can be conceived that all these appointments just happened by accident. It seems to clearly show that there have been guiding hands planning and directing so that the University should have its hand upon practically all Boards of our denomination. When this control of our denominational organizations began I am not prepared to say, but there have been indications of it which I have personally noticed in connection with the Convention for a number of years. It has been specially evident to me in reference to the appointment of the President of the Convention. In 1919-1920 Rev. John McNeill was elected President, a member of the Board of Governors; in 1920-1921 Mr. S. J. Moore was elected president, a member of the Board of Governors; in 1921-1922 Professor A. L. McCrimmon was elected President,—at that time I think he was Chancellor of the University, in any event he was a professor thereof. At the Convention in Walmer Road Church, October, 1922, a little bird whispered to me that there was a nice little plan made to elect Dr. W. T. Graham, one of the close friends of McMaster University and now a member of the senate, to that position, and Mr. S. J. Moore, in his usual happy and magnificent way of dealing with matters of this kind, nominated with great praise Dr. W. T. Graham for President of the Convention. I immediately afterwards went to the front and without having consulted with any person and not even with Mr. Coumans, I nominated Rev. H. B. Coumans, then of Collingwood, for President, pointing out that for some years the President of the Convention resided in Toronto, and that it was about time that a man outside Toronto should be elected to the position. Mr. Coumans was elected by the Convention. It was interesting to note the stirring around of McMaster officials and some of their close friends almost immediately after the announcement of the election. It looked to me for a little while as if they thought that all their plans regarding that historical convention might be set aside as their nominee for President had been. If we should go back for thirteen years in the Presidency of the Convention, 1913-14, we will find that of the twelve Presidents during that time, ten were or had been or are now closely identified with McMaster University, namely: Rev. W. E. Norton (a member of the Board of Governors for the preceding year), Mr. James Ryrie, Rev. J. G. Brown, Mr. Jos. N. Shenstone, Rev. O. C. S. Wallace, former Chancellor, Rev. John MacNeill, Mr. S. J. Moore, Dr. A. L. McCrimmon, Mr. Albert Mathews, Dr. J. H. Farmer.

### From What Churches the Governors Come.

It is well to enquire where these men who seem to have such a controlling influence in our denomination, come from, and whom do they represent. The Board

of Governors consists of 16 members and the chancellor. Of these 17 members five came from Walmer Road Church, namely: Messrs. MacNeill, Shenstone, Sanderson, Robertson and Warren. Four came from Bloor St. Church: Messrs. Cameron, Whidden, Fox and Stark; these representatives from two Churches, represent a majority of the Board of Governors. Messrs. Ryrie and A. Matthews came from Central Church and Mr. Moore from Parkdale Church, Rev. R. R. MacKay from Sarnia Church, Mr. Reynolds from Brockville Church, Mr. George Matthews from First Brantford Church, Mr. Edwards from First Ottawa Church, and Rev. T. T. Shields from Jarvis St. Church, Toronto. It is clear that the representatives of two Churches control the Board of Governors and as such control our Educational policy. Let us consider another sphere wherein McMaster has practical control of Denominational activities, namely, in the Executive Committee of the Convention. According to the year book there are 30 names given as members of the committee, made up as follows:—President, 1st and 2nd Vice President, Secretary-Treasurer, 3 each from McMaster University, Western Missions Board, Church Edifice Board, Ministerial Superannuation Board, Religious Education Board and Publication Board, 4 each from Home Mission Board and Foreign Mission Board. Of these 30 members the name of Mr. R. D. Warren, the general Treasurer, appears 6 times (and he would probably be entitled to six votes) as a member of the Committee, and Mr. McLeod's name appears twice but I presume that they really only exercise one vote each on the Committee, hence the Committee consists of 24 members—of whom 11 are directly connected with McMaster University, either as members of the Board or Senate or as Professors therein, namely: Messrs. Farmer, Whidden, A. Matthews, Ryrie, Warren, Moore, Graham, New, Stark, Geo. S. Matthews, Bengough, and I do not need to intimate how closely identified several of the others named on that Executive Committee are with McMaster University. Some of them have been considered as such close camp followers that you could not distinguish them from those wearing the real uniform. It seems clear to me that our Educational institution has full control of all the plans for the annual convention—time, programme, place of meeting, arrangement of details, so as to make the setting as easy as possible for their plans to materialize, and as difficult as possible for any criticism to have adequate opportunity to present its case.

