

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES AND
IN DEFENSE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.

\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any Address. 5c. Per Single Copy.

T. T. SHIELDS, *Editor.*

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1: 16

Address correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto

Vol. 6. No. 26.

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 10th, 1927

Whole No. 288

McMaster "Substantially" Orthodox! Dr. Farmer Says So!

For some years one of the fiercest religious controversies of modern times has been raging in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. The centre of attack has been McMaster University. It has been contended by some that the Governing Bodies of McMaster University have for years assumed a hospitable attitude toward what is now called, for want of a better name, Modernism. It has been alleged that this attitude has manifested itself by the retention for many years on the staff of McMaster University of Professor I. G. Matthews; later by the articles of an anonymous writer in the editorial columns of *The Canadian Baptist*, (which articles were repudiated by the Ottawa Convention of 1919); that it further showed itself in the singling out of President Faunce of Brown University for special recognition; and that at last it has come out into the open by the appointment, retention, and defense, of Professor L. H. Marshall.

On the other hand, the Editor of this paper has been blamed for being the chief accuser, and on this point no argument is necessary, for we frankly admit it. The medium through which these charges have been launched against McMaster has been *The Gospel Witness*, for whose utterances the Editor is solely responsible. In reply to these charges McMaster University has contented itself almost exclusively with an attempt to discredit the pastor of Jarvis Street Church. Agents of McMaster have gone up and down the Convention representing that Dr. Shields always misstates the facts, and that his words are utterly untrustworthy. Hundreds of letters have been written, and indeed perhaps thousands, by our opponents, and in conversations that were "private" or "confidential", the Editor of this paper has been assailed as being altogether a bad man. The controversy has issued at last in an amendment of the Constitution of the Convention, and the application of that amendment to the exclusion of Jarvis Street Church from the Convention.

These are the broad facts concerning the controversy, briefly stated. In this article we are going to

assume, for the sake of argument, that all that McMaster and its aides allege respecting this Editor is true. We will suppose that he is altogether a very bad man. Let us take the indictment as it may be drawn up by the bitterest of our opponents, and again, for the sake of argument, plead guilty to all their charges. What then? The question is not settled; it still remains for Canadian Baptists to discover the cause of the trouble. What if a convict should escape from Kingston Penitentiary? What if his record were so bad that he had been committed to the penitentiary for life? Being at large, this convict some time in the night, watching while others sleep, discovers that a large building in which hundreds of people are housed is on fire. He turns in an alarm, and the fire brigade are soon upon the spot to which they have been called. Thereupon someone advances to tell the chief that he recognizes in the man who turned in the alarm one who was serving a life sentence in Kingston Penitentiary and had escaped from that institution, and that he was altogether such a bad man that no attention should be paid to anything he says or does, beyond arresting him and sending him back to prison. Would the chief of any fire brigade be influenced by such counsel, especially if smoke were belching from the basement windows, and the stifling fumes gave indubitable proof that there was a fire within, which threatened the destruction of thousands of lives? One can imagine the fire chief replying, "I do not care who called us to the fire, even if it were the Devil himself; my business is to ask, Is there a fire? And, if there is, to put it out."

Or, if a bank robbery should be reported, and a policeman should recognize on a car speeding past him the license number which had been reported as belonging to the robbers—what if he should mount a motorcycle and overhaul the speeding motor, and arrest the occupants? And what if later, when they are brought into court to answer to the charge of robbery, the defense should produce a witness to declare that the

policeman who arrested the accused was not altogether an honest man, and that he was certainly grossly untruthful, would that affect the case? What if the prosecution should actually produce the money found on the person or persons which had been taken from the vault in the bank, would not the court say, "The issue before the court is not the character of the policeman who arrested the accused, but rather the question, Are the accused guilty or not guilty of robbery?"

We submit that this is the course which should be pursued in respect to the controversy now raging among us. It is not the character or record of Dr. Shields that is the issue before Ontario and Quebec Baptists—though he covets the closest scrutiny and the fullest investigation of both—the question is, Are Ontario and Quebec Baptists affording hospitality to principles which are unscriptural and unbaptistic?

We submit certain questions as comprehending the present issue between Canadian Baptists.

I. Is there Modernism in McMaster?

II. Has the Convention endorsed Modernism?

III. If the foregoing questions are answered in the affirmative, can true Baptists longer support either the Boards or the Convention?

I.

IS THERE MODERNISM IN McMASTER?

Again and again we have been told there is no Modernism in McMaster! Everybody is loyal to the Word of God! Everybody is still more loyal to the Charter! And if these professions of loyalty are not convincing, they will cap the climax by quoting McMaster's Motto: "In Christ all things consist"! In some quarters some people seem to think, to quote a great authority, that "prayers are morality; and kneeling, religion".

For the convenience of those who may not have at hand in convenient form the utterances of Professor Marshall we shall assemble some of them here. We have said before that Professor Marshall is a symptom of the plague by which McMaster is afflicted, rather than the plague itself; but the symptoms must be carefully studied if anyone would know the true nature of the malady from which the patient suffers. We begin therefore with the Professor's most recent utterances and give

Quotations from Professor Marshall's Convention Speech.

"Surely if I were to confess that I had difficulty in regard to an iron axe-head swimming—I understand I am to be held to the word 'swim'—you would not have there irrefutable proof that I neither believe in the Bible nor love the Bible. Such a kind of argument is really puerile and absurd."

"It is alleged that I have been untrue to the Charter, that it is I who have been wanting to alter the Charter. I beg you to note, fellow-delegates, that it is my critics who want to alter the Charter. You say, 'How do you make that out?' They want to alter the Charter in two directions, which I, for one, am not prepared to accept. In the first place, they want to alter it in this direction, they want to fasten this creed on the denomination, namely, the absolute infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible. Why is that not in the Charter? I will tell you why. Simply because those who framed the Charter knew that such a position cannot possibly be main-

tained, and there is no Baptist church in the world that fastens upon itself the doctrine of the absolute infallibility and inerrancy of Holy Scripture."

"I cannot subscribe, as an honest man who knows the facts, to this doctrine of inerrancy and infallibility, and I won't."

"The Bible is not authoritative for instance where scientific questions arise."

"The Bible is not a textbook of science. Its authority is in the realm of religion and morals, and I hold it is dangerous to the cause of religion among men to put the alleged authority of the Bible on such matters against established scientific facts."

(The reference in the following quotation is to the Genesis record of Creation.)

"I think I should like to repeat at this point, as far as I remember them, the words of one of the greatest Biblical scholars of our time, 'How long, oh Lord, will those who profess to be Thy servants, turn Thy beautiful Oriental poetry into their own dull western prose?'"

"What Jesus said was this, 'Ye search the Scriptures because in them ye think ye have eternal life and ye will not come unto me.'"

(The text is John 5:39. We hope Professor Marshall's omission of the words, "that ye might have life", was not deliberate.)

"This is too big a problem to go into here and now, this is no class in the history of doctrine, and these things are far too difficult to summarize. But when it is asserted that I do not believe in a substitutionary view of the Atonement, because I do not believe in a penal substitutionary theory, because I won't say the word 'punish', well I must say that is going too far. I had no idea that there was anything very novel in this refusal to say the word 'Punish'. Look at what I have got here;

It is *The Canadian Baptist* of November 2nd, 1911, sixteen years ago. It is an account of a sermon preached by one of our Toronto ministers, who is with us to-day; he is in the building now, Rev. J. A. Grant, on the Atonement. This is what he says:

"That God punished Christ, or that He was angry with Him, cannot be held. Christ was not punished at all."

"May I say, quietly and calmly, that I cannot say the word punish. You must not be cross with me. To me it does not seem scriptural. To me, according to Scripture, the Atonement is rooted and grounded in the love of God. 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.' That is Scripture. 'God commendeth His love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' That is Scripture, and you must take it into account when you are discussing the Atonement.

