

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. 28.

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 24th, 1927

Whole No. 290

When Should Regular Baptists Withdraw?

We have been asked to answer the above question in this issue of *The Witness*. As we see the present situation, we offer these suggestions. First of all, we believe that every true Christian is a steward, and responsible to God for the use he makes of his money. Therefore he should see to it that not a dollar of his money is given to the support of Modernists or Modernism; or for the support of one who, while professing orthodoxy himself, supports Modernism. To this some will reply, "But while we remain in the membership of our respective churches, we must at least support the church to which we belong, even though we cannot approve of the course the pastor, or the church, or both, may be taking in this issue." To that we reply that every person who joins a Baptist church, joins it in the faith that it will stand for what Baptists stand for, and in that confidence they make their contributions of life and interest and money to the church, and thereby they become a shareholder in the church. But when that church ceases to support the gospel, or, supporting the gospel in its own pulpit, neutralizes its ministry by supporting, through vote of its pastor or other delegates, those who would destroy the faith of men, we believe it becomes a duty to withhold support.

Certainly this principle should apply to the support of all the Boards of the Convention. There is no longer a shadow of a doubt that every Board of the Convention is absolutely dominated by McMaster, and to cut off support of McMaster University and continue to support any of the other Boards, is merely to support McMaster indirectly. We believe there is no remedy for the present situation but absolutely to withdraw all financial aid from McMaster, directly and indirectly. In other words, we are at war. McMaster University is the beleaguered city, and so far as it is possible to do so, it should be completely blockaded.

But ought those who thus withdraw their support to withdraw their membership? That is a question

which cannot be answered with a Yes or No. Three hundred and forty-one members retained their membership in Jarvis Street for one year after most of them had withdrawn every dollar of support; and these three hundred and forty-one, although they did not ask for their letters until April 12th, 1922, cancelled their subscriptions and withdrew support as from September 21st, 1921.

This principle should be taken into consideration. In the majority of instances it will be found that those who believe the Book, and are standing for spiritual things, are among the most liberal supporters of the work. For them to cease absolutely to support as a protest against the church's course, will very probably force the issue and compel a consideration of the whole question. Then the majority will decide the issue. And we would earnestly recommend our friends not to withdraw hastily from the churches to which they belong, for it may be if they will wait, the Lord will give a great victory.

We venture to quote the case of Jarvis Street Church. At an illegal meeting, and by utterly illegal methods, our opponents in Jarvis Street, in the middle of the summer, obtained a snap verdict in which they had a majority of twenty-eight against us. At that time one of the Deacons supporting us said, "Shall we walk out with you?" to which we replied, "Sit still; others will walk out before this matter is ended." Before the vote on September 21st our opponents were as arrogant as Pharaoh and his hosts, and were absolutely sure of victory. On the first vote our opponents were victorious, and we were defeated in the vote for the Chairmanship,—indeed, it looked as black as anything could be. Humanly speaking, there did not seem to be any possibility of victory. But the Lord was in the meeting, and the Lord was on our side; and when the vote was taken on the motion to declare the pulpit vacant, it was lost by forty-one votes. The majority was large enough to give us the victory, but it was small enough to make us very humble before God and to lean hard upon Him. But He came into that

meeting and put the enemy utterly to rout. Never until that night did we understand the full significance of the scriptural phrase which speaks of the arm of the Lord being made bare. Since that time God has blessed us in an extraordinary way, and practically two thousand have come into the fellowship of the church. He has supplied our needs financially, and through *The Gospel Witness* and in other ways, has spread the testimony of Jarvis Street Church around the world.

We would remind our brethren who face such difficulties that it is scarcely possible that any one of them should have a situation more difficult than was ours. As one leading business man of Toronto said to us, "You had everything against you: numbers, wealth, social position, Denominational organization; and, by every human standard, you were beaten from the beginning. But," lifting his hand toward heaven, he said, "my brother, God was on your side." And He was. And He is on the side of all who stand for truth and righteousness; and "if God be for us, who can be against us?"

Therefore we venture to urge all our brethren to betake themselves to prayer and to cry mightily to God. Our victory in Jarvis Street was not wrought by organization, or by human effort; but by the mighty power of God. Of course we must use the best judgment we have, we must adopt such measures as may seem to be wise; but over and above it all we must depend upon the mighty power of God. Let it be remembered that He can change the hearts of men,—He did so in our case. And let it be told once again that while the vote was being taken, when there was a lull in the proceedings, we went back into the parlor and we found that room crowded with people of all denominations, and, under the leadership of an Anglican woman, they were all on their knees before God, praying for victory. God raised up bands of praying people all over Canada and the United States. We did not deserve it, and the only explanation we have ever been able to offer of that widespread spiritual interest in Jarvis Street's domestic affairs, was that God intended to use Jarvis Street as an example to show churches elsewhere what He stands ready to do for the church that will put Christ first.

Therefore we would urge our Fundamentalist friends in all churches to band together for prayer, and for wise organization and effort, that they may stand together in the church to which they belong, for the truth of God. Of course, when the issue has been faced, and a vote has been taken, and a decision registered adverse to the principles of Fundamentalism and favourable to McMaster, there would remain nothing for them to do but to withdraw and find fellowship in another church. But if there be but half a dozen

people who stand for the faith in a large church, it is their right to have their views considered by the church; and we therefore suggest that in every such instance our Fundamentalist friends, in the exercise of their right as members, force the church to which they belong to vote on the question, so that they may know exactly where the church stands, and not until such vote has been taken ought Fundamentalists to withdraw.

On the other hand, when a church has actually committed itself by vote to the support of McMaster and its Modernism, it would seem to us to be utterly inconsistent for such to remain in the church. In some instances members will be actuated by sentiment—it is the church of their father or their mother; but in all such cases we believe the time has come—as, indeed, it has been always with us—for us to put Christ before all human relationships, and to make loyalty to Him and His Word the first consideration in life. Let it be remembered that it is written: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

It is not the well-being of the church of your father or your mother that is at stake, but the honour of the Christ Who died for you. And here we quote from an article by Dr. Masters, published elsewhere in this issue, in which he says, "We still account it a thing to be praised, for men among us to fight for law and for moral reform and for the honour of women. What kind of foul nightmare is this settling down upon us which would defend the honour of a woman, but would purr like a pussy cat toward men who would betray the honour of the world's Redeemer?" Let us put Christ first at all costs.

Incidentally, and somewhat aside from this particular article, we call attention to what Marshallism has done in England. We have before us a report which says that in the London Baptist Sunday Schools alone for the year 1926 there was a decrease of two thousand Sunday School teachers.

NEWS FROM THE FRONT

Last week a number of meetings were held in Western Ontario, and several in Eastern Ontario, for the purpose of setting before the people the facts in relation to the present controversy. Mr. James McGinlay addressed a large audience in Chatham on Monday, November 14th, when ten more Baptists were added to the list of those who are forming the new Regular

Baptist Church in Chatham. On Tuesday Mr. Thos. Urquhart and the Editor of this paper joined Mr. McGinlay in Windsor where we addressed an audience of over five hundred people in the Collegiate Auditorium. A large number of Baptists from Windsor, as well as many from outside points, were in attendance. The Border City presents a magnificent oppor-

tunity for a clear evangelical testimony. A considerable company of strong and representative people are gathering there, and we shall soon have a large Regular Baptist Church in that place. It was a time of happy fellowship when we were very conscious of the presence and power of the Spirit of God in the midst.

The following evening we had a magnificent gathering in Leamington. The people came for many miles through a deluge of rain, and notwithstanding the opposition on the part of certain people, a good number of local Baptists were present.