#### To What Churches Members of the Senate Belong.

If we examine into the constitution of the Senate which according to the 1925 year book consists of the Chancellor and thirty-three other members, there are seventeen members named other than the Chancellor and the elected Board of Governors. From the information which I have secured these 17 members came from the following Churches; Messrs. Farmer, Gray, Merrill and Smith, from Walmer Road Church; Messrs. McLay, Ten Broeke and Cranston, Mrs. Zavitz and Miss Whiteside, from Bloor St. Church; Messrs. Firstbrook and McArthur from Central Church; Mr. Wilcock from Woodstock Church; Mr. McDonald from Brampton Church; Mr. McKechnie from Belleville; Mr. Imrie from Kitchener Church; Dr. Graham from First Avenue Toronto and Dr. Brown from St. Clair Ave., Toronto. It will be noted that nine of these seventeen members of the Senate come from Walmer Road and Bloor St. Toronto Churches, thus showing that these two churches have control, not only of the Board of Governors as hereinbefore set out, but of the Senate of the University as well, with 9 representatives on the Board of Governors and 9 representatives among the other members of the Senate. I do not think it can be conceived that all these things just happened so, but as already stated there has been a power directing and guiding these appointments so that the hand of McMaster, whether modernistic, evolutionist or otherwise, should be at the head in every important place in our denomination and further that everything was so directed that two churches, strong no doubt numerically—should have through their representatives, the power to control our educational work.

#### Proportional Representation.

Might we just look at it in another way. For the various regular boards of our denomination the Convention elects altogether 100 members, 16 being elected for the Board of Governors of McMaster University and 12 for each of the other Boards. According to our last year book the membership of Baptist



Churches in Ontario and Quebec was 62,234. Therefore we have a representative on a Board for each 622 members of the Denomination. Walmer Road with its 1,600 or 1,700 members, has 11 members with 15 memberships on various boards as follows: Rev. John McNeill on three boards, McMaster, Foreign Missions, Western Missions; Mr. Shenstone on two boards, McMaster and Foreign Missions; Mr. Farmer, Foreign Missions; Mr. McTavish, Foreign Missions; Mr. Merrill, on two boards, Publication Board and Religious Education Board; Mr. Warren, McMaster Board; Mr. Robertson, McMaster Board; Mr. Sanderson, McMaster Board; Mr. Gray, Ministerial Superannuation Board; Mr. Foster, Ministerial Superannuation Board; Mr. Clark, Western Board, or one representative for a little over 100 members. Bloor St. with a membership of 1,200 has 6 members with 10 memberships on Board as follows; Rev. W. A. Cameron, McMaster Board; Mr. Craig, Foreign Missions and Ministerial Superannuation; Mr. Ratcliffe, Publication Board; Mr. Stark, McMaster Board and Board of Religious Education; Mr. Fox, McMaster Board; Mr. M. W. Houlding, Religious Education; Mr. C. W. New, Ministerial Superannuation; Mr. Wright, Religious Education Board.

The result of the analysis is that McMaster University not only has its hand upon practically all our denominational Boards but that two churches, Walmer Road and Bloor Street, have a dominating influence to a very great extent in the affairs of the Convention, educational and otherwise.

*(From an Address by Mr. T. Urquhart).*

## MR. THOMAS URQUHART EXPLAINS HOW THE HOME MISSION BOARD RESOLUTION WAS PASSED.

The Editor of the Gospel Witness:

There have been matters discussed at recent meetings of the Baptist Home Mission Board and the Executive thereof in which the whole Denomination is vitally interested and this is my reason for writing this letter.

I have been a member of the Board for over thirty years and have taken an active interest in the work thereof and have, until recently, felt that the Board had exercised great fairness in their dealings with missionaries and students engaged in Home Mission work, as well as keeping free from any entanglement with the difficulties of any other Boards. Now we have the Board itself, by a large majority, approving of a resolution which, if carried out, will in my judgment, be disastrous to the work of the Convention, but like a runaway horse, a majority of the members of the Board took the bit in their teeth and issued commands to our missionaries who were assumed to be employees of the Board, directing them regarding the denominational subjects they should discuss on their fields, thus attempting to muzzle the missionaries and take away the freedom of speech enjoyed by every Baptist pastor. Further, the Board endeavored to put a ban on members of the Board discussing matters outside the Board which vitally affected the life of the Denomination.

### The Issue is Not Dr. Shields.

The issue in the controversy is not what the students' or missionaries' opinions are or may be. The issue is not Dr. Shields or those who support him. The issue is McMaster University and the teaching therein and the management thereof, and this is the issue the Convention and our churches will have to face and decide, and until it is decided right the controversy will continue and in the discussion thereof the mouths of our Pastors, our Missionaries, our Church members cannot be closed by the order of any Board.

A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Home Mission Board was held on January 21st, 1926, when the following resolution was moved by Rev. H. McDiarmid, and seconded by Rev. H. E. Green:

"The Executive Committee of the Home Mission Board ask the Executive Committee of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec to take immediate steps whereby Convention-wide action be taken with regard to the attitude of Dr. Shields and others whose propaganda is hindering the work in which we are engaged."