"It seems to me the word punish is not ethical. Where there is no guilt there can be no punishment in the strict sense of the term. To me it is also bad theology for this reason: to represent Christ as more sympathetic to fallen humanity than God, is to deny the essence of the Christian revelation. 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' I believe with all my heart that God is like Jesus Christ. One of the greatest words Paul ever uttered was 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.' Therefore, remember, I accept the fact that Christ suffered for our sakes and in our room and in our stead. If there is not substitution there, I cannot put it in. 'He suffered under Pontius Pilate,' says the Apostles Creed. You see I have a great classical document on my side,—to a certain extent at any rate. As Spurgeon says, the Atonement is a mystery our human intellect cannot fathom. I accept with all my heart the greatest authority of all upon this sub-

ject, our Lord Himself; I am thinking of His own account of His death, when He declared that He regarded His death as the means of establishing a new spiritual covenant relationship between God and man, the covenant relationship foretold in Jeremiah 31. He said: "This cup is the new covenant in My blood."

"The issue is not fundamentalism versus modernism, it is this: Are we as Baptists to stand for ignorance and obscurantism and intolerance, or are we to get into line with all the truly great men whose names are written upon our Baptist roll of fame, (and the greatest of them all, in my humble opinion, is Wm. Carey, the great pioneer of modern missionary enterprise) and stand for sound scholarship, for the love of truth, for tolerance, for reasonable liberty, with the McMaster motto as our watchword: "In Christ all things consist." That is where I stand, ladies and gentlemen, and, I say, again, the issue is for you to decide."

We have quoted above Professor Marshall's own words in the address delivered before the Convention in Temple Baptist Church. It should be remembered that the address was what a Montreal writer called, "A dress-suit" address. Professor Marshall knew that he was under criticism, and that his address was to be printed. He had had ample time to prepare his address; he was not called upon to speak on the spur of the moment. We must therefore assume that he said the best that could be said in defense of his position.

But we must refresh our readers' memories by reminding them of other things spoken by Professor Marshall when he was less on his guard.

OTHER QUOTATIONS FROM PROF. MARSHALL.

The following quotations are taken from utterances of Professor Marshall made from time to time, both in this country and in England:

On the Scriptures.

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

"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.*

"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 14th, 1926.*

"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 Man's Natural State.

"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.

"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 endeavoring 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. 19th, 1925.*

On the Supernatural.

"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.*

On the Atonement.

Students W. Gordon Brown and W. S. Whitcombe report the teaching of Professor Marshall in the classroom as follows:

"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."

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.

In his speech at the First Avenue Convention, Professor Marshall quoted, with approval, Dr. Denney on reconciliation as follows:

"Punishment is something which can only exist in and for a bad conscience, and the sufferings into which Christ's love led Him and in and through which His reconciling work was achieved, do not come through a bad conscience and therefore are in no sense penal. That the innocent, moved by love, should suffer with the guilty and for them is in line with all we know of the moral order under which we live. It is the triumph of goodness in its highest form. But that the innocent should be punished for the guilty is not moral at all. It is in every sense of the term impossible. As an incident in the divine administration of the world it is simply inconceivable.

"It may not be out of place to quote one or two of the most signal instances of this perversion. Luther, for example, carried away by the passion with which he exulted in Christ's identification of Himself with men, could write that 'in His tender, innocent heart He had to feel God's wrath and judgment against sin, and to taste for us eternal death and damnation, and in a word, to suffer everything which a condemned sinner has merited and must suffer eternally.'"

Then he went further and referred to C. H. Spurgeon as follows:

"Whether I am a heretic or not on this question of the atonement, I simply take my stand by the side of Charles Haddon Spurgeon. (Applause). You will find the passage if you want it in Fullerton's *Life*. It is Spurgeon who is the speaker, and I never came across any statement which has so appealed to my heart:—

"This darkness tells us all that the passion is a great mystery. I try to explain it as a substitution and I feel that where the language of the Scripture is explicit I may, and must, be explicit too. But yet I feel that the idea of substitution does not cover the whole of the dread mystery, and that no human conception can grasp the whole. Tell me the death of the Lord Jesus was a grand example of self sacrifice—I can see that, and much more. Tell me it was a wondrous obedience to the will of God—I can see that, and much more. Tell me it was the bearing of what ought to have been borne by myriads of sinners of the human race, is the chastisement of their sin—I can see that and found my best hope upon it. But do not tell me that this is all that is in the

Cross. No, great as this would be, there is much more in the Redeemer's death. God veiled the Cross in darkness, and in darkness much of the deep meaning lies, not because God would not reveal it, but because we have not capacity to discern it all."

Well, that is just what I feel about the matter—and you can call Spurgeon a modernist if you like."

In his quotation from Dr. Denney, Professor Marshall omitted a paragraph occurring between the two paragraphs he quoted. The paragraph which Professor Marshall omitted is as follows:

"All this may be admitted without reserve, and we may reflect with pleasure that it excludes a great deal by which the Christian conscience has often been shocked in discussions of the atonement. It excludes the idea that the Son of God, with whom the Father was well pleased, should be regarded at the same time as the object of the Father's displeasure, and the victim of His wrath, on whom the punishment of all the world's sin was inflicted. It excludes all those ideas of equivalence between what Christ suffered and what men as sinners were under an obligation to suffer, which revolt both in intelligence and conscience in much of what is called orthodox theology. It excludes all those assimilations of the sufferings of our Lord in the garden and on the cross to the pains of the damned, which cast a hideous shadow on many interpretations of His Passion."

Let it be borne in mind that while quoting Dr. Denney with approval, Professor Marshall said, "I simply take my stand by the side of Charles Haddon Spurgeon"! But let our readers now go back and read the last paragraph from Dr. Denney quoted by Professor Marshall—of which he approves—and at the same time, take the paragraph from Spurgeon with which Professor Marshall claims to be in full accord, and then let them read the following which is taken from the very sermon by C. H. Spurgeon from which Professor Marshall quotes:

"His strong crying and tears denoted the deep sorrow of His soul. He bore all it was possible for his capacious mind to bear, though enlarged and invigorated by union with the Godhead. He bore the equivalent of hell; nay, not that only, but He bore that which stood instead of ten thousand hells so far as the vindication of the law is concerned. Our Lord rendered in his death agony a homage to justice far greater than if a world had been doomed to destruction."

Prof. Marshall and Dr. Shields at First Avenue Convention.

We come now to a quotation from the stenographic report of Dr. Shields' speech before the First Avenue Convention:

"Now, Professor Marshall having told us that—and I wish the Professor would tell me whether I am correct or not—that he does reject the idea that the innocent was punished for the guilty, and that such view is not moral—I think he quoted Dr. Denney to that effect. Is that correct?"

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I do not care for the idea of the word "punished". "Suffered" for the guilty; "suffered" in our stead, but not "punished". That is the word. But I am not going to be drawn into a debate, into a discussion. (Cries of "Oh, oh"). I simply refuse to have questions put to me, to be catechised on the floor of this Convention. (Applause). I simply stated what Spurgeon's view was, and read—

DR. SHIELDS: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to catechise. I simply want, now that Professor Marshall and I are face to face, to get a clear understanding—(Cries of "Oh, oh" and laughter) — of Professor Marshall's statement of the atonement.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I told you it. Spurgeon gives it perfectly. I have nothing more to add.

DR. SHIELDS: Now, Mr. Chairman and friends, I, too, read Spurgeon, and I am going to quote from Spurgeon. I think I am within my rights, am I? (Cries of "Amen" and "Yes").

Professor Marshall has said that he stands with Spurgeon in his view of the atonement. If, after I have read this, Professor Marshall will stand with Spurgeon, then, I think all controversy would be about at an end:

Spurgeon Agreed With Luther on Substitution.