We returned to Windsor Wednesday night, and the next day, via Detroit and Port Huron, made our way to Sarnia. Here the meeting was held in the Parish Hall of St. John's Church. There was a fine attendance, including many local Baptists. On Friday night we held a meeting in the City Hall, Woodstock, where we had an audience of perhaps five hundred people. Many local Baptists were present, with many from outside points.

While these meetings were held in the West, Rev. G. W. Allen and Mr. Wm. Fraser journeyed to Dalesville, Quebec. The Dalesville and Lachute churches work together under one pastor. Both churches had passed resolutions of protest against the amending Bill, and both had invited speakers from our side of the question. This invitation was accepted: Rev. G. W. Allen spoke at Lachute, and Mr. Allen and Mr. James McGinlay at Dalesville. The Sunday following the pastor of the church, without the sanction of the church, announced a meeting for Wednesday night when certain McMaster representatives would be present to present the other side of the case. It should be noted that a business meeting had been announced for that night, and the pastor took it upon himself to invite McMaster representatives to come and speak before the church on that occasion. The church communicated with us, with the result that Mr. Allen and Mr. Fraser were there to meet Rev. C. R. Duncan and Rev. W. E. Hodgson. There was a large meeting, and it was arranged that the speakers should speak alternately. Mr. Duncan was followed by Mr. Allen, and Mr. Hodgson by Mr. Fraser. There could be only one result from such a free and frank discussion of the merits of the case, namely, that the church would be united in opposition to McMaster.

A Good Suggestion.

This leads us to suggest that it would be eminently fair for both sides to be presented before every church in the Convention; and, at the same time, if, as McMaster and its supporters represent, those who oppose McMaster are a company of falsifiers who always misrepresent facts and cannot tell the truth, it would appear to us to be in the interests of McMaster to have some of their representatives present when addresses are delivered by their opponents. They would then be in a position to answer their critics. On the other hand, it is our contention that the present issue is always misrepresented by McMaster supporters. We have read the speeches of Professor Farmer and Dr. MacNeill at Lindsay, and it is almost unbelievable

that such men should be guilty of such gross misrepresentations of fact. We hereby suggest therefore that meetings be held in every church in the Convention at times when it is possible to have one or more representatives from each side of the question, so that the church itself may be able fairly to judge between the two. We have great pleasure in inviting Dr. MacNeill, Dr. Farmer, Professor Marshall, Dr. Whidden, and as many more as they like, to speak from the Jarvis Street platform on this subject. We are willing to have one night of it, or, if it suits them, a week, for a full and frank discussion. We could take up the points at issue one by one, the length and order of the speeches could all be pre-arranged, and duly announced, so that everyone would have a fair chance to prepare for the discussion of the case. A full report could be taken of the discussion, and printed and broadcast throughout the Denomination. The churches would then be able fairly to judge of the issues involved.

Our proposal is made with the utmost sincerity, and with an earnest desire for its acceptance, although we fear there is little probability of such a fair proposal being even considered. McMaster University prefers to speak when and where there is no one to answer them. We shall await with interest McMaster's reply to our suggestion.

This Week's Meetings.

These notes are written in the early hours of Tuesday morning. A little later in the day we hope to take the nine o'clock train for Montreal, arriving there in time for an evening meeting which will be held at Stanley Hall, 92 Stanley Street. On Wednesday evening the meeting will be held in St. Paul's Baptist Church, Ontario Street East, corner of Chamley; on Thursday evening, in Wood Hall, 187 Gordon Avenue, Verdun. Mr. James McGinlay will be the other speaker at each of these meetings.

Returning to Toronto early Friday morning, we shall have opportunity to speak a word of greeting to the delegates at the Women's Convention of Regular Baptists, to be held in Jarvis Street; then lecture in the Seminary from twelve to one, and shall be off again in the afternoon for Otterville, Ontario, where we hope to hold a meeting for the discussion of the same great subject.

Glorious Good News.

From all parts of the Convention territory we are receiving communications indicating that at last the people are awaking. In practically every church throughout the Convention there are groups of earnest believers, in some instances large numbers of such, who are unwilling to sell their Baptist birthright for McMaster's mess of pottage. These groups are demanding that the issue be brought before their respective churches, and are asking that representatives of the new Union be sent to present the facts of the case. All such communications should be addressed to: Rev. W. E. Atkinson, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto, Canada.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

How a Professor of Theology Was Converted

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, November 20th, 1927.

(Stenographically Reported)

"And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest.

"And desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.

"And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven:

"And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

"And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

"And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

"And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.

"And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus.

"And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink."—Acts 9:1-9.

PRAYER BEFORE THE SERMON.

O Lord, before we open Thy Book, we would open our hearts to Thee, and seek the blessing of the Spirit of God that we may understand the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: which none of the princes of this world knew. We confess that we, of ourselves, have no ability whatever to enter into these hidden things; but rejoice to know that that which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the Spirit of God is pleased to reveal. So may we be conscious this evening of His revealing ministry, that we may be led into the truth of Christ. Grant, we beseech Thee, that this service may be used of God to bring sinners to the feet of Christ. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

I have a word or two I desire to say this evening before we come to the consideration of the evening text. I shall read a clipping from one of the Toronto papers, I think it appeared on Friday:

"McMASTER STUDENTS SUPPORT PROFESSORS. Students' Council Also Takes Issue With James McGinlay's Statements.

Drawn up for the purpose of placing before Baptists in particular and the public in general what they describe as 'The True State of Affairs in McMaster University', the members of the Students' Council of McMaster University passed the following resolution which, in a request from W. J. Riddiford, President, George M. Edwards and L. D. Begg, acting for the Council, the Mail and Empire was asked to publish:

'We are gravely concerned about the fact that a great many earnest people both within and without the bounds of our Convention, are being deliberately misinformed about the true state of affairs in McMaster University, with the result that the confidence of many has been shaken and doubts fostered in the minds of many more.

'Believing that it is the desire of all such people to know the truth regarding our attitude, and feeling that such an expression would correct misunderstanding, we consider it our duty and our right to make public the following resolution which was passed at a duly called and regularly conducted meeting of the Students' Council.

'Whereas, we are aware of the fact that certain statements have been made regarding our faculty which we know to be unfair and untrue, and,

'Whereas, one student in particular, Mr. James McGinlay, has been making such statements,

'Be it resolved, that we,

1. Reaffirm our confidence in our professors,

2. Declare to be untrue certain of the public utterances of Mr. James McGinlay, and disapprove of the hostile attitude which he has adopted, feeling it to be unfair both to the University, to himself, and to all who are led to give credence to his statement.

'We desire to add that we are acting under no pressure of personal animosity but in all fairness to everyone concerned and that the resolution and this accompanying statement reflect faithfully the true feeling of the undergraduate body.'

Another article appeared in the evening paper of yesterday:

"JAMES MCGINLAY IS NOW EXPELLED.

"James McGinlay, McMaster university student who a week ago was suspended from lectures for what was termed outrageous utterances against the university, was expelled by the faculty late yesterday afternoon. He is debarred from attendance and enrolment at McMaster by the order which takes effect immediately.

"The following brief statement was given out following a meeting of the governing body:

"The faculty of McMaster university has canceled James McGinlay's registration. He has repeatedly made statements from public platforms in regard to officials and professors of the university which are untrue and grossly insulting. He has been afforded ample opportunity to explain or disavow these statements and has failed to do so.'

"Commenting on the university's action, Chancellor H. P. Whidden stated that cancellation of McGinlay's registration did not permanently preclude the possibility of reinstatement on proper conditions."