I had been at the meeting up to about 12.30 and had to leave the meeting to keep an important business engagement, and it was after I left the meeting

that this resolution was presented and carried. I heard during the afternoon that important business had come up after I left and I asked the Secretary for a copy of this resolution, and I inquired regarding the discussion thereon and then learned that it was stated at the meeting that the Executive Committee of the Convention were arranging for a meeting of the Convention within a few weeks, but that the plan was being kept quite secret for the present. The matter leaked out—the newspapers got hold of it—and the Convention plan was abandoned. There were only nine members of the Committee present, I believe, when I left. This resolution was not on the agenda of the Committee and no notice had been given of its presentation in the call of the meeting and it was business which, in my judgment, the Committee had no right or authority to deal with.

#### Minutes of the Board Not Inviolable.

When the minutes of this Executive meeting were sent out to the members of the Board, I received my copy on the morning of April 15th, for which date another meeting of the Executive had been called. This resolution did not appear in the copy of the minutes and at the meeting on April 15th an explanation was given by Rev. Mr. Coumans, a member of the Board, that some time (the date was not mentioned) after the meeting on 21st January, he had asked the mover and seconder of the resolution to withdraw same and they had agreed to do so, stating the resolution was embarrassing to the Superintendent. I cannot see how this resolution could embarrass the Superintendent, but I can quite understand it might be embarrassing to those who supported it. I understood one of the sponsors for the resolution to say in reply to Mr. Coumans, that he did not agree to this withdrawal. I cannot see how, after the minutes of a meeting have been completed, any member, even though the mover and seconder desired to do so, could withdraw any motion which had been duly passed. At a subsequent meeting of the Executive there might have been a resolution rescinding the motion, but the minutes would have to stand as they were passed. It is to be noted that the minutes of a meeting are not inviolate if it is necessary to serve the interest of certain members. If I had not got a copy of the resolution, probably I would not have known that such a resolution had been passed.

#### Meeting of the Executive Committee.

A meeting of the Executive Committee was held on April 15th, 1926, and a copy of the minutes, as appears in the Secretary's book, are as follows:  
"Re Summer Students:

Mr. Webb, chairman, stated that he had received three letters from three members of the Board—Brethren Burrel, Green and McDiarmid—in regard to the appointment of students on summer fields who had protested against the appointment of Professor Marshall to McMaster University.

For the consideration of this question this emergency meeting of the Executive Committee has been called.

Mr. McDiarmid stated that he had written a letter to the Superintendent, in which he protested against the appointment of these students unless they were first examined or their case fully considered by the whole Board. He felt convinced that all proceedings relative to their final appointment should be stayed or withdrawn if already accomplished, until after the general Board meeting.

There followed a discussion as to whether the Executive could deal with the work of the Examining and Stationing Committee.

Mr. Urquhart, the Solicitor, held that the Board only can revise the work of a committee that the Board has appointed and that one committee could not revise the work of another committee, as both committees are responsible, not to each other, but to the Board.

It was decided, therefore, to refer this question to the Board which it is expected will meet before the end of this month. It was then arranged that the date of the semi-annual meeting of the Home Mission Board should be Thursday, April 29th, 1926.

Upon motion by Mr. Green, and Mr. Boyd, the meeting was adjourned."

#### Students' Protest Discussed.

This is a fairly accurate report of the meeting, but it should be added, for the information of the Baptist constituency, that there was much discussion

at that meeting regarding the matter and some of the members of the Committee were bound to take up the question of the allotment of fields to the student missionaries who had signed the protest against Professor Marshall's teachings. They were prepared, if they had the power to do so, to prevent those students (some of whom the Superintendent at the subsequent Board meeting stated to be among the very best workers the Board had) from expressing their opinion on a question which was of vital interest to the Denomination, namely, the teaching of Professor Marshall. They had practical knowledge. They were in his classes. Heard his lectures. Some even had personal interviews with him. They knew better than members of the Home Mission Board what the Professor taught, and what he believed and they, with this personal knowledge, were either to be muzzled or not appointed to fields. They also sought to suppress the members of the Committee reporting what was discussed at that meeting; I declined to be bound by any such agreement and several of the members used some very strong personal expressions regarding myself, but these are neither here nor there in the controversy. I stated, however, that I would give such publicity to the discussion as I might deem necessary and that I might use it in an address at the meeting called to organize a Baptist Bible Union for Ontario. (I did not, however, do so, as I decided it was better to see what the Board would do). Were they ashamed of what they were doing—were they afraid of Baptist public opinion? If their proposed action was just and right, why not broadcast it over the Denomination? The fact remains, they did not wish the discussion made public.

A meeting of the Board was held on Thursday, April 29th. The following members were present:

#### Names of Board Members.

Members elected by the Convention: Rev. O. U. Chapman, Windsor; Mr. W. J. Kerr, Hamilton; Rev. H. McDiarmid, Stratford; Mr. C. Cook, Brantford; Mr. Arthur Jones, Montreal; Rev. H. B. Coumans, Toronto; Rev. J. R. Webb, Kitchener; Thomas Urquhart, Toronto.