"If any man here should be in doubt on account of ignorance, let me, as plainly as I can, state the Gospel. I believe it to be wrapt up in one word—Substitution. I have always considered, with Luther and Calvin, that the sum and substance of the gospel lies in that word, substitution, Christ standing in the stead of man. If I understand the gospel, it is this: I deserve to be lost and ruined; the only reason why I should not be damned is this, that Christ was punished in my stead, and there is no need to execute a sentence twice for sin. On the other hand, I know I cannot enter heaven, unless I have a perfect righteousness; I am absolutely certain I shall never have one of my own, for I find sin every day; but then Christ had a perfect righteousness, and He said, 'There, take my garment, put it on; you shall stand before God as if you were Christ, and I will stand before God as if I had been the sinner; I will suffer in the sinner's stead, and you shall be rewarded for works which you did not do, but which Christ did for you.' I think the whole substance of salvation lies in the thought that Christ stood in the place of man."

Professor Marshall No Religious Kinship with Spurgeon.

Thus it will appear that Professor Marshall says he stands with Spurgeon, while, at the same time, declaring that he does not believe there was any penal element in the Atonement, or that Christ endured our punishment; while we have quoted Spurgeon as affirming that the very heart of the gospel is in the truth that Christ endured the punishment our sins deserved. All over the Convention it has been published that Professor Marshall stands with Spurgeon. The quotations we have given prove to a demonstration that Professor Marshall's position theologically is not Spurgeon's at all. After thus using Spurgeon's great name, and declaring his agreement with him in respect to the Atonement, driven into a corner, Professor Marshall has to admit that he stands with Spurgeon only in the isolated quotation contained in Fullerton's *Life of Spurgeon*.

At the close of Professor Marshall's address at the Educational Session of the last Convention the following interesting discussion occurred:

REV. C. J. LONEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Convention, I rose to ask a question of Professor Marshall before he left the platform. My question is this: Professor Marshall has quoted again this afternoon Charles Haddon Spurgeon. I should like to ask Professor Marshall, seeing that he has quoted Mr. Spurgeon in connection with the Atonement, if he accepts the Spurgeonic interpretation of the Atonement?

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: May I reply?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I read a statement from Mr. Spurgeon's work last year. That statement I accepted. If that is not a complete statement of Mr. Spurgeon's position that is not my responsibility. I accepted that particular statement. It was printed in the official report. Mr. Spurgeon said it, nobody can deny that, and when Mr. Spurgeon made that particular statement I was in perfect harmony with him. That does not mean, does not imply, that I am necessarily in harmony with all Mr. Spurgeon's other statements. I am in harmony with that one statement.

REV. C. J. LONEY: Mr. Chairman, that is not my question. We are all convinced that our Professor is too well educated a gentleman not to know the matter whereof he speaks. My question is, Does he endorse Mr. Spurgeon on the Atonement, not that particular statement?

A DELEGATE: What is it?

REV. C. J. LONEY: I am asking my question. He knows what it is. I am not here to discuss it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is quite possible that the Professor is not familiar with the Spurgeonic statement. Perhaps Mr. Loney will tell us what it is. (Applause.)

SOME DELEGATES: Order.

REV. E. T. NEWTON: Has the Spurgeonic interpretation of the Atonement been written into the Charter? We are not committed in this Convention to the interpretation of Luther, or Spurgeon, or anyone else. I believe it is entirely aside from the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a good deal in what Mr. Newton says, but we are granting a little license, provided it does not develop into licentiousness. (Laughter.)

REV. C. J. LONEY: Mr. Spurgeon said—

A DELEGATE: What are you reading from?

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Give him a chance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just give Mr. Loney a few minutes, please.

REV. C. J. LONEY (quoting from Spurgeon): "It is our delight to preach the doctrine of substitution, because we are fully persuaded that no gospel is preached where substitution is omitted. Unless men are told positively and plainly that Christ did stand in their room and stead, to bear their guilt and carry their sorrows, they never can see how God is the 'just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly'. We have heard some preach a gospel something after this order—that though God is angry with men, yet out of his great mercy, for the sake of something that Christ has done, he does not punish them but remits the penalty. Now, we hold that this is not of God's gospel; for it is neither just to God, nor safe to man. We believe that God never remitted the penalty, that he did not forgive the sin without punishing it, but that there was blood for blood, and stroke for stroke, and death for death, and punishment for punishment without the abatement of a solitary jot or tittle; that Jesus Christ, the Saviour, did drink the veritable cup of our redemption to its very dregs; that He did suffer beneath the awful crushing wheels of divine vengeance the selfsame pains and sufferings which we ought to have endured. Oh! the glorious doctrine of substitution! When it is preached fully and rightly, what a charm and what a power it hath! Oh! How sweet to tell sinners that though God hath said, 'Thou must die', their Maker stops His head to die for them, and Christ incarnate breathes His last upon a tree, that God might execute His vengeance, and yet might pardon the ungodly." (End of quotation from Spurgeon.) Mr. Loney continued: That is but one statement; I have many more here if you want them read. I ask again, Does our professor endorse Spurgeon's view concerning the doctrine of the atonement, that Christ died the Just in the stead of the unjust; that He was made sin for us, He who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him? And if the professor endorses the Spurgeonic position, I turn, sir, to ask him another question, Do you still take the position that is ascribed to you by Professor Farmer as holding the Driver position as to dates and authorship? If you hold one, what about the other? You are on the horns of a dilemma. I want the answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, it is very apparent that this kind of thing could go on for the afternoon and into the evening (Cries of "Oh" and "Shame".) Just a minute, please. There have been presented to us two statements by Spurgeon relating to the Atonement. The professor declares that he believes one. But Mr. Loney believes the other. Why should we discuss this matter at greater length?

A DELEGATE: That is not the point, Mr. Chairman.

REV. C. J. LONEY: All I am asking is this. If you,

Mr. Chairman, make that statement, I am perfectly satisfied. I have never taken the position in this Convention—if the majority take the other side concerning God's Word, they have the right to have the kind of professors teaching what they believe. I am quite willing to take my position. All I want to say, sir, is this: Does the professor take the opposite position to the one I take here, that Spurgeon takes?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

REV. C. J. LONEY: You have just said so.

THE CHAIRMAN: The professor has declared that he believes the statement made by Spurgeon relative to the Atonement. We have no right to gather up a hundred statements from Mr. Spurgeon and ask the Professor if he believes them.

REV. C. J. LONEY: Mr. Chairman, when I was ordained I was on the floor two hours and had to answer every last question put to me by the ministers. Why should not the man who is teaching our young men for the ministry answer some questions? (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: This is not an ordination service. Mr. Linton has the floor. (Cries of "Shame.")

Professor Marshall on the Resurrection.

"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 discarnate 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.*

Professor Marshall on Conversion.

"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."—*From Hamilton Convention Address, October 19, 1925.*

Professor Marshall on the Ordinances.

"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 scriptural interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense."—*From article on Baptism and Church Membership, in Baptist Times and Freeman.*

Professor Marshall's Statement of Faith.

Copies of Professor Marshall's Statement of Faith have been freely distributed throughout the Convention. Since the Hamilton Convention, and after much criticism of the article beginning, "I believe that Jesus ever liveth", Professor Marshall has added the words, "to make intercession for us"!

The quotations we have given showing Professor Marshall's view of the Atonement will serve to define his meaning of the word "vicarious".

The clause relating to the authority of Christ is carefully phrased, and distinctly limits His authority: "I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and final word is with Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour." Christ is an authority only on matters of "morality and religion"! He is not an authority on matters of biblical criticism! He is not an authority, for example, on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; or the Davidic authorship of the one hundred and tenth Psalm; or the historicity of the book of Jonah—these belong to the realm of literary criticism, and therefore the pronouncement of Christ in these matters may not be final! That clause, indeed, does away with the absolute infallibility of Christ, and opens the flood-gates for the inflow of all the alleged "assured results" of modern scholarship.

With the foregoing quotations from Professor Marshall before them, our readers will be able to judge for themselves whether we have sounded a false alarm in saying that Professor Marshall is a Modernist. If it be admitted that he is—and we believe it cannot successfully be denied—it follows, of course, that there is Modernism in McMaster.

What About Other McMaster Professors?