I have no defense to make of Mr. McGinlay—for the simple reason that he does not need any; he is well able to take care of himself, and of several other people at the same time! He is of age, although a young man, and can speak for himself. But there are one or two things that I should like to call attention to.

The charge, both by the students and Faculty, is that Mr. McGinlay has made certain statements that are untrue. But they do not inform us of what the statements are! They never do! They simply cry "Liar", that is all. That has been McMaster's attitude, that is what she has done, these eight years. When her modernistic tendencies have been proved up to the hilt, when evidence has been adduced which would convince any jury in the world, McMaster simply answers, "Liar". They never meet the issue.

In this case Mr. McGinlay is expelled from the University—I think that is a higher honour than to have received any degree which McMaster could confer upon him; I can think of no greater distinction than that—he has been expelled from the University for making certain statements which they say are untrue. I have heard him make the particular statement to which they refer. I was not there when he made it in Ottawa, but I heard him repeat it, because he was with me all last week. What Mr. McGinlay said was this, that never since the devil told the first one has a greater falsehood been told than that told by Professor Marshall when he said, "I stand with C. H. Spurgeon on the Atonement." Lest there be any mistake about it, I should like to say that what Mr. McGinlay said is manifestly true. There is a falsehood in connection with it—but that lies at the door of McMaster University and Professor Marshall. I repeat it with the greatest possible emphasis, that I have never heard or read a statement made by any responsible man which was more emphatically untrue than when Professor Marshall said he stood with Spurgeon on the Atonement.

Perhaps we ought to excuse him because he did not find the quotation he made for himself! There is one man at McMaster University who is always finding things in books, and putting them into the hands of other people. At one of the Conventions the Chancellor of the University read a quotation from Dr. Orr. The book from which he quoted was not in the hands of the delegates, nobody knew he was going to quote Dr. Orr; and therefore no one was in a position at the moment to challenge the accuracy of his statement. I have read Dr. Orr, and when I heard the quotation, I said to myself, "That does not sound like Dr. Orr's position at all." Later I looked up the book and I found that the quotation of the Chancellor was made up out of a paragraph from Dr. Orr's book, a part of a sentence here, part of a sentence there, and part of a sentence further on—and then all put together.

(Below we print, first, the Chancellor's quotation made up from sentences here and there without the omissions being indicated; and, secondly, the quotation as it really appears in Dr. Orr's book, the Chancellor's deletions being printed in italics.)

As quoted by the Chancellor

"To what result, we may ask, does our whole investigation conduct us on the age and composition of the Pentateuch generally?"—a matter of composition and date, not of document.—"For one thing, not to the conclusion that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch in the precise shape or extent in which we now possess it; for the work we think, shows very evident signs of different pens and styles, of editorial redaction (i.e., editing) of stages of compilation—in the collation and preparation

of the materials of this work—and many hands and minds may have co-operated and have continued to co-operate after the master-mind was removed."

As it appears in Dr. Orr's book:

To what result—we must now ask—does our whole investigation conduct us on the origin of the Priestly Writing, and the age and composition of the Pentateuch generally. We began by leaving it an open question whether, or how many, separate documents were employed in the compilation of that work, and if so, what were the ages and mutual relations of these documents. To what conclusions have we now been led?

For one thing, it is first to be said, not to the conclusion that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch in the precise shape or extent in which we now possess it; for the work, we think, shows very evident signs of different pens and styles, of editorial redaction, of stages of compilation. As before observed, its compilation has a history, whether we are able ever to track satisfactorily that history or not. On the other hand, next, very strongly to the view of the unity, essential Mosaicity, and relative antiquity of the Pentateuch. The unity which characterises the work has its basis mainly in the history, knit together as that is by the presence of a developing divine purpose; but arises also from the plan of the book, which must have been laid down early, by one mind, or different minds working together, while the memory of the great patriarchal traditions was yet fresh, and the impressions of the stupendous deliverance from Egypt, and of the wonderful events connected with, and following it, were yet recent and vivid. In the collation and preparation of the materials for this work—some of them, perhaps, reaching back into pre-Mosaic times—and the laying of the foundations of the existing narratives, to which Moses by his own compositions, according to constant tradition, lent the initial impulse, many hands and minds may have co-operated, and may have continued to co-operate, after the master-mind was removed; but unity of purpose and will gave a corresponding unity to the product of their labours. So far from such a view being obsolete, or disproved by modern criticism, we hold that internal indications, external evidence, and the circumstances of the Mosaic age itself, unite in lending their support to its probability."

There is not a word in the Chancellor's quotation that Dr. Orr did not write, and yet the deletions make Dr. Orr say the very opposite of what he really said. That kind of thing applied to business puts a man in the penitentiary; that is forgery. In other words, it is an unmitigated misrepresentation, and I lay that charge at the door of the Chancellor. But probably we ought to excuse him because he did not prepare it for himself.

Neither did Professor Marshall select the quotation which he made from Spurgeon; he quoted what somebody handed him about the atonement, and said, "I simply take my stand by the side of Charles Haddon Spurgeon." If he had read on to the next page in the same sermon, he would have found Spurgeon stating in unequivocal language a position which Professor Marshall opposes. Professor Marshall says, "I do not care for the idea of the word 'punishment';" Professor Marshall has declared repeatedly that he rejects the penal principle in the Atonement; that the cross of Christ was not the revelation of God's hatred of sin, but a revelation of God's love; Professor Marshall says that Christ "suffered" for us, and he uses the term in his confession of faith, "vicarious suffering"; by which he did not mean that Christ honoured the law of God in the sense of paying our debt. He did not bear the sinner's punishment. There is no penal element in it at all—that is Professor Marshall's position.

I have been a student of Spurgeon, I have preached in his pulpit for about six months, although that does not mean very much in this case; but I know whereof I speak. Had we time, I could quote from this book, but in the very sermon from which Professor Marshall

quoted—he did not quote from Spurgeon's sermon, but rather an extract from Dr. Fullerton's *Life of Spurgeon*—if he had gone to the sermon he would have found Spurgeon saying on the very next page, "He (Christ) 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." And he actually uses the word "punishment", and says that Christ endured the punishment of our sins. I affirm that the testimony of Spurgeon's whole ministry, exercised in that great pulpit for nearly forty years, during which time it was estimated he reached not less than three hundred millions of people—the testimony of his whole ministry was a protest and a denial of the "damnable heresies" which this Professor has brought here from England. And when Mr. James McGinlay said that never since the devil told his first lie has a greater falsehood been told than Professor Marshall told when he said he stands with Spurgeon on the Atonement, Mr. McGinlay said what was absolutely true.

But Brother McGinlay will have ample opportunity to speak for himself. He is going with me to Montreal for three days this week, Tuesday to Thursday, then back to a place in Ontario on Friday;—and I am quite sure he will say nothing to make it possible for him to re-enter McMaster University!

But that is Ahab's way, to cut off the heads of all the prophets who tell the truth. *The Canadian Baptist* has been closed against the discussion of this matter for two years, and the people have heard only one side of it—except as we have been able to give the other side through *The Gospel Witness*.

Last week we held a meeting in Leamington, Ontario. Arrangements had been made to hold the meeting in one of the public buildings, and after the arrangements had been completed through some local person, the McMaster influence got to work and the engagement was cancelled—but we held the meeting in the skating rink. We had a signed agreement for the use of the collegiate auditorium in Sarnia, and even after the agreement was signed, the collegiate auditorium was closed against us; but we held our meeting in the Parish Hall of St. John's Church. Arrangements were made for a meeting in Simcoe, and after the engagement was made, that also was cancelled, but here, too, another hall was engaged. When the brethren got there for the meeting they found the enemy had gone to the length of putting a sign on the hall, "No Meeting To-night." They held a meeting because people had come from out-of-town.