Members representing Associations: Rev. H. C. Bryant, Smith's Falls; Rev. P. C. Cameron, Orillia; Rev. D. W. Terry, Sherbrooke, Quebec; Dr. F. R. Watson, Georgetown; Rev. R. R. McKay, Sarnia; Rev. H. E. Green, Hamilton; Rev. J. D. McLachlan, Waterford; Rev. M. Hall, Timmins; Rev. W. R. Telford, Cornwall; Rev. C. R. Duncan, Brantford (now Toronto), Secretary of McMaster University; Rev. N. S. McKechnie, Belleville; Rev. W. E. Hodgson, Toronto; Rev. G. W. Connors, Mount Forest; Rev. F. G. Burrell, Leamington; Mr. A. D. Kitchener, Lindsay.

#### Are Board Meetings Secret?

The question of summer students and student pastors was brought from its place on the agenda after the first hour of the meeting and was discussed (except during one hour adjournment for lunch) by the Board until about three o'clock in the afternoon. Rev. J. R. Webb was in the chair in the absence of the President, and explained how he received letters from Rev. H. McDiarmid, Rev. H. E. Green, Rev. F. G. Burrell and Rev. R. R. McKay, and also referred to another letter from a layman in Guelph, whose name was not mentioned. Several of these letters were read and there was some discussion and comment thereon. Then Mr. Hodgson asked if this meeting of the Board was a public meeting and referred to the discussion of the Executive Committee when Mr. Urquhart refused to be bound not to report anything that happened at the Executive meeting. The Chairman suggested that the discussion should not be made public, there should be what he called, a gentleman's agreement. There was some discussion about this. Mr. Jones, of Montreal, held that this was not a secret meeting and that its doings could not be kept secret. Mr. Webb thought that the Board should express an opinion regarding it. Mr. McKay thought the decisions only might be given out. Dr. Watson thought that any statement made by Mr. Urquhart would be correct. I suggested that the business of the Board was the business of the Denomination and that every Church that was interested in the Home Mission Board had the right to have knowledge of the work that was carried on by the Home Mission Board and declined to be bound by such an agreement.

### Fear of Publicity.

It is again seen from this that, not only did the members of the Board seek to stifle or muzzle the opinions of the students in their discussion of the teachings of McMaster University, but they sought also to stifle and muzzle the discussion thereof in the Denomination by a member of the Board. Why such a desire if their project was just and right?

### Rev. H. McDiarmid's Attack on Students.

Rev. H. McDiarmid read a resolution which he moved, condemning in the strongest possible way Dr. Shields and his friends with their propaganda, and particularly dealing with the question of the students on summer fields, and particularly those students who had the temerity to sign a protest regarding the teachings of Professor Marshall. I have asked the Secretary for a copy of this resolution, but he advises me that he has not got a copy as it was not left with him. While the resolution itself was not seconded, yet there afterwards was a motion made and seconded that it be discussed, clause by clause, and it was so discussed, and this resolution of Mr. McDiarmid should be on the files of the Board. I did not make a copy at the meeting as I thought it would be on file. The resolution proposed to instruct all students not to discuss matters now in controversy in our Denomination on their fields, if the discussion or opinion would be in opposition or contrary to the expressed will of the Convention.

### Can Students be Muzzled?

There was a very long discussion on this resolution. It is not possible to give it all. Mr. Tekford thought it would be very difficult to compel students not to talk about the matter, and said that there was discontent regarding the teachings of McMaster University. Mr. Coumans strongly supported Professor Marshall. He was all right in his opinion. Mr. Bryant, Smith's Falls, said that his church was opposed to Professor Marshall and that he himself was opposed to retaining Mr. Marshall. Mr. McDiarmid claimed that he was not trying to muzzle anyone, but he was endeavouring to safeguard the interests of the Convention, and later on, in speaking again, he stated that they had the right to make any demands dealing with treason in our Denomination. It was time to fight the results of treason. Men in employ of the Board should in every respect support the attitude of the Convention. Mr. Jones said it was not treason for students to say Professor Marshall's appointment was wrong, but the students should carry out the wishes of the Convention, and the regulations should be carried out in as far as possible. Mr. Burrell claimed that he would not become a servant of a Church if he was not in harmony with its views. This Board is the servant of the Convention and when the Convention speaks a man should agree or should resign. The Churches will say that they are not going to support the Board if they send us students to criticize the policy of the Board. This Board has the Convention's will to exercise. Mr. Duncan, speaking after lunch, thought they ought to follow the intention of the Board as expressed in the morning meeting. Mr. McKechnie thought they should have some resolution passed. Mr. Jones said they should bind down students as against either side. Mr. Kitchener said he was no friend of Dr. Shields. Steps should be taken that students should not agitate, but passing a resolution might affect his church.