Thus far we have confined our attention to Professor Marshall, but we do not believe Professor Marshall is one whit worse, theologically, than Professor Chester New. That Professor Wilson Smith is an evolutionist everybody who knows anything about the case is aware. And now we are being told that Professor Parker is blossoming out into a full-blown critic. No doubt, in due time, abundant evidence will be forthcoming to establish our contention that McMaster University is now almost thoroughly modernistic in its attitude and teaching.

Who is Responsible for McMaster's Modernism?

But the next question which naturally arises from the considerations we have had before us is this, Who is responsible for McMaster's Modernism? Dr. Farmer has frankly admitted that the responsibility for Professor Marshall's being in Canada rests largely with him. Professor Marshall said in his speech before the Temple Baptist Convention: "You did not appoint Mr. Linton to examine me when I came out here; you appointed Dr. Farmer. And it was Dr. Farmer who declared that my views on the Bible were within the Charter." But Dr. Farmer evidently found some difficulty in recommending Professor Marshall, for this is what he said in his speech before 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."

What Was the "Crisis" Faced by Dr. Farmer?

We beg to enquire, What was this "crisis" to which the Dean refers when he says he had to make up his mind as to his action, when he faced the thing before God and in his own room? Does not the language suggest that the Dean was face to face with some great problem, and that he had some sort of a battle

with himself before he was able to make up his mind as to his course of action? What does he mean when he says, "I said to myself, I cannot turn down a man like that"? Who asked him to turn down Mr. Marshall? Against whose protest was the Dean mentally contending? It has never been suggested that any objection to Mr. Marshall was mentioned in the Senate. Was it the Dean's own conscience? Was it his own conviction of truth? Were these the protestants on this occasion? One thing is certain: we were not to blame, for we were in California at the time; and were blissfully ignorant of the whole "crisis". Mr. Marshall had been brought all the way from England for the purpose of interviewing him. It was after the interview, after the Dean had questioned Mr. Marshall so thoroughly, that he faced the thing before God, and in his own room! We ask again, What was the "crisis"? What was it he faced before God in his own room? Who asked him to "turn down" Mr. Marshall? Was it conscience? Was it conviction? Our readers must form their own conclusion as to whether or not Dr. Farmer did in himself feel that there was something about Mr. Marshall's position that was not strictly in accord with that which is believed by the people of this Convention.

Dr. Farmer Knew Prof. Marshall's Coming Would Cause Trouble.

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."

Dr. Farmer's Plea for the "Looser" View.

In his speech on Education Day before the Hamilton Convention, Dr. Farmer said further:

"There are two views; one is that Scripture from cover to cover, through and through, every word, every sentence, every thought, is infallibly inspired; it is the word of God through and through. Now I have no hesitation in saying that my sympathies have been with that strong view of the Scriptures; I have stated it in my classes. I know perfectly well that we have not got the original text; I am quite clear that there may be many scribal errors and the like of that, but as I think of these Scriptures in the marvel of them, in the truth of them wherever I have been able to test them at all, when I think of them that way, when I come up against difficulties, my faith can rest there quietly and hopefully. That has been my attitude. I have a good many students, my old students, here to-day, I think they know that. ('Hear, hear', and applause.) I have nothing to conceal on that. But mark you, there is another view which a great many people who are just as good Christians as I am, and vastly better, whose sandal straps I am not fit to loose, there are a great number of other men who believe it is the religious content of scripture, it is the whole religious message that in its ministry to our spiritual life, is all of God,

infallibly sure, and you can bank on it and commit yourself to it. Now I say that any man that looks at it in that way but still may feel there are difficulties of this kind and mistakes of that kind, any man that can say that much about the Scriptures, that they are inspired like that, absolutely true for all the purposes of the religious life, I say that as a Baptist I can co-operate with that man if he has got the spirit of Jesus in him."

Dr. Farmer on the Ottawa Convention.

Again in his speech following Professor Marshall on Education Day at the last Convention, referring to the Ottawa Convention, Dr. Farmer spoke as follows:

"Now, I went to Ottawa rather expecting that the resolution to be proposed there would be a resolution demanding that we should adopt that platform (platform of absolute inerrancy), and I went with an amendment in my own pocket in case such a demand was made. That amendment was to the effect that we should stand by the Bloor Street standard, the charter standard in other words. When the resolution was offered to that Convention I saw it was simply a repetition of the Bloor Street platform, and I did not produce my amendment because it was not necessary. From that day to this we have stood squarely on that point."

The fact is, however, Dr. Farmer, in his speech, did not support the resolution which we had the honour to propose at that Convention. We cannot be sure how he voted, but we do know that he spoke in favour of the compromising amendment proposed by Mr. James Ryrie, and seconded by Rev. W. A. Cameron. At the Ottawa Convention Dr. Farmer threw the whole weight of his influence against the resolution which the Convention supported.

Again in his speech at the last Convention, Dr. Farmer repeated his statement about the two views as follows:

"There are two views: There is the stricter, the closer view, the inerrancy view; there is the other view; and they are both within the limits of the charter."

Thus it will be seen that Dr. Farmer is pleading for the inclusion of the "looser" view of the Scripture.

While we have Dr. Farmer's speech before us it is worthy of note that he dips a little into history and refers to Dr. Fyfe and to Dr. W. N. Clark. In both instances he makes the most positive assertions. Those who remember the 1922 Convention will be struck with the fact that Dr. Farmer has a remarkably clear memory of some things! He is able to recall conversations and incidents which occurred more than thirty years ago with extraordinary vividness! It seems to be characteristic of him that he is especially certain when recalling the utterances of dead men! Perhaps it is safer to speak positively respecting the sayings of men who are dead, than to have a positive memory in relation to events in connection with men who are still alive!

We have a further example of the working of Dr. Farmer's mind:

"Now, mark this: Those who hold what may be called the more liberal of these two views—both within the charter—are not undertaking to excommunicate the other people, they are not undertaking to excommunicate the people who believe in verbal inspiration and absolute infallibility.

SOME DELEGATES: They have done it. They did it the other day.

DEAN FARMER: Not for that reason. That was not the point at all there. They have not undertaken to do that. But what is demanded here to-day is this. A minority has been demanding that all the others shall

be excommunicated from the rights of membership in this Convention."

We have already quoted Dr. Farmer's plea for the adoption of an "inclusive" policy in the educational affairs of the Convention as reported by Mr. W. S. Whitcombe; but that "inclusive" policy advocated by Dr. Farmer means the inclusion of liberalism, and therefore the exclusion of conservatism. But enough has been said at this point to show that if Professor Marshall is a Modernist, he is heartily supported and sponsored by Dr. Farmer. But what is true of Dr. Farmer is true of the entire Governing Body in McMaster, the Senate and the Board of Governors.

Professor Findlay Admits There Has Been Modernism in McMaster.

But let us hear what one of the Professors of McMaster University has to say about McMaster in the past. Mr. James McGinlay at the last Convention reported a conversation he had had with Professor Findlay in the following words:

"But I was speaking one day with Dr. Findlay, who, by the way, as a mathematical professor, shattered my aspirations along that line. He said to me, 'McMaster is not as bad as it used to be. In the days of Matthews, Foster, and Cross, we had reason to believe there was heterodox teaching in our University.' I would not ask him if it was true, I would not reflect upon him to ask him that question. We discussed it, and I asked him if he believed Matthews, Cross and Foster were modernists. He said, 'Yes'. I said, 'Will you come on a public platform and say that with me? If you do, over night I will bid adieu to Dr. Shields for ever, and I will shake hands with the present governing body of McMaster University, and I will endeavor to co-operate with them in cleaning house.' But he said 'No'. So I said, 'All right, I will go on.'"

Some time later Professor Findlay asked for the privilege of replying to Mr. McGinlay. This he did in the following words:

"Mr. Chairman, I feel I must apologize for speaking on what seems like a very trivial matter, yet I felt that if I kept silence it might be misinterpreted.