I mention these things to show what those who contend for the faith must meet. Certain halls are closed against us. The doors of this church are always open, and our friends may come in here any time they like, they may send as many stenographers as they like, and take as many reports as they desire. I think I would like to have Professor Marshall come here to speak! I hereby extend him an invitation now to come and state his position from the Jarvis Street platform—on the one condition that I follow him! "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." It is a very bad cause that is afraid of the light, that closes the columns

of the paper, that endeavours to close every avenue of expression, in order that the people may not know the facts.

I wanted to associate myself with my young friend and brother, McGinlay, but let everyone understand that it is not because he cannot look after himself. You watch the papers on Wednesday, and you will probably hear from him in Montreal. We shall be there Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

I should like to speak to you to-night for a little while of the conversion of Saul. "Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter." It is a principle recognized, I think, by the medical profession, that in order to find a remedy for any disease, they must first isolate the germ which causes that disease. In other words, they must discover the cause of the disease, they must know its nature, before they can prescribe a cure. If you call a doctor in to see you, he will ask for a history of your case; if you are not well, he will examine you, he will endeavour, first of all, to discover what is wrong with you; and when he has found that out, he will prescribe a remedy.

And the doctor who makes a mistake in diagnosis, is certain to make a mistake in treatment. I read a story of a certain bishop who, when he had been slightly indisposed, consulted a doctor. When it was reported that he was improving, someone called to see him and asked him what had been the matter. He told the visitor what the doctor had said. "And are you quite sure he is right?" "Well", said the bishop, "I hope so; I should hate to get well of the wrong disease!"

I.

Before we can know what salvation is, WE MUST KNOW SOMETHING OF MAN'S NATURAL STATE. If you find a man who denies the biblical doctrine of human depravity, you will be sure to discover that he is weak in his estimate of the remedy which God has prescribed, because he does not know how radical the cure must be. The best way to find these things out is the way the doctor finds them out: he studies the patient himself to ascertain what is the nature of the disease from which he is suffering. In our text we have the diagnosis of the Divine Physician. He tells us what, by nature, was the matter with Saul of Tarsus. "Breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord"—and he could not very well breathe out what was not in, that which he expressed was native to his carnal mind. The Bible says, "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

If you put that statement down beside your own experience you will see that it fits in exactly with your own condition. I venture to say there is scarcely a man or woman here who, at some time or another, faced by some divine prohibition, by something which the Word of God, the law of God, reveals to be wrong, did not wish that there were no law against it. There is not one of us who has not desired the thing which the law of God forbids; by nature, the unrenewed mind of man is, in its very warp and woof, in its constitution, not only at enmity with, but is itself, enmity against God. It is a strong expression that might well be put down beside that other principle of which I spoke a few weeks ago, "He made him to be sin for us." Christ became sin itself in the sight of God in our behalf. That is what the

natural mind is: its whole nature is depraved, it is "enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

This principle has many expressions, but for our purpose to-night, that I may not detain you unduly, let me name one. It does not necessarily express itself in lying and stealing and drunkenness and murder—all these things are evil in themselves; but you will find that *the natural enmity of Saul's heart was directed against the supreme manifestation of God in the Person of Christ*. He hated the name of Christ; he hated the word of God as given to the world in Christ Jesus the Lord; and he hated everybody who espoused the cause of Christ, and thought with himself that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.

I think I will tell you a secret. When, as a young man, I attended ministerial meetings—and that is not long ago—I began to discover that in these confidential meetings ministers seemed to find special delight in tearing the Word of God to pieces. I first of all protested against it, and after a while I ceased to attend such meetings, because I found I had to do one of two things: either to be always protesting and fighting, or else I had to come away with a guilty conscience, feeling I had been silent while my Lord was dishonoured. I remember when I was a pastor in Hamilton twenty-five years ago, and attended the General Ministerial Meetings there, I heard Methodist ministers, and Congregational ministers, and Presbyterian ministers, tear the Word of God to pieces. I marvelled at it; I said to myself, "What are these men doing? Why should they hate the Bible? I thought they had been ordained to preach it." At that time, thank God, we had no Baptist ministers in Hamilton of that type. But I was unsophisticated, inexperienced, and I could not understand why it was that men seemed to come to this task of denying the Word of God with such enthusiasm and zeal. I remember a remark of my great predecessor, the late Dr. B. D. Thomas, when referring to these things—and he was a very mild man—but once he said with fine scorn, "What do the fools think they are going to accomplish by so doing?"

Why are men opposed to the gospel? Why should men breathe out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord? against those who stand for the Bible as the infallible Word of God? Supposing we were all wrong—what then? Supposing we were mistaken, why should we be treated as criminals? Why should men gnash their teeth at us? Why should they breathe out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples, I wonder? What is at the basis of it all? Why is it, if you go into any city or town in Canada or the United States or England, or go to the mission fields in India and China and elsewhere, you find men professing to be followers of Christ, especially busy in seeking to destroy the faith of men in the Bible? What is the explanation of it? People who are separated by thousands of miles, who have never seen each other, who have had no contact with each other, but all apparently acting under one direction, seeking the same end, saying the same things, breathing our threatenings and slaughter just like beasts of prey from the jungle. Why is it?

Well, you tell me why it was that, when the fullest and the ultimate expression of the word and will of God in the Person of Jesus Christ, appeared among

men—find me an explanation for the implacable hatred which men manifested toward Christ; toward Him Who said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father"; toward the One Who said, "Which of you convinceth me of sin"; toward the One Who was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners—why did men hate Him? Was it because of His "methods"? Was it because of His "spirit"? Why did the religious world hate Him? Why did the religious world express its antagonism to Him by nailing Him to a cross? I will tell you why: when the nature of God is revealed, and in the measure in which it is revealed, the natural enmity of man manifests itself in opposition. The cross of the Lord Jesus Christ is not only God's estimate of the value of the soul, it is not only a revelation of the love and grace of God toward poor sinners; but *the Cross is man's estimate of God*. Human sin, when it is finished, drives a spear to the heart of God, and crowns the brow of Deity with thorns—"breathing out threatenings and slaughter". Count it not strange, by brethren, if God should call you in any measure at all to endure what your Master endured. "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."

This native enmity *was not affected by pure blood*. Do you know what you are? You say, "I am a Scotsman", "I am an Englishman", "I am a Canadian"—no, I will tell you what you are: you are a mongrel, every one of you. There is not one of us who can say as Saul did, "Of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee"—pure blooded, well bred, the flower of the most favoured race on earth; yet the very best that human nature could produce was one who would murder those who witnessed for Christ! There are a great many people who talk about heredity to-day, they are going to improve the breed naturally. It is a good thing to be well born, and we cannot be too thankful for our parents; but there never was a man so well born after the flesh that he did not need to be born over again. Here was a man who was an aristocrat of the aristocrats, who challenged comparison with anyone. He said, "If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more. I can trace my lineage in an unbroken line right back to Abraham"—but he is a pretty bad lot notwithstanding. And so are you; so am I; so are we all. Professor Marshall may talk about the angel in man if he likes. There is an angel there no doubt, but I do not like his colour! Let him look and see what that hidden angel does until God touches him. This is the lineage of a true Christian: "Born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

Saul was not only well bred, but *a man of intellect naturally*. It is a fine dream that all men are equal—they are not. Some men can think, and some men cannot think very well. We are not all alike. Saul had large natural capacities. But mental vigour, alas, is not incompatible with a natural bias toward evil.