Mr. Cook thought to deliberately appoint students to fields who were opposed to McMaster University would be wrong; to deliberately appoint men to pull down would be wrong, but the Board must be careful not to go too fast or too far. He read a resolution prepared by himself, but it was not seconded. The writer of this letter spoke and stated to the members of the Board that they were playing with fire, that they might as well pass a resolution directing what the missionaries' wife should wear as to say that the missionaries should not discuss questions of interest to the Denomination. They could not, by a resolution, close the mouths of our missionaries or students.

Mr. McKay stated that he had made up his mind while sitting on the Board in the morning that he was opposed to any attempt to bind or muzzle, but there should be a resolution that the Superintendent and members of the Stationing Committee be instructed to request all students going to summer fields to refrain from anything that would be divisive.

### Messrs. Duncan and Green Move the Muzzling Resolution.

"In view of the fact that the present controversy disturbing the churches must be dealt with by the Convention which sanctioned the appointment to which some exception is now being taken, the Home Mission Board instructs the Superintendent to confer personally or by letter with all missionaries of the Board and make it clear to them that the Board does not desire any Pastor supported by denominational funds and under their direction to bring the controversy into the churches or to influence the members of the churches in a manner which may interfere with the loyalty of the Board to the work of the Convention as a whole."

### Mr. Jones Objects to Calling Protest "Treason".

This resolution was discussed by a number. Mr. McDiarmid, Mr. McKechnie and others desired the Stationing and Examining Committee be associated with the Superintendent. Mr. McLachlan questioned the wisdom of passing the resolution. Mr. McKechnie desired to know if you could call Home Mission pastors appointees of the Board. Mr. McDiarmid claimed the Board had the right to make any demands. They were dealing with treason in our Denomination. Time to fight results. A man in the employ of the Board should in every respect support the attitude of the Convention. It was at this point that Mr. Jones said it was not treason for students to say Professor Marshall's appointment was wrong, but they should carry out the wishes of the Convention.

### Chairman Stops Superintendent.

Mr. Chapman thought that students should appreciate a guiding hand like the Superintendent's upon their shoulders. Mr. Hodgson, supporting the resolution, said that students should be advised to keep out of controversy. Dr. Watson asked for Mr. Schutt's, the Superintendent's, report, and Mr. Schutt stated the Board could not get along without the protesting students named, that among them were found the very best men that we had, and he particularly mentioned the splendid work of some of these men and naming the fields on which they did their work. As he went on to do this the Chairman stopped him in the midst of his explanation, and the writer asked that Mr. Schutt be allowed to finish and the Chairman claimed that he did not desire to stop Mr. Schutt, but the result was that Mr. Schutt ceased his explanation and the Board did not have the full explanation of the Superintendent regarding the work of these students.

### Mr. Urquhart's Amendment.

I then moved the following amendment to the resolution, seconded by Rev. Morley Hall:

"That all words after the word 'view' in first line be struck out and the following inserted so that it will read 'In view of the discussion before the Board the Superintendent be instructed regarding students taking summer work on Mission fields to carry out the policy which has been in force in other years and give the student Missionaries such instruction as he has been in the habit from year to year of giving them before going to their fields'."

### Names of Yeas and Nays.

When the vote was taken on the amendment, I asked for the yeas and nays. The yeas were as follows: Messrs. Hall and Urquhart. Nays: Messrs. Kitchener, Connors, Green, McKay, Burrell, Chapman, Telford, Hodgson, McDiarmid, Kerr, McKechnie, McLachlan, Terry, Cook, Watson, Jones and Cameron—seventeen. I am not quite sure whether Mr. Webb, the Chairman, actually voted, but he supported the resolution, and I am not sure whether Mr. Coumans was in the room, but he also supported the resolution. Only two members supported the amendment, which approved of the policy which the Board has always carried out regarding students, and nineteen supported the radical change. Mr. Schutt and Mr. Bryant did not vote. Mr. Duncan's resolution was carried on the same vote, the same 17 or 19 voting yea, and two nay.

**Rev. J. R. Webb's Letter.**

In connection with the resolution, what someone called a covering letter was sent out by the Superintendent as follows:

"223 Church St.,

Toronto 2, April 30th, 1926.

My Dear Brother:

At the meeting of the Home Mission Board held on April 29th, 1926, which was very largely attended the following resolution was passed: (Then followed the resolution set out above).

The Vice-Chairman of the Board, who presided at the meeting, has asked me to state that it is not intended that this resolution should in any way limit the usual liberties of Baptist workers, but rather that the considered opinion of an overwhelming majority of the Board is, that any propaganda one way or the other in connection with the present controversy is considered outside the purpose for which this Board has sent men into its fields, and can only hamper us in our preaching the Word of God, to which we all desire to be loyal.

Earnestly praying that large blessing may rest upon your labours, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

in His service,

CHARLES H. SCHUTT."