"I wish to say just two things. In the first place, the conversation referred to was a confidential conversation between a professor and a student to whom he was assigned as adviser. Such conversations, I think, ought to be sacred and not proclaimed around the country. In the second place, Mr. Ginlay has not told you the main purport of that conversation, and what he did tell you can only be interpreted in view of the main purport of that conversation. In the third place, I am rather convinced, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. McGinlay has told this story so often that there have been certain additions made to it which to my mind completely change the bearing of the remarks quoted. I admit that a large percentage of the phrases he uses were used in the conversation referred to, but there are other phrases added that are not correct, and I think they vitiate the value of the main points made."

Thus it will be seen that Professor Findlay recognized that Professors Foster, Cross, and Matthews, were Modernists. The tendencies in Professor Foster's teaching, which were apparent enough while in McMaster, later developed to such an extent that he even suggested the possibility of a time when no living soul would remember even the name of Jesus! Professor George Cross in one of his books said:

"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."

And Professor I. G. Matthews, in his book, *Old Testament Life and Literature*, at every point, denies

the supernaturalism of the Old Testament. Yet when these men were here they were defended as being perfectly orthodox; and when Dr. Elmore Harris protested against Professor Matthews' retention, he, too, was called a disturber of the peace, and blamed for disseminating unwarranted suspicion.

But surely we have said enough to prove there is Modernism in McMaster. When it is remembered that the powers of Parliament have been evoked so to amend the Constitution as to give the Convention power to exclude from the Convention those who voice their criticism of Professor Marshall's views, it must be admitted that somewhere behind the scene there is a group of men determined to work their will for the licensing of Modernism, even though the doing of it involves the wrecking of the Denomination.

Rev. John Linton Speaks.

But let us hear further testimony. After hearing Professor Marshall's speech, Rev. John Linton in the course of his speech said:

"I shall go out from this Convention to carry on my campaign with all the strength that God will give me—(applause)—Nobody will do that with more regret than I. I believe that all young men going out to preach the gospel in our Baptist churches with that attitude towards the Word of God,—I believe that it means the spiritual impoverishment of our churches, and the ultimate partial paralysis of our spiritual power as a Baptist denomination."

Rev. H. C. Bryant.

Among those who spoke after Professor Marshall was Rev. H. C. Bryant who said in part:

"Mr. Moderator and gentlemen, this is about my first appearance after twenty-five years in the ministry to come to the platform to say a few words. I suppose what I have to say may not be very acceptable to this audience. I was rather surprised after having heard the statement of Professor Marshall that it was so fully endorsed—(Hear, hear)—I recall the address given by Professor Marshall at Hamilton, and I was fairly satisfied with his statement, and so were my people at Smith's Falls; but I must say that I have not been satisfied with the statement of Professor Marshall this afternoon—(applause)—and I know my people will not be satisfied—(Hear, hear)—as I know that eighty per cent. of our church are opposed to the retention of Professor Marshall. Now, I shall have to report to them what I have heard to-day, and what the result will be I do not know.

* * *

"Nothing but a sense of responsibility would impel me to this platform this afternoon, but if I believe the Bible as it has been given to us by Professor Marshall, my preaching days will be over.—(applause)—There is no bitterness in my heart, but I felt that I must say this in order to be true to my Lord, and in order also to be faithful to the church which I represent here at the Convention."

An examination of the speech of Rev. Andrew Imrie shows that he, too, strongly expressed his dissent from Professor Marshall's position. Volumes more could be written on this point but here we rest our case as having, we think, proved to a demonstration that there is Modernism in McMaster.

II.

**HAS THE CONVENTION ENDORSED
McMASTER'S MODERNISM?**

At Ottawa in 1919 the Convention, by a vote that was almost unanimous (only twelve to twenty voting

against it), made a declaration in opposition to all modernistic tendencies. Again in 1924, after nearly a year's discussion of the action of McMaster University in honouring the noted liberal theologian, President Faunce, the Convention, for the first time in McMaster's history, refused to that Institution a vote of confidence, and in the end of the day, passed a resolution in the following terms:

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

But in Hamilton and First Avenue, by proxy votes, McMaster University secured a verdict in support of Professor Marshall's Modernism. (The last Convention in Temple Church was the first Convention at which no proxies were allowed.) But this Convention not only endorsed Modernism, but amended its Constitution so that it might have power to silence every critic of Modernism in the Convention. Having amended its Constitution, it applied the provisions of the amending Bill the next day by excluding Jarvis Street Church from the Convention.

We remind our readers that no intimation was given of what the scope of the excluding resolution would be. It was not known whether it would be directed against one church, or against a number of churches. But the day after the Constitution was amended, a resolution applying to Jarvis Street alone was passed. Jarvis Street Church, as an organization, was given absolutely no opportunity to defend itself; not even its twenty-four delegates were given opportunity to speak. With great generosity it was proposed that the Editor of this paper be allowed thirty minutes to reply to all that had been said in a day and a half! That time was exceeded somewhat, but the motion carried, and Jarvis Street delegates were excluded.

Thus the Convention put itself on record as being next of kin to Ahab who, so far as it was in his power, silenced every voice that dared to tell him the truth.

What shall we say, then, of the Convention vote? We still believe it was not wholly representative of the temper of the churches. It must be remembered that the majority of Baptist churches have McMaster graduates for their pastors, and, with few exceptions, wherever there was a McMaster graduate, he was trained to manipulate the vote and to secure McMaster partisans as delegates. But whatever may be said of the political methods by which the vote was secured—and we must not forget that the vote was an open vote, and therefore not a free and untrammelled expression—but whatever may be said, we repeat, of the methods by which the vote was secured, the fact remains that the Convention has endorsed the Modernism of McMaster; and, by its action, and in response to the plea of Dr. Farmer—perhaps we had better call him Dr. Substantially—the Convention has approved of the inclusion of the principles and teachings of Modernism in its programme.

Incidentally, it occurs to us that Dean Farmer's use of the word, "substantially", in the Charter is a true

index of the character of the man—"Be not righteous over much. . . why shouldest thou destroy thyself?" Following Dr. Farmer's ethics, when the man behind the counter is asked concerning a piece of cloth, "Is this all wool?" he need not answer, Yes or No—all he needs to reply is, "It is substantially so"! When a man desires to evade the truth when under the necessity of making a statement in politics, or business, or in a court of law, and he is asked respecting his statement, "Is this statement true?" he replies, "Well, it is substantially so"! When young people stand at the marriage altar and are asked the important question, "Wilt thou have this man?" and, "Wilt thou have this woman?" etc., each may now reply, "I will, substantially", and then make what mental reservations they like! When a young man comes before an ordination council and is asked, "Do you believe in the divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures?" he will be able to say, "Substantially, I do"! If asked to explain what he means by that, he may with force respond, "Ask Dean Farmer; he taught me how to avoid committing myself by use of the word, "Substantially".

The fact is, Dr. Farmer's psychology in this matter is pure Jesuitism. Any kind of mental reservation is possible to the man who desires to say he believes certain things "substantially". From this forward, it will be impossible to hold anybody to any standard. Professors will be able to subscribe to any statement of faith, no matter what they believe, by use of the word, "Substantially".

III.

CAN TRUE BAPTISTS LONGER SUPPORT THE CONVENTION?

At a later time we shall discuss more fully the relation of the Boards to McMaster, and to the Convention at large. It is enough now to say that every Board of the Convention has become a tool of McMaster University, and is being used as an instrument of persecution by which every church and every pastor, in any sense dependent upon any Board, is being made subject to its despotic will. The independence of the churches is no longer respected, and every minister who dares to oppose the will of the machine is marked for destruction.

In the Great War, did any loyal British subject give money for the manufacture of munitions to be used by Germans against our own soldiers? And it has come to a day when every dollar entrusted to any Board serves only to increase that Board's power either to destroy or to distress churches and ministers who stand for the faith.

The same responsibility rests upon missionaries in India and Bolivia as rests upon the people at home, to stand boldly for the faith. It was at the suggestion of one of our foreign missionaries that we first took up arms against this enemy of the truth in the Convention; and if foreign missionaries have not the courage of their convictions, they do not deserve our support. There is grave reason to fear that at least some of our foreign missionaries have wandered nearly as far from the truth of the gospel as have some of those who are nearer home.