And he was *a man of education*. Nowadays education is being substituted in our mission fields for evangelism. There was a time when our Foreign Mission Boards sent our evangelists to preach the gospel of God's grace to sinners. Then the stream of religious life flowing

from our theological seminaries and institutions became corrupted, and instead of sending out evangelists they send out teachers; so that to-day the proportion being sent out is nine teachers to one evangelist. Why? Because our theological seminaries are turning out men who have no gospel to preach, that is why; and they propose to save men by education. If any man could be saved by education, Saul could. He was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, he was a great scholar. You say, "He learned the wrong thing." No, he did not. He learned the law of his fathers, he learned the Bible, he learned the traditions of his fathers, he was a scholar in the truest sense.

Paul lived the law outwardly; he was a moral man: "Touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless." He was well bred, he had natural capacity, he was well educated, he was instructed in the law; but with it all, he thought within himself that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.

Human nature is not changed by education. I heard a man say long ago, Your ignorant thief may steal a watermelon out of a railway car on the siding, but your educated thief will steal the whole railroad—and be knighted for it. Education does not make men honest, education does not reconcile men to God: it only gives them a larger capacity for evil. Divorce education from Christian ethics, from the dynamic of the gospel, and you have a force that, instead of making for the uplift of Christianity, is a chosen weapon of the devil, I do not care whether your college is state or denominational. Paul is an example. As a matter of fact, he was a professor, he was a teacher of the law, one of the greatest of his day; and when he had graduated, when men had done everything they could for him, you find him "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord."

Furthermore, Saul's human nature *was not changed by religion*. He was a very religious man, "as touching the law, a Pharisee." He was exercising his religion when going to Damascus, for he was armed with letters from the high priest to the synagogues. Notwithstanding his religion he was a bitter enemy of Jesus Christ. Mere religion does not change human nature. The bitterest enemies of Christ and His word have always been religious people. Do not trust to religious profession, to church membership, to observance of ordinances, for salvation. Your nature must be changed, your carnal mind must be renewed. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creation."

II.

But what happened? This is the better part. How WAS THE CHANGE EFFECTED? First of all, *there was a light from heaven*. No lamp of scholarship can light the path that leads to God. But while Saul was pursuing this murderous intent, "suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven". We shall never change the hearts of men without the Light from heaven; you cannot invent a light that will show the way of life. It is ancient history and prophecy, it is written in an old, old, Book, but it still remains true; and it will for ever be true—listen: "Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore." Men never learn that by any kind of earthly enlightenment: there must be a Light that is above the light of the sun; there must

be a Light that is above the light of human reason; there must be a revelation from God, a light shining into dark hearts, enlightening the mind, engaging the affections, transforming the whole life.

That is why I want you to be at the prayer meetings next week, that is why I invite everyone of you to pray. Do not depend upon the preacher, do not depend upon human effort; but pray, and pray again, and keep on praying, that the Light from heaven may shine. We had this church relighted, and I rather like it; but we can never lead people to Christ in this place, people will not be converted, unless we have the shining of that other Light, "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ". "God who hath shined out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts."

My brother, have you seen the Light? Have you seen the Light? You want to argue with me? I will not argue with you; I have no power to convince your reason. Let me tell you what is far better: if you have not seen the Light, just fall on your face before God and ask Him to make the Light to shine. You say, "But we must do something, must we not?" Yes, but that is the first thing, get the Light from heaven. "Salvation belongeth unto the Lord." I have no hope that we shall ever be able to turn back this tide of unbelief by argument, although we must bear our testimony; yet that alone will not do. Nothing can possibly do it, but the Light from heaven. If the Light which fell upon Saul of Tarsus on the Damascus road were suddenly to shine in the class rooms of McMaster University, it would transform that institution instantaneously; if that Light were to shine upon Toronto University, you would have a revival even among the most skeptical.

Then there was a *Voice from Heaven*. Nobody could have persuaded Saul of Tarsus that Jesus was alive; he knew that He had been put to death. He said in effect "All these people are either deceived or deceivers, they are going everywhere saying that Jesus of Nazareth is alive. He is dead. He was crucified, and was buried; and His disciples came by night and took His body away. They have hidden it somewhere—that is what happened." How do you know, Saul? "The chief priests say so"—they paid the soldiers to say so. Saul could get any amount of authority for his unbelief. And on the Damascus road, when the light fell and Saul heard a voice from heaven saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"—I should like to preach to you for a while on that text—but *He knew how to call Saul by name*: "He calleth his own sheep by name." I wish I could remember names. Some people say I do fairly well at it; but I cannot help forgetting some folk, for I only see you occasionally. You church members who want the Pastor to remember your name, come to every meeting and have a word with him, and he will not forget you. Mr. Spurgeon remembered names. He met a man one day, was introduced to him by some friend who said, "Mr. Spurgeon, this is Mr. Partridge." He had a moment's conversation with the gentleman, and went into the service. A year later the same man came again, and Mr. Spurgeon said, "Good evening, Mr. Partridge." "Oh no," said the man, "not Partridge, but Partridge." "I am sorry", Mr. Spurgeon replied, "I will not make game of you any more"! But he was near to it, he remembered the name.

But here is a wonderful thing: this man on the

Damascus road heard a voice out of heaven calling him by name, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Did you ever have your name called from heaven? Did you ever hear a voice that was not a human voice, so speaking to you that you felt there was someone who knew all about you? I have had people come from England to Toronto who thought they were running away from things. A young fellow years ago wrote me a letter saying, "I should like to see you." I wrote and asked him to come to my study. He came, a young man of perhaps twenty-one. He told me how, years before, he had stolen money from his sister. He had a passion for the movies. The quarter's rent was saved up, and was kept in a teapot in a little glass case. His sister and his mother were living in two rooms in Old London, and their name was Smith. He said he knew the quarter's rent was laid away, his sister being the wage-earner. He came in from school and took the money, called some boys together, went to the movies and spent all the money. He was afraid to go home, and so spent the night in a hidden place. Later he was picked up and put in a home. He was sent to the country for a year or so, and then to Canada. He told me he had been on farms here, and finally had come to Toronto to learn the printer's trade. He said, "I had forgotten all about stealing the money from my sister. It must be eight years ago. But I came to your church and sat in the gallery right in front of you. Every time you preached, you spoke as though you had just received a letter from England. I went home and said I never would go back to hear you again, you made me so uncomfortable,—but I came again and again. At last I have got so I cannot sleep, and I have come to you." "Do you want to be a Christian?" I asked. "I do not know that I do," he said, "I want first of all to find my mother and pay back that money. I want to make right where I have been wrong. I thought that, knowing you go to England frequently, you might know somebody there who would find out if she is still alive."

I did not know what else to do, so I wrote the great Dr. John Clifford and told him this boy's story. I told him her last address, that she was a widow in London by the name of Smith, living in two rooms, and that the last word we had was that the son had stolen the money laid by for the rent! It was not very long after that I received three letters, one from Dr. Clifford and two other envelopes bordered with black. I opened Dr. Clifford's first. He said, "I received your letter and I went myself"—I have always loved Dr. Clifford for that. There are some things on which I did not agree with him, but I loved him for that—he said, "I went myself, and traced this mother and daughter from place to place, and found them—but one week too late: Robert's mother died a week before. The last thing she said before she died was that if Robert were found to tell him his mother died forgiving his sins, praying for him." Then I opened the sister's letter to me. She told me the same story that Dr. Clifford had told me.