It will be noted that this letter added to the resolution is the opinion of Mr. Webb, the Vice-Chairman. There is nothing in the minutes of the Board to suggest that the Chairman was to interpret the resolution but the letter seems to be an effort to extract the poisonous sting from the serpent but it may be found, that instead of the sting being removed, additional poison has been inserted.

**The Resolution Analyzed.**

Notice for a moment the wording of the resolution: It refers to all missionaries of the Board. They are treated just as simple employees, although they have been called by the Churches as pastors on their respective fields and they have been ordained by a Council representing Baptist Churches in the ordinary way in which a Baptist Minister is ordained, and it is to be made clear to these missionaries that the Board does not desire any Pastor supported by denominational funds and under their direction, to bring the existing controversy into the Churches.

This can only mean that being supported by denominational funds, they are under the direction of the Board and therefore the employees of the Board, and if an employer expresses a desire to an employee surely the desire must be interpreted as a command. It plainly means that no missionary of the Board shall be permitted an opinion that differs either with the Board or the opinion of the Convention as interpreted by the Board. It intimates further that the Home Mission Board must be loyal to the work of the Convention as a whole, even though the very existence of the Denomination might be concerned. This is a principle which no loyal Baptist can support. The loyalty of our pastors and of our churches and of the members thereof should not be a loyalty to a Convention or to a Board but must be a loyalty to God and His Word, and any resolution that seeks to interfere with any pastor or missionary expressing his full opinion upon any matter concerning the religious life of our Denomination would be a muzzling and a stifling of the liberties which are one of the dearest heritages, not only of every loyal Baptist, but of every British subject.

**The Vice-Chairman's Letter.**

In dealing with the covering letter it need only be said that the surest way of hampering the preaching of the Word of God is to direct our missionaries that they shall not discuss teachings which they believe adverse to the Word of God and directing them to support or give allegiance to a man as a teacher, who, from the evidence of those students in closest touch with the one involved, from the evidence of Professor Farmer who admits that Professor Marshall holds Dr. Driver's view, it is perfectly clear that his teachings are modernistic and are not in accordance with the principles of the Word of God to which our Denomination has adhered from the very beginning.

### The Baptist Bible Union Anticipates the Resolution.

If my reading of history is correct, what is now the Roman Catholic Church was once really a Baptist Church, but bishops and others leading in the work began to take authority upon themselves and gradually an ecclesiasticism was established with an infallible pope at its head with absolute control and little or no freedom for the individual as to his belief or his principles. Will history repeat itself? The Committee on resolutions at the organization of the Baptist Bible Union must have had a vision of what would happen when they passed the following resolution:

"That we further desire to enter our protest against any unscriptural ecclesiasticism either by leading representatives of our University or by the Home Mission Board of our Denomination, and call upon all our Baptist Churches and pastors to assert their independence and to resist to the utmost any and every attempt to interfere with the independence of the local church or the liberty of its members."

I would like to deal with several other questions arising out of the situation but leave them over for the present.

THOS. URQUHART.

## STATEMENT OF TRUSTS IN DEED OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY.

Toronto Baptist College was incorporated by an act of the Ontario Legislature on the Fourth day of March, 1881 (44 Victoria, Chap. 87), by which power was given a Board of Trustees to organize and carry on a Theological College for the training of students for the Regular Baptist denomination and by an amending Act assented to Thirtieth March, 1885 (48 Victoria, Chap. 96), it was provided that the Conventions of the Denomination should be represented on the Senate of the College, with a view to securing a more direct voice in the management of the College.

By an Act of the said Legislature assented to on the Twenty-third day of April, 1887 (50 Victoria, Chap. 95), Toronto Baptist College and Woodstock College were united under the name of McMaster University and it was provided in said Act that "McMaster University shall be a Christian School of Learning, and the study of the Bible, or sacred scriptures, shall form a part of the course of study taught by the professors, tutors, or masters appointed by the board of governors."

It was further enacted that "Nothing in this Act contained shall be deemed to authorize the use of the lands and premises conveyed to the trustees of the Toronto Baptist College by the Honorable William McMaster, by deed bearing date the first day of December, 1880, for any other purposes than those set out in the said deed, or to otherwise alter or affect the trusts in said deed contained, otherwise than by vesting the rights and powers of the said trustees in the university hereby created."

The trusts in said deed in so far as they refer to Religious teaching are as follows: "For the education and training of students preparing for and intending to be engaged in Pastoral, Evangelical, missionary or other denominational work in connection with the Regular Baptist Denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed of persons who have been baptized on a personal profession of their Faith in Christ holding and maintaining substantially the following doctrines, that is to say: "The Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice, the existence of one living and true God, sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the same in essence and equal attributes, the total and universal depravity of mankind, the election and effectual calling of all God's people, the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, the free justification of believers in Him by His imputed righteousness, the preservation unto eternal life of the Saints, the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust, the general judgment, the everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting

misery of the wicked, immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the only gospel baptism, that parties so baptized are alone entitled to Communion at the Lord's Table and that a Gospel Church is a body of baptized believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God."