(Continued on page 14.)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

How We May Have A Revival

A Sermon by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields.

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, October 23rd, 1927.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Josiah was eight years old when he began to reign, and he reigned in Jerusalem one and thirty years.

"And he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in the ways of David his father, and declined neither to the right hand, nor to the left.

"For in the eighth year of his reign, while he was yet young, he began to seek after the God of David his father: and in the twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images.

"And they brake down the altars of Baalim in his presence; and the images, that were on high above them, he cut down; and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images, he brake in pieces, and made dust of them, and strowed it upon the graves of them that had sacrificed unto them.

"And he burnt the bones of the priests upon their altars, and cleansed Judah and Jerusalem."
—2 Chron. 34:1-5.

I have read a few verses, but the subject I bring before you extends over the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth chapters.

The Bible is a history, a record, of revivals; again and again you will find God's people turning away from Him, and then, by His matchless grace, being brought back again. Abraham went out from Ur of the Chaldees, "not knowing whither he went"; and when a famine arose in the land, instead of meeting it in faith, he went down to Egypt, and there got into great trouble, and dishonoured the Lord. Then he came back again to the place of the altar which he had made at the first, and called upon the name of the Lord.

I have observed sometimes when travelling on certain trains—they are not as common now as they were a few years ago—that between stations they made good speed; but they spent so much time on the sidings, shunting back and forth, that the whole journey occupied twice the time of an ordinary train. And there are many Christian people like that: they run well for a while, and then they are sidetracked; like Abraham, they go down into Egypt; they come face to face with some great difficulty, and instead of believing God and meeting it in faith, they resort to expediency; they go the way of their own reason, they walk sometimes in the "counsel of the ungodly". Then, like Abraham, they must needs come back again to the place of the altar which they made at the first, between Bethel and Hai, and there call upon the name of the Lord.

You will find, too, that the history of Israel, as a nation is very largely the history of revival. Again and again false religion found place in Israel's life, and the people followed after Baal, or Ashteroth, or some other heathen deity; they turned aside from God, they forgot God, and walked in their own ways. Then in His mercy, He visited them, and He turned them back again into the ways of holiness. So has it been since the canon of Scripture was closed. All down through the Christian dispensation there have been periods when evil seemed to be in the ascendancy, when "truth was fallen in the street", when men ceased to seek after God, when the Word of God was discredited, and, in some quarters, discarded. And then again God has visited His people.

There is a prophecy in the Scriptures of a time of great spiritual declension, of great, of general, of almost universal, apostasy, preceding the coming of the Lord. I do not know whether we are in that apostasy to-day. I think there is danger sometimes of our jumping to conclusions too hastily. A more thorough acquaintance with church history, with the record of the past, would sometimes, I venture to think, lead us to hope for better things. If you read of the religious condition of England prior to the great Wesley and Whitfield revivals, it would be difficult, I think, to find anything more discouraging, more distressing, than the condition of the professed church of Christ at that time. Or if you read the history of religious movements in this country, particularly at the beginning of the nineteenth century, you will find that Deism was rampant, that Unitarianism seemed to be sweeping all before it, and it really seemed as though the last dark days had come. You know that in the days of the Napoleonic wars there was a widely-spread belief that Napoleon was himself the Antichrist; and when The Great War came, there were many who asked whether this was the end of all things. But I can find no reason in the Word of God for our refusing to believe that God may yet visit His people. Where one conversion is possible, a thousand are possible. Only the Spirit of God can save a soul; and if one man be really saved, it is the work of the Spirit of God. He is still with us, and we are not straitened in Him, but in ourselves.

So I turn to this chapter of ancient history to show you how God visited His people at that time, and how a revival came to a whole nation. Josiah was king, and it is recorded of him that, "he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord", and "declined neither to the right hand, nor to the left," for "while he was yet young, he began to seek after the God of David his father."

I.

First of all, there was a man who gave himself to one pursuit, who determined to know what was possible for him to know of God, who whole-heartedly sought after the God of his fathers—and HE WAS A YOUNG MAN. "While he was yet young" the revival came, not through a man whose years were multiplied, but through one of the youngest in the realm. It has often been so.

The great revival of the Ottawa Valley, of which Ralph Connor speaks in one of his books, is said to have begun in a Baptist church; and it originated, so far as human agencies were concerned, with two little girls who went from their school each day at noon to pray. It was, I believe, during that great revival that our own Professor P. S. Campbell was converted.

It may be there is some young man here this morning, some boy, to whom the Spirit of God may speak, who will be a Josiah in this generation. If that be so, then your first concern must be to know God for yourself, and to seek Him with all your heart as did Josiah. He will not be found without your seeking, but "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." He is not a God who is afar off. He hears the cry even of little children. What a blessed thing it would be if we could hear of some of our boys and girls taking part of the lunch hour just to wait upon God! Oh, that God would call young men and women, and boys and girls, in this place, and give to them the Spirit of grace and of supplication, and teach them how to pray! Seek revival for yourself first before you seek it for others; make sure that your own heart is right with God, no matter what conditions may obtain about you.

Especially ought this to be true of those who occupy positions of leadership. Oh, let me address your Sunday School teachers. Josiah, of course, was king, and none of us are brought to such an exalted position, yet in our measure we have certain responsibilities of leadership, every one. Will you who are teachers in the School think again of the responsibility which rests upon you for the salvation of the scholars in your class, for the salvation, perhaps, of hundreds of people whom you may touch through those scholars if you yourself are filled with the Holy Ghost? No matter how large or small the class may be, how young or old your scholars, whatever their position, God only asks that men and women, and boys and girls, should be His, surrendered to Him; and there is no instrument thus surrendered which He cannot sovereignly use for the accomplishment of His purpose of grace. Will you go home, teacher, this morning with a new sense of responsibility? Will you determine, as God shall help you, that you will be a channel of His grace and power? that your class may be set on fire for God, and that through those boys and girls, or young men and women, others may be saved? So let me make application of the principle to the officers of the school, to the deacons of the church, and to the pastor of the church. Whatever others do, we must seek the God of our fathers; we must be right with Him; we must be in daily fellowship and communion with the Most High, in order that the power from on high may flow through us to others.

II.

HOW, THEN, DID JOSIAH EXERCISE HIS REVIVING MINISTRY? What did Josiah do in the name of the Lord? This is a strange story. We hear everywhere to-day that if you want to have revival you must have done with all contention, and with all controversy—but you never will finish with controversy until the devil is cast into the bottomless pit, and chained. We are told everywhere that the way to have revival is to find some middle ground of compromise. My brethren and sisters, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth, and He never compromises with

error; He has no fellowship with the men of compromise; He will never work through the man who surrenders the truth of God, never. I care not who the preacher is, or the church, or the denomination, that body of people is destitute of spiritual power, and can have no experience of the Holy Spirit's ministry, that does not exalt Jesus Christ above all. He must in all things have the pre-eminence. The special function of the Holy Ghost is to glorify Christ; and the man, or the people, who would reduce the Lord Jesus to the level of a man, who would deny His absolute authority in all realms, can never have the Holy Ghost. They may have many substitutes for that Divine Energy, they may offer "strange fire" before the Lord, but God the Holy Ghost will never work with any man or people who compromise with error.

What did Josiah do? Listen to the record: "He began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images. And they brake down the altars of Baalim in his presence; and the images, that were on high above them, he cut down; and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images, he brake in pieces, and made dust of them; and strowed it upon the graves of them that had sacrificed unto them"—he destroyed every symbol of a false religion; he ground into powder everything that lifted its hand against the supremacy of Jehovah. My dear friends, I am confident that that church, and that people, will never have a revival who consent to those who deny the authority of the Word of God. Certainly when human effort, when sacrifices of man's devising, are offered instead of the one and only Sacrifice for sin, God the Holy Ghost will not bless that service. And I hold it to be a duty, if we would have a revival, to break down the idols, to destroy the altars, to unsheath the sword of God's truth against every man who dares to challenge the absolute Lordship of Jesus Christ.