I sent for Robert, and he met me in the vestry. I told him, "We were just too late, mother went home the week before we found where she lived." The boy broke down and wept like a little child. "It is bad news, is it not?" I said; to which he replied, "Pretty bad." "But," I continued, "it might be worse. Your sister lives; your mother forgave you; and you can make it

right with your sister." Then the war broke out, and Robert went into the army. Shall I tell you where I saw him last? I was preaching in Spurgeon's Tabernacle in 1918. The war was over. At the close of the service Robert came up, and a woman older than he was with him. He said, "I want you to meet my sister. This is the sister whose money I stole." I said, "Are you coming back to Toronto, Robert?" "No," he said, "I am going to stay here and make a home for her." The last I heard of Robert he had settled down in London making a home for his sister.

No detective agency could have found that young man lost in this great land, but he sat up there in the gallery and a Voice from heaven called and opened the book of the past and said, "Face it, you will have to meet it some day." I trust that he gave himself wholly to Christ.

If God calls you, making you know this evening that He has discovered you, that He knows what you are at, that He knows the object of your life, that He knows the whole bias of it is against Him, what then? Well, you had better heed His voice.

Saul answered, "Who are thou, Lord?" He knew it was the Lord, or He would not have spoken from heaven; he knew the voice was superhuman. But I do not suppose anybody in all the world's history was more surprised than when a voice of music came, ringing down the skies, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." "Why," said Saul, "I thought He was in the grave, and behold He is in the glory—Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" That is the proper attitude toward Jesus Christ. I have no sympathy with people who want to analyze Christ and reduce Him to the measure of a man. The proper place for every truly converted soul is at the feet of Jesus Christ saying, "Lord, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" That is what Saul said,—Lord of everything: of his body, of his spirit, of his intellect; and from that hour he gloried in being the bondslave of Jesus Christ.

"Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." When he got into the city, and a man came to teach him—I cannot talk to you about that, for my time is gone, but he came and said, "The Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Then Saul added to that his own story later, that Ananias said to him, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." That is a strange expression, is it not? I am not going to try to expound it, but simply to say that when a man receives Jesus as Lord, and asks what He will have him do, the Lord will show him the way. And always, He commands him to be baptized.

Shall we bow before Him to-night? Shall we yield to the Light and the Voice, and make Jesus, by an act of our own will, by our surrender under the leading of the Holy Ghost, Lord of all? Shall we say, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Then the day will come when we shall be able to say with Saul, "What mean ye for to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." Oh, He is worth living for, He is worth serving. Well do I know that He is worth dying for; and as I know my own heart, I would rather

let this be the last breath I should ever draw, than that I should deny Him:—

"Happy if with my latest breath
I may but gasp His name;
Preach Him to all, and cry in death,
'Behold, behold the Lamb'."

Better that we should die, any of us, than that we should ever give a testimony that is contrary to that.

How many of you know Him and love Him and rejoice in Him? How many of you can say in your heart, Hallelujah, because He has saved you? Let us see how many Christians we have who are rejoicing in Him. (A great multitude raised their hands.) As we sing, "Just as I am", we will give an opportunity for any who have yielded to Him, or do now yield to Him, openly to confess Him.

(A number responded).

Does Prof. Marshall Stand with C. H. Spurgeon?

(We give below in parallel columns Professor Marshall's view of the Atonement, and that of C. H. Spurgeon.)

PROFESSOR MARSHALL.

In his speech before the First Avenue Convention Professor Marshall quoted from Dr. Denney's book, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, and in that connection he said, "I only came across this the other day". He "came across" it because the man in McMaster University found it for him! Here follows the paragraph which Professor Marshall quotes with approval:

"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.'"

In the same speech Professor Marshall says:

"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. 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 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

C. H. SPURGEON.

Let us hear what Spurgeon says further on in the same sermon 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."

Spurgeon Agreed With Luther and Calvin.

"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. The prisoner is in the dock; he is about to be taken away for death; he deserves to die; he has been a mighty criminal. But before he is taken away, the judge asks whether there is any possible plan whereby that prisoner's life can be spared. Up rises one who is pure and perfect himself, and has known no sin, and by the allowances of the judge, for that is necessary, he steps into the dock, and says, 'Consider me to be the prisoner; pass the sentence on me, and let me die. Gentlemen of the court,' he says, 'consider the prisoner to be myself. I have fought for my country; I have dared, and deserved well of it; reward him as if he had done good, and punish me as if I had committed the sin.' You say, 'Such a thing could not occur in an earthly court of law.' 'Ay, but it has happened in God's court of law. In the great court of King's Bench, where God is Judge of all, it has happened.

(Prof. Marshall continued.)

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."

During the First Avenue speech of the Editor of this paper the following discussion took place:

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. I simply refuse to have questions put to me, to be catechised on the floor of this Convention. 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."

In his address at the last Convention Professor Marshall said:

"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 subject, 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 blessings of Christian redemption, remember, are to be appropriated by faith, and faith in the Pauline sense of the word, which is not merely intellectual assent, but spiritual union with Christ.—'In Christ.' Or as John puts it, 'If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with the other, and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin.' That is what I believe and teach now, that is what I have always believed and always taught, and that is in complete harmony with the Charter, 'The atoning efficacy of the death of Christ'."

From the foregoing any candid reader will acknowledge that Professor Marshall's view of the Atonement is utterly opposed to that of C. H. Spurgeon. And yet representatives of McMaster have been going up and down the Convention for a year using the name of the greatest of all evangelical preachers to credential Professor Marshall's heresies, by saying that Professor Marshall stands with Spurgeon on the Atonement. If by any accident *The Gospel Witness* had come within a thousand leagues of such misrepresentation as is here apparent to all, what adjective would McMaster University have coined to describe such a lapse from truth? But unblushingly, boldly, blatantly, and repeatedly, this falsehood has been given currency by McMaster University and its supporters.

(C. H. Spurgeon continued.)

The Saviour said, 'The sinner deserves to die; let Me die in his stead, and let him be clothed in My righteousness'. To illustrate this, I will give you two instances. One is that of an ancient king, who passed a law against a crime, and the punishment of the crime was, that any one who committed it should have both his eyes put out. His own son committed the crime. The king, as a strict judge, said, 'I cannot alter the law; I have said that the loss of eyes shall be the penalty; take out one of mine and one of his.' So, you see, he strictly carried out the law; but at the same time he was able to have mercy in part upon his son. But in the case of Christ we must go a little further. He did not say, 'Exact half the penalty of me, and half of the sinner'; He said, 'Put both My eyes out; nail Me to the tree; let Me die; let Me take all the guilt away, and then the sinner may go free.' We have heard of another case, that of two brothers, one of whom had been a great criminal, and was about to die, when his brother, coming into court, decorated with medals, and having many wounds upon him, rose up to plead with the judge, that he would have mercy on the criminal for his sake. Then he began to strip himself and show his scars—how here and there on his big, broad breast he had received sabre cuts in defence of his country. 'By these wounds,' he said—and he lifted up one arm, the other having been cut away—'by these my wounds, and the sufferings I have endured for my country, I beseech thee, have mercy on him.' For his brother's sake the criminal was allowed to escape the punishment that was hanging over his head. It was even so with Christ. 'The sinner,' He said, 'deserves to die; then I will die in his stead. He deserves not to enter heaven, for he has not kept the law, but I have kept the law for him, he shall have My righteousness, and I will take his sin; and so the just shall die for the unjust, to bring him to God.'"

Spurgeon Does Not Subscribe to Prof. Marshall's "Lax Theology."