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 4.

Lesson 6.

Fourth Quarter.

November 7th, 1926.

### THE HOME OF THE SOUL.

LESSON TEXT: John, chapter 14.

GOLDEN TEXT.—"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me" (John 14:6).

#### I. CHRIST BRINGS NEWS OF ANOTHER WORLD.

1. He teaches us that faith is the cure for trouble; and He bids us believe in Him as we believe in God (vs. 1). 2. He speaks of the life beyond as His Father's House, which suggests not only a state of condition, but a place. It is a beautiful picture of home. To our Lord's departure from earth meant going home to His Father; and He would have us think of our exodus in the same way. He tells us that in His Father's House "are many mansions". He never suppressed the individual: He represented the Shepherd as calling His sheep by name. The tendency nowadays is to institutionalize the church, and every form of religious service. Christ came to make men, and as there are many men, there must be many mansions—a place for every one distinct, and different, and separate from every other place, and yet room for all. 3. He goes to prepare a place for us, and will return to receive us unto Himself, for we must be where He is. How wonderful this suggestion, "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made"! The record of the creation suggests instantaneous action, and by His miracles He showed Himself independent of the process of time: He could multiply five loaves to the proportion of a generous harvest; He could instantaneously turn water into wine. And He has gone to prepare a place. What a wonderful place it must be! Furthermore "the chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels"; He is the Lord of Hosts. It would be easy for Him to provide an escort for every believer to secure his safe passage to the place prepared, but His love will not permit another to do that which He desires to do Himself: "I will come again, and receive you unto Myself". And then, wonder of wonders, He insists that where He is we must be:

"For this I shall find  
That such is His Mind,  
He will not be in glory,  
And leave me behind."

4. Thomas speaks with the voice of universal human experience when he says, "We know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way"? Notwithstanding all the progress of human knowledge at this late day, from personal experience we know no more of the future life than did the first human mourner who stood beside an open grave. Men have speculated about the future, and in due time have gone where they must put their theories to



the proof; but we do not know what discoveries they have made for not one of them has returned to tell us. Apart from Divine revelation we know nothing certainly of the life beyond. 5. Christ's is the only voice of authority to speak on this matter: He has personal knowledge of both worlds, and breaks in upon our darkness with the words, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." He has brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel, and now we know that the grave is only the vestibule to Glory. 6. We are to see God in Christ. He is the express image of His Person (vss. 8-11). See also Heb. 1:1-4. The Lord forbade any attempt to make an image of God, or to imagine what He is like; and this because it was His gracious purpose to give us a portrait of Himself in the Gospel. 7. Faith is the victor that overcometh the world (vss. 10-12). This has been truly fulfilled in the experience of many. It may be doubted whether a single discourse of the Lord Jesus delivered during the days of His flesh did ever win for Him as many as three thousand souls. Yet this was accomplished at Pentecost by a single sermon. Our Lord never travelled beyond the boundaries of Palestine, and in the days of His flesh reached comparatively few people. At the time of Spurgeon's death it was estimated that by voice and pen he had spoken to more than three hundred millions of people. 8. Christ gives His disciples a book of signed blank cheques promising to honor them as they were filled in (vss. 13-14).

## II. HE PROMISES THE HOLY SPIRIT.

1. We are to prove our love by our obedience (vs. 15). 2. The Comforter is described as the Father's gift, and is coming as an answer to Christ's prayer. All this was fulfilled at Pentecost (Acts 2:32-36), and may be fulfilled in the experience of every believer. 3. He predicts that the world will not receive the Spirit: it never has done, and never will. Therefore we ought never to be disturbed by worldly judgments of spiritual matters. 4. But the Holy Spirit will dwell in His people. The Paraclete comes to stand by, not to be an occasional visitor but to abide with us for ever. 5. The ultimate proof of Christ's Messiahship is to be found in the coming of the Spirit: "At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you" (vs. 20). "Therefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36). And to this day it remains true that only the Spirit of God can convince men that Jesus is the Christ. 6. The condition of the Divine indwelling is ever obedience (vss. 21-25). 7. The mission of the Comforter is to bring to remembrance the things which Jesus has spoken. This promise was fulfilled in the writing of the Gospels and of the Epistles; for it should be remembered that even the earliest Gospel was written years after the ascension of our Lord. Yet we have His extended discourses as well as His brief sayings recorded as though they had been stenographically reported. God never forgets what He has said, and every word that Jesus spoke was in the knowledge of the Holy Ghost, and when the writers of the Gospels wrote by inspiration of the Spirit, they were able to record the very words of Jesus. 8. Christ speaks of His departure as a cause for rejoicing (vs. 28). "Because I said, I go unto the Father." If we could know what lies beyond the grave, and into what bliss redeemed souls are admitted when they depart to be with Christ, the funeral of a believer would be an occasion of rejoicing.