I have no hope that the Holy Spirit can bless my ministry in the least, if, for a moment, anywhere, at any time, I should assume an attitude of acquiescence toward those damnable things that are destroying the souls of men. We shall go on with the controversy, we shall never cease it as long as there is a pagan altar to be destroyed, as long as there is a heresy to be exposed, as long as man, in his folly, sets up his own thinking in opposition to that which is revealed as the very Word of God. It must be our duty, in the light of this truth, and in the power of the Holy Ghost, to destroy it. We have been talking about controversy in these days, and I agree with Rev. John Linton who is reported to have said, that he should far rather see McMaster University cast into the depth of the sea than that it should go on in its present course. Beyond all peradventure, it is at present an instrument of Antichrist, it is inspired of him who hates the Word of God; and unless God shall stretch forth His hand in judgment or in mercy, it will go on corrupting the lives of men, and turning the whole people away from God. God give us strength ever to contend for the truth, and to grind to powder that which is opposed to the gospel of the grace of God!

Now another thing: it is useless for us to speak of that in other lives and in other denominations, unless we apply the principle to ourselves. Let there be no pagan in our own hearts; let there be no substitute for the divine oracles in our lives; let there be nothing put in the place

of the Supreme Sacrifice there. Let us seek with all our hearts unto the God of our fathers, and without reserve dedicate ourselves to His service.

III.

You will be surprised at the second point which this chapter brings out. After he had destroyed the idols, what do you suppose Josiah did? **HE AUTHORIZED A GREAT COLLECTION!** Think of that! The people began to bring their money, they presented a great offering to the Lord for the repair of His house; or, in other words, for the support and propagation of the truth of God as it was represented by that house of prayer. Sometimes I fear that I have been derelict in my duty in this respect; but nothing is more clearly taught in the Word of God than this, that God requires of every one of His true children that every day we live there should be a recognition of God in our material affairs. Who is it gives the power to get wealth? By whose mercy and grace do we enjoy health and strength, and physical and mental ability, to play our part in the world of men? What we receive, be it little or much, comes to us because God has enabled us to earn it; and if we are His, we do not own a penny, not a penny. "Ye are not your own. Ye are bought with a price." The Scriptures speak most strongly of people who do not recognize God in their giving. It uses this strong term, "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes of offerings." And has God so small a place in your life and mine that He has nothing to do with our money? What is our money? It is the product of our labour. How much time do you spend in earning it? "Why," you say, "every day I live except Sunday. I have to labour all the time." What you receive is the product of your life's investment, and God comes and says, "Recognize me there". And the man who does not recognize God there, will never be a spiritual power; he never will have spiritual blessing. Never can the Holy Spirit, Who is One with the Father Who gave His only begotten Son, and Who in very essence is love itself, never will He co-operate with us while we withhold our tithe, our money, from Him.

That is in the lesson! I did not look for it, it was there. When I came upon it I said, "That is one of the conditions of revival; first, breaking down the altars, and then building up the work of God." And what need there is for money nowadays! Think of these little churches! Think of these groups of believers all over these two provinces! Because of their devotion to the Word of God some people will walk out from the buildings which they have built, into which they have put their very life's blood, and go out to worship in a little store or somewhere else. I expect to go to Lindsay tomorrow to assist in the recognition of a new Baptist Church made up of people who said, "We can stand it no longer. We are going to stand for God and His Word." Do you not think they ought to be re-inforced by Baptist believers everywhere? Ought we not to have money just pouring into our missionary treasuries, so that we shall be able to stand behind them?

The Home Mission Board of the Convention from which this church has been excluded, say in their report to the Convention, "So many churches have declared for self-support." Well, it is true, and it is not true. Some of them declared for self-support because the Home Mission Board said, "Obey us, or we will not give you another

dollar." And they said, "We will go out without anything before we will surrender." One heroic pastor who lives, even at best, on a starvation salary, sat here on this platform last week, and he said to us, "My stand will mean at least the loss of three hundred dollars a year, but I take it." I know of men who have had to dissolve partnership in business, who have lost hundreds of dollars, and perhaps thousands of dollars, because they would not betray the Lord. So I say there is a place for generous, for sacrificial, giving. Although, blessed be God, we have a house here that does not let in the storm; we have plenty of need every day here with our Seminary, and all our multiplied activities; but think of the places that have no house at all! Think of the places in this province, scores of towns and villages, where there is scarcely a testimony for God at all, into which we ought to go and carry the gospel. These young men that are coming to our Seminary, in three or four years will be ready to go out—where shall they go? We ought to be opening up doors everywhere for them, and take this province for God, by the gospel of God's grace. If we are going to have such a revival that will spread over the whole country, let us see to it that we follow the example of those men who gave of their money.

The money was put into the hands of the artificers, the workmen of various ranks, and they used it "to repair and amend the house." Now that is the kind of amendment that I believe in! (That is rather an archaic form of expression, Mr. Stockley). They did not give the money to pass an amended resolution, but they gave the money, "they put it in the hand of the workmen that had the oversight of the house of the Lord, and they gave it to the workmen that wrought in the house of the Lord, to repair and amend the house. Even to the artificers and builders gave they it, to buy hewn stone, and timber for couplings, and to floor the houses which the kings of Judah had destroyed."

What was the money for? Josiah came upon a day in Israel's history when the very temple of the Lord had been defiled, and when that which in earlier years had been meant for the worship of God had been put to wrong uses. And so they had to "floor the houses which the kings of Judah had destroyed". And we shall have to go into places and build another house, because the devil has stolen the house that was built for the worship of God. That is strong speech, is it not? It is intended to be strong, for it is literally true that God is crowded out of His dwelling place. So let us remember that, and bring of our substance to the Lord; and great blessing will be ours.

IV.

Then the next thing: while they were repairing the house **THEY FOUND SOMETHING THAT HAD BEEN LOST IN THE HOUSE OF THE LORD.** Why was a revival needed? Because **THEY HAD LOST THE BOOK OF THE LORD**—and, strangely enough, *it was lost in the house of the Lord.* I can find hundreds of men on the street who make no profession of religion, and who say this, "Well, sir, I don't go to church very often, but when I do go to church I want to hear the Bible; and if these preachers have no Bible, I wonder what right they have to preach at all? I don't know much about it, but when I go to church I want to hear the Bible, the Word of God." The man in the street is not the man, left to himself, who is opposed to the Word of God. I know the publicans and sinners

joined with the religious leaders in Christ's day in demanding His blood, but left to themselves they would not have done it. It was the religious leaders of the day that took the Incarnate Word to the Cross; and the gospel of Jesus Christ has always found its most vigorous opposition through men who were called "religious leaders". This accursed thing called Modernism has originated in religious circles, it is a college movement; that is where it originated. In the very house of the Lord, the Word of the Lord has been lost, buried beneath heaps of rubbish. *And if we are to have a revival, it will come by taking this Book from where human unbelief has buried it, back to the chief place in the house of the Lord.* When the Word of the Lord is exalted, when preachers come back to proclaim the Word of the Lord, we shall have revival.