"We are singular enough to believe in substitution. The blood upon the lintel said, 'Someone has died here instead of us.' We also hold and rest in this truth, that Christ died, 'The just for the unjust, to bring us to God.' We believe that He was made a curse for us, as it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' The belief in the greatness of sin distinguishes Christians from Pharisees, and all other self-justiciaries; and the belief in substitution separates Christians from all those philosophic adulterators of the gospel who are willing to hold up Christ's example, but cannot endure His expiatory sacrifice, who will speak to you of Christ's spirit and the power of His teaching, but reject His vicarious death. We do not subscribe to the lax theology which teaches that the Lord Jesus did something or other which in some way or other is, in some degree or other, connected with the salvation of men: we hold as vital truths that He stood in His people's stead, and for them endured a death which honoured the justice of God, and satisfied His righteous laws. We firmly believe that He bore the penalty due to sin, or that which from the excellence of His person was fully equivalent thereto."

Canada Baptist Convention Sustains Modernistic Professor

(Editorial Note: The following article is reprinted from the editorial page of "The Western Recorder", and is from the pen of its Editor, Dr. Victor I. Masters. It speaks for itself, and will serve to show how the conflict in the Ontario and Quebec Convention is viewed by unprejudiced outsiders.)

The conflict which Modernism has infected within the fellowship of every evangelical religious body in the United States has also made itself felt elsewhere. Modern Liberalism had honeycombed the State Church in Germany, and both the State Church and the independent evangelicals in England before it entered upon its dire work in America.

It may be humiliating that fashions in theology come to America from across the Atlantic just as they do in women's clothing. We definitely so regard it. We have on other occasions been constrained to say that in America down-grade theological fashions originate in the North and spread later to the South. This also is to us exceedingly humiliating. If the North has the measles, roseola is sure to break out in some "select" religious circles in the South some five or ten years later!

Some persons of religious prestige in the South express pride in this. They appear to regard "advanced thought" a badge of superiority and distinction, even when the "advance" is in the direction of the fool "who said in his heart, There is no God" (Psalms 14:1). Keeping one's mind open to "advanced thought" in theology has become a synonym of keeping it open to any thought that will condemn the Bible, and closed to any truth that tends to demonstrate that "the foundation of God standeth sure".

I.

In America it appears that this unfortunate tendency of strange and new thought in theology to move South to exorcise the "sixteenth century" theology of the "Bible belt," has been paralleled by a similar movement into Canada. In fact, Canada seems to have learned the New Theology wisdom with more aptitude than has been shown by the "backward" South. At the recent meeting of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec there headed up a conflict which has been an open sore for six or eight years and in gestation for still longer period. The spectacular results of the conferences were the endorsement by the Convention of Prof. L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, and the exclusion from the Convention of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church of Toronto, and its pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields. This was done by a decided majority of 532 to 217.

Properly to set forth the significance of this action would require more space for the setting down of its background than is here available. It is an unhappy circumstance that practically every outstanding Baptist defender of historic faith against the subtle encroachments of Modernism has suffered severely in reputation among the great mass of Baptists who

loyally support the organized life of this denomination of Christians. This is true, irrespective of the personal merits or demerits of the persons of the men involved.

If it is actually true that each man who fights prominently for the defense of historic faith is by strange chance a person who deserves discredit among the official conservators of the Baptist position and those who trust and follow their lead, it is still a most unhappy and embarrassing fact. God have mercy on us if Satan is leading in the defense of those things which we have been taught that the people of God should defend.

If this is not true, then we would seem to face the fact that there is something within the regular group of Baptists who endeavor to hold together in fellowship and to engage constructively in all the work of the Lord, which promises odium and discredit to those brethren who distinguish themselves as frank and outstanding witnesses against Modernism for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints.

II.

It is, we concede, possible that men of sensational proclivities may see in the deep upheaval which is inevitable between Modernism and historic faith an opportunity to push themselves into the limelight for their own glorification. No one of long observation has failed to see instances of this. *But this does not explain the anomalous position in which we seem to be placed, that nobody can speak out clearly where every instinct of reverence and loyalty to Jesus Christ our Lord indicates that we should speak out clearly and without fear, without having discredit cast upon him and his motives and wisdom questioned.*

We esteem the fellowship of Baptists within the Southern Baptist Convention beyond all words. That fellowship carries with it the implication of courtesy and good will toward other Baptist bodies, but our soul grows weary as the passing years go by with no fighting front frankly established and honored against an enemy now on all hands conceded to be astute, unscrupulous, entrenched in many places of power, and out to wage to the bitter end its fight against Christ and the Bible.

God help us if the defence of sacred revealed truth has indeed become so entangled with human weakness and sin that it is to be held as our evil thing, and every voice of it rated as that of an unreliable man or a fanatic! *We still account it a thing to be praised for men among us to fight for law and moral reform and for the honour of women. What kind of foul nightmare is this settling down upon us which would defend the honour of a woman, but would purr like a pussy cat toward men who would betray the honour of the world's Redeemer?*

In the recent Convention of Ontario and Quebec, Prof. L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, made an address which is published in the Canadian Baptist of October 27th. For the present our purpose in relation to the address is merely to call attention to a

single utterance in it on the subject of inspiration. Prof. Marshall said:

"I am simply wanting to get at what the Bible actually says, and the nearer you get to what the Bible actually says the more you will love the Bible, and the more you believe the Bible (applause). A man said to me last week, 'Yes, and the original text was inerrant'. How can we regard as the basis of our fellowship in this Convention a text which nobody has got and nobody can get? The thing is absurd. I simply stand by the Charter in this sense, that I believe in the divine inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, and their absolute supremacy in matters of faith and practice."

It will be seen that the McMaster professor declares that nobody knows or can find out what was the original text of the Holy Scriptures. Prof. Marshall says that it is absurd to talk about an inerrant original text of the Bible. In the same paragraph he safeguards the opening of that loophole which is a particular dodging-hole of the Modernist theological cult. He claims for the Scriptures "absolute supremacy in matters of faith and practice." It will be observed that he does not claim *inerrancy* for the Scriptures even in matters of faith and practice. They are "supreme"—that is, there is nothing to be had higher than the Scriptures, when it is a matter of faith and practice. Then on such other matters as the Scriptures may deal with—such as history and natural law and science—the Scriptures are not only not free from error, but they are not "supreme". Human wisdom outranks them. Thus the Modernist would limit the Scriptures and bend them to do obeisance to his "consensus of scholarship."

We ask the reader to let the significance of the above soak in. We purpose to deal with it at a later time in these columns. The great mass of Southern Baptists, and the great mass of evangelical Christians in other bodies, once they "get the number of" this downgrade theology of Modernists will refuse to accept it, or to keep quiet while the treacherous be-

trayal of these weasel-word theologians goes on. The Southern Baptist Convention never will accept this teaching. It would have first to be made over entirely. Yet this seems to be the central point on which Prof. L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, received the glorification and endorsement of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec at its recent meeting.

It is in this place—Toronto—the very centre and head of this conflict among Canadian Baptists, that the World Baptist Congress is to meet next year, and McMaster University is the outstanding Baptist institution of Toronto and Canada. We do not here undertake to define just how far the fellowship and faith of Southern Baptists are involved in our participation in the World Baptist Congress. But it would obviously be humiliating to Baptists from the South in attendance on that meeting, if it should be sought in any way to use the occasion to seem to make them a party to endorsing the position taken by Prof. L. H. Marshall, late of England, now of McMaster University, or of the University itself so far as Professor Marshall represents its attitude on the authority of the Bible.