# INDEX

Authorship and Dates:	Pages.
Bearing on Scripture .....	10
Bearing on New Testament .....	10-11
Brown, Prof. J. G., and <i>The Western Recorder</i> .....	31-32
Board and Senate of McMaster .....	33-34
Campbell, Prof. P. S.—Warns against Modernism in McMaster .....	34-36
Superannuation of .....	36
Charter of McMaster—Statement of Faith in .....	47
Christ, Authority of (Driver's View) .....	11-12
Controversial—the Gospel .....	5
Controversialist—Jesus Christ .....	4-5
Cross, Dr. George:	
Commended in Year Book .....	28
His Teaching .....	28-29
Dr. A. H. Strong on .....	29
Curr, Prof. H. S. ....	24
Driver's View .....	9
Relation to Authority of Christ .....	11-12
Quotation from .....	11-12
Duncan, Rev. C. R.—Moves Home Mission Resolution .....	45
Ethics of Modernism .....	4
Farmer, Dean J. H.:	
Alarming Statement .....	8-9
Attitude Toward Modernism .....	27
At Ottawa Convention .....	30
"Inclusive" Policy .....	31
Defends Professor Marshall's Appointment .....	31
McMaster Professors and An Infallible Bible .....	33
Relation to Convention Crises .....	30
Says Professor Marshall Holds Driver View .....	8-9
Fosdick, Dr. Harry Emerson—"Vicarious Sacrifice" .....	18-19
Foster, Prof. G. B.:	
Commended in Year Book .....	27
His Teaching .....	28
Glover, Dr. T. R.:	
Death of Christ .....	20-21
Resurrection, The .....	21-22
Gordon, Ernest—"Leaven of The Sadducees" .....	29
Jesuitism of Modernism .....	37-38
Joshua's Covenant with Gibeonites .....	5
Keirstead, Prof. E. M., on Jonah .....	24
Keyser, Prof. L. S., on Driver .....	11
"Leaven of the Sadducees" .....	37-38
Linton, Rev. John—Speech of .....	9
Machen, Prof. J. G.:	
Atonement, The .....	17-18
Liberal Preacher, The .....	13-14

# INDEX

	Pages.
<b>Marshall, Prof. L. H.:</b>	
Atonement .....	15-17
Authority of Christ .....	14-15
Baptism .....	26
"Coming to Christ"—Sermon in James St., Hamilton .....	17
Confession of Faith .....	13
Conversion—Meaning of .....	24-25
Deity of Christ .....	13
Prof. Marshall and Prof. Curr .....	24
Prof. Marshall and Dr. Glover .....	20
"Hebrew Tradition" .....	24
"Inspiration of His Followers"—Present Ministry of Christ .....	22
Is He a Modernist? .....	13
Jonah .....	23-24
Loose View of Scripture .....	22
Man's Natural State .....	25
Miracles of Christ—"Clues" to .....	26
Miracle—Definition of .....	26
"Other Books Inspired" .....	23
Pamphlet of Defense .....	17
Paul Did Not Know He Was Writing Scripture .....	22
Reflection on Intelligence of Orthodox .....	23
Resurrection Body .....	19-20
Resurrection—and The Empty Grave .....	19-20
Science—the Last Word .....	23
Scriptures .....	22-24
Seat of Authority in Religion .....	23
Sunday School Work .....	26
Supernaturalism .....	26
Virgin Birth .....	15
Walmer Road Sermon .....	16
<b>Matthews, Prof. I. G.</b> .....	30
<b>Mathews, Dr. Shaller—On Inspiration</b> .....	24
<b>McLay, Dean—Defends Dr. G. Cross</b> .....	32
<b>McMaster Governing Bodies</b> .....	33
<b>Modernism, Ethics of</b> .....	4
Fruits of, in Student Life .....	27
Weasel Words .....	13
<b>Personalities—</b>	
Justified .....	5
Prevention of .....	6
<b>Robertson, Rev. W. M.—Letters of</b> .....	7
<b>Senate—Robertson's Letters</b> .....	6-8
<b>Shields, Dr.—Not the Issue (Linton on)</b> .....	34
<b>Sunday School Lesson</b> .....	48

## INDEX

(Continued)

	Pages
Truce-Breaking .....	3
Urquhart, Thomas:	
Centralized Ecclesiasticism .....	39-41
Home Mission Resolution .....	41-47
Webb, Rev. J. R.—Letter of .....	46
<i>Western Recorder</i> —and The Rest of The Faculty .....	32
Whidden, Chancellor H. P.—Inauguration of .....	30

# 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 (\$2.00 in Toronto).

Send your subscription to:

**The Gospel Witness**

130 Gerrard Street East - - Toronto 2, Canada