The need of the hour is the restoration of the Word of God to its proper place in the house of God. Hilkiyah said, "We have found a book, we have found a book by the hand of Moses, the book of the Law. And when they brought out the money that was brought into the house of the Lord"—now mark that: Hilkiyah found the book of the Law given by Moses, after they had brought their money—"And when they brought out the money that was brought into the house of the Lord, Hilkiyah the priest found a book of the Law of the Lord by Moses. And Hilkiyah answered and said to Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord. And Hilkiyah delivered the book to Shaphan. And Shaphan carried the book to the king, and brought the king word back again, saying, All that was committed to thy servants, they do it. And they have gathered together the money that was found in the house of the Lord, and have delivered it into the hand of the overseers, and to the hand of the workmen. Then Shaphan the scribe told the king, saying, Hilkiyah, the priest hath given me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king. And it came to pass, when the king heard the words of the law, that he rent his clothes." When he heard the terrible things that were in the Word of the Lord, the woes, the judgments, that were pronounced upon sinners in the Word of the Lord, the king rent his clothes. Oh, my friends, if we can get back to the Word of the Lord, and hear what the Word of the Lord has to say about sin and judgment, we shall all rend our clothes; we shall sit down in sackcloth and ashes, and repent before God of all our wickednesses, when we get back to the Word of the Lord. When a man is supremely satisfied with himself, magnifying humanity, and talking about evolution as Bishop Barnes does, that man has got away from the Word of the Lord. It is a mistake, they say, to suppose that man is a fallen creature. It is a mistake to believe that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and that back there he became a living soul. Man has emerged from a lower animal order, and even his mind, his intelligence, and his spirit, are all the products of evolution! In other words, it is the damnable heresy that man made himself by forces inherent in himself, instead of the great truth of the Bible that he was made in the image and likeness of God, that he sinned against God, and has fallen from his high estate. If we get back to the Book of the Lord, we shall find what God intended us to be, we shall see the high and holy standard which God has set up; and, if we measure ourselves by it, we shall be like Josiah and repent in sackcloth and ashes; we shall say with Isaiah, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people

of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts."

Do you want to have a revival in your own heart? Find the book. Do you want to get back to God? Begin to read the Book—not a verse a day, but read it, and study it, and let God speak to you out of the Book. And when He speaks out of His Book, we shall be ashamed of ourselves every one, we shall be so concerned on account of our own sin that we shall hide our faces before Him. Then you will understand the necessity for the blood, my friends. Oh, if we see ourselves in God's light we shall come to understand that:

"None but Jesus,
Can do helpless sinners good."

V.

He found the Book in the house of the Lord where it had been lost. And they read it—and what followed? After they read the Book **THEY WERE DRIVEN TO PRAYER.** Josiah said, "Go, enquire of the Lord for me, and for them that are left in Israel, and in Judah, concerning the words of the book that is found: for great is the wrath of the Lord that is poured out upon us, because our fathers"—listen—"because our fathers have not kept the word of the Lord, to do after all that is written in this book." And so they began to pray. And as they prayed, they got another message from the Lord. Oh, it was a terrible message, it told of the destruction of Judah, and fearful judgments upon Judah—and what did the king do? "Then the king sent and gathered together all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem. And the king went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the priest, and the Levites, and all the people, great and small: and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant that was found in the house of the Lord. And the king stood in his place, and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all his heart, and with all his soul, to perform the words of the covenant which are written in this book. And he caused all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to it. And the inhabitants of Jerusalem did according to the covenant of God, the God of their fathers. And Josiah took away all the abominations out of all the countries that pertained to the children of Israel, and made all that were present in Israel to serve, even to serve the Lord their God. And all his days they departed not from following the Lord, the God of their fathers." And so revival came; and the judgment, for the time being at least, during Josiah's days, was averted.

Then he proclaimed a feast, and they came together to the Passover, and such a Passover was observed in Jerusalem as had never been observed since the days of Samuel: "There was no passover like that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet; neither did all the kings of Israel keep such a passover as Josiah kept." And what was the Passover? To what did the people gather in that time of great revival? To the memorial of the slain Lamb, to the observance of the ordinance which celebrated the Lord's Passover. And, my friends, as we pray and wait upon God, and see ourselves as sinners, and make a covenant with Him, and yield ourselves to Him, there will be one hope for us only, and that will be the blood of the Lamb: "If we walk in the light, as

he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Shall we all come back to Him this morning, if we have wandered? Shall we make a covenant with Him to-day, that we will walk in His ways? Shall we give the Word of God its proper place? Shall we honour the Lord with our substance and with the firstfruits of all our increase? Shall we do all that the Word of the Lord commands us to do? If we do, there will be a revival, a great revival. And I am sure that the things that have happened unto us in recent days will fall out to the "furtherance of the gospel", we shall go untrammelled with nothing but the Word of God to preach, nothing but the gospel to proclaim, nothing but the blood to offer for the sinner's hope, for the salvation of men. Oh, that God's people would this morning,—

"Break down every idol, cast out every foe—
Now wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow."

Let us pray: We come to Thee, O Lord, saying this morning, "Wilt Thou not revive us again, that Thy people may rejoice in Thee." How many are there in Thy presence this morning who recall days of blessed fellowship with Thee, days when wholeheartedly they wrought in the work of the Lord, days when the Word of God was precious to them, and the Voice from heaven continually whispered the promises of God to their souls. But many have lost that joy, they have lost that consciousness of the divine favour, they have lost the power that comes from walking with God; and they have to say, as we have been singing this morning:

"Where is the blessedness I knew
When first I saw the Lord?
Where is the soul-refreshing view
Of Jesus and His word?"

"What peaceful hours I once enjoyed—
How sweet their memory still!
But they have left an aching void
The world can never fill."

O, Thou compassionate Spirit, bring them back again, bring them back again. Hast Thou not said, "I will heal their backslidings, I will love them freely"? Lord, we beseech Thee, bring the backslider home. And there are some who scarcely will admit they belong to that class, yet they have forsaken their first love, and they are neither cold nor hot, but lukewarm, and Thou hast said "I will spue thee out of my mouth". O may the heavenly fire be kindled within, may their lukewarmness be forgiven. Set them on fire for the Lord, we pray Thee; bring them back again. It may be there are some here this morning who have been like Peter, warming themselves by the enemy's fire, denying their Lord in the day of His great trial, and Thou hast looked upon such this morning, and they are disposed to weep and to remember how lovingly Thou didst warn them that they might fall by the way. Oh, wilt Thou bring Peter back again? Grant, we beseech Thee, that he may hear the voice of the angel from the risen Christ, "Go tell His disciples, and Peter." Bring him back again, O Lord. If any of us have rendered Thee a grudging service, if any of us

have withheld that which was due, if any of us have robbed God, O forgive us, and help us, we pray Thee, that we may be true to Thee, and bring in "all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it. And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes." Then wilt Thou give us plenty even in the midst of famine, and it shall be known to all that the Lord God is in the midst of His people. O, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we are before Thee, wilt Thou not revive us again? Send Thy reviving Spirit this morning, break down all resistance, make Thy people forget time and every material and physical interest and shut us up in these few moments to God. Let there be a real dealing with God this morning on the part of every one in Thy holy presence. O come to us, begin a revival here that shall spread throughout the whole land, that shall carry a flaming message of the gospel to every corner of this continent, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth. Lord, let it be known that Thou art God, that we are Thy servants, and that we have done all these things at Thy word. So let the heavenly fire fall that the multitudes may cry, "The Lord, he is God; the Lord, he is God." We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

McMASTER "SUBSTANTIALLY" ORTHODOX.

(Continued from page 9.)

We do not see how any church protesting against the action of the Convention, can, with any degree of consistency, support the Boards which are subject to the Convention. We do not suggest that any church withdraw from the Convention; let the churches wait until the Convention excludes them. In spite of what Dr. MacNeill and others have said, every Regular Baptist Church in Ontario and Quebec has a vested right of control in the funds of McMaster University, and of all the Convention organizations; and we suggest that every church should stay in the Convention, in order that the onus legally may rest with the Convention. And inasmuch as every Baptist church has vested money in the various properties held by the various Boards, and inasmuch as every Baptist church has a share in the McMaster estate, every church has a right to remain in the Convention, even though it makes no contribution to its funds.

Furthermore, we urge the orthodox Baptists who stand for the faith of Christ in the various churches, not to be too hasty in transferring their membership to other churches. Of course, where the modernistic element is overwhelmingly in the majority, and there seems to be no reasonable chance of turning the tide, we would suggest that members transfer their membership to some other church where they can heartily co-operate with the work. But in many churches of which we have knowledge, where the church itself, at its heart, is true to the Book, and is prevented from expressing itself only because it has a McMaster pastor, we would recommend the members of the church to stay in that church and force the issue, and endeavour, if possible, to save the church for a true ministry of the Word.