We now say, with all consideration for all parties concerned, that any such use of the occasion would be broadly resented and should be resented by the great mass of Southern Baptists. Happily President E. Y. Mullins presides over the World Alliance. Though we regret that such a local issue should have arisen, yet every one may be sure that President Mullins will find a way that, while it will be appreciative of the local Baptists for their courtesies, will not jeopardize the convictions of Southern Baptists or their full length committal to the authority and full inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. We all know very well that the Southern Baptist Convention, rather than have its prestige used to seem to back up such an utterance as gained victory and glory for Professor Marshall, if that were the alternative, would refuse to accredit any representatives to the Baptist World Alliance.

McMaster's Million and a Half Dollars

We deplore the division in the Denomination, and particularly the divisions in individual churches. But there is one thing that would be worse than such division, and that would be acquiescence on the part of the churches in McMaster's apostasy. The fact that the remnant according to the election of grace is bestirring itself, and that the seven thousand who have not bowed their knee to Baal are responding to the call of Mount Carmel, is full of encouragement. Better than all, we are hearing from practically every church that has taken its stand for the faith, of revival blessing; while in churches where compromise or surrender obtains, there is stagnation and barrenness.

We are wondering where McMaster University is going to find its million and a half? We remember

with what joy we did our little bit in connection with the Forward Movement in 1919, 1920, and the early part of 1921. It looked as though the Denomination had come to Kadesh-Barnea, and was really about to cross the river into the land of promise where milk and honey and the grapes of Eshcol were awaiting our enjoyment. But the ten spies—be it remembered, the majority—again gave evil counsel, and the Denomination was turned back into the arid wilderness of Modernism.

But, dropping the figure, with the then popular Home and Foreign Mission interests to carry it, McMaster University, with an outwardly united Denomination, received something less than \$100,000.00; and a little less than \$600,000.00 was raised for all objects.

Now that McMaster's Modernism, with its theological and ecclesiastical expressions, has driven a wedge into every church in the Convention, except such churches as are a unit in opposition to it, what hope is there, with divided forces everywhere, that McMaster single-handed will be able to raise a million and a half? Frankly, while on the former occasion, we did everything in our power to assist it, we shall now do everything in our power to hinder it; for the reason that every dollar given to McMaster, we hold, is a dollar given to assist in the destruction of some students' faith, and, through them, in time, of the faith of the whole Denomination. It were a thousand times better that McMaster should cease to exist, and that we should be driven back to the days when men of little learning but mighty faith went forth to preach the Word of God alone,—to preach it, perhaps, as Spurgeon declared the unlearned preacher under whom he was converted preached, quoting his text because he had little else to say—better that we should go back to those conditions when God honoured the simple proclamation of the gospel, than that McMaster should be supported in its present faith-destroying course.

THE INSPIRED ESTIMATE OF ORTHODOXY.

(Editorial Note: The following article was a valedictory address delivered at Woodstock College in 1878 by Dr. D. A. McGregor, who was Principal for a short period of Toronto Baptist College (which later developed into McMaster University). There is no plea in this address for the doctrinal laxity advocated by Dr. Farmer in his "inclusive policy".)

A low human estimate of orthodoxy is the present curse of Christendom. Every department of religious thought and feeling is marked by a carelessness of theological belief. The loose-reined speculation, now so prevalent in reference to fundamental doctrines, would find a much narrower limit, if there were a higher reverence for truth. Doubt may, for a time, take possession of the sincerest mind, but while it remained doubt, it would never be flung broad-cast upon the world by anyone who had any just appreciation of sound doctrine. While there is real earnestness for human salvation in the great evangelistic movement of the present day, there is yet an utter recklessness of correct belief. How many are ready to praise the liberality of him who can say, "If you are only converted I care not what church you join." Yet those who are pleased with this sentiment know full well that the fundamental doctrines held by one denomination are flatly denied by another, and that therefore the beliefs of both cannot be true. The human estimate of uncorrupted doctrine is so low, that utter indifference as to whether men hold truth or error is accounted a perfection of Christian life. How many look with careless eye upon the rending of the seamless robe of truth, into what are called its essential and non-essential parts! How many are ready to indulge in a sweet self-complacency, because they can find it in themselves to sacrifice their sincerest convictions, upon the altar of a falsely-named Christian charity! Let us turn from such grovelling valuation of correct belief and view the Inspired Estimate of Orthodoxy.

We read this estimate in the care taken to impart correct doctrinal knowledge. For thousands of years the world was undergoing a course of preparation for the reception of the truth. Language was brought to its highest degree of perfection, that it might be a vehicle fit for such a communication. Then the great Instructor appears upon the scene, commissioned to teach men definite doctrines. He bears with him the credentials which attest his divine authority. While he repeats and enforces the lessons he would impart, he, yet, abides so closely by the letter of the Father's commandment, that in closing his earthly ministry he can say: "I have given unto them the very words which thou hast given me. Though his presence is dearer than life to his people, he tells them that there is an end to be gained by his departure, which makes it better for them that he should go away. The end in view is, that, by another course of teaching, they may be led into all the truth. He proves his estimate of his doctrine, in that he dies a martyr to the truths he proclaimed. As he is about to seal his testimony with his blood, he thus emphatically declares the great purpose of his mission: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth." Another Person of the divine trinity is now commissioned to carry on the work begun. He is to lead his followers, not so much into new fields of thought, as to bring to their remembrance, and unfold to them, the truths already delivered. To guard against any possibility of change or loss, he gives a written record for all time. In this work he makes choice of the human mind as a medium, so that truth imparted through the ordinary channels of communication may be understood by all. He makes use of various minds, so that, by every style of thought, men may apprehend more closely his meaning. He so guides each chosen writer, by his own immediate influence, as to secure an unerring testimony to his people, and then pledges his presence to them forever, to guide them into all the truth revealed. This wondrous course of instruction, undertaken in order that men might know the truth, reveals the inspired estimate of a correct knowledge of divine things.

The high value attached, by the divine mind, to orthodoxy is seen in the means employed to perpetuate its existence. The church is made the pillar and ground of truth in the world. Her glorious work is to preserve and extend the knowledge of the truth. For this purpose the gifts of the Spirit are lavished upon her. There are given unto her apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, that, thus edified, she may be strong "in the unity of the faith," unmoved by the shifting winds of false doctrine. Those who have embraced the truth are commanded to hold it fast, to keep it pure, to receive from neither man nor angel any contrary teaching. They are bidden to part with all things else, if need be, for its sake, but on no condition to part with the truth: to die for it rather than renounce it. He who thus commits the sacred trust to his people's keeping declares his excellence, in that he has given to it immutability. No other system shall supersede the form of doctrine delivered. No change shall be wrought in it. The most solemn threatenings are recorded against any who would dare to take from, or add to, its divine

perfection. That the world may know the exceeding preciousness of the doctrines which Christ has taught, he contrasts them with all created things, and shows their pre-eminent value, in that he accords to them alone perpetual existence. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

The inspired estimate of orthodoxy is seen in the position assigned to it, in the scheme of redemption. All the vital interests of the Christian religion are secured to man on no other condition. Salvation is dependent upon, and effected through, belief of the truth. One of the degenerate tendencies of the age, arising, in part, out of a misapprehension of the source of power in the present evangelical movement, is to accept the fervid utterances of false doctrines as a means through which conversion may be wrought, as if human earnestness could accomplish the work of the living word. Let the Church of God cease to dishonor the truth. Sincerity is not orthodoxy. If sincere belief were an equivalent for correct doctrine, then might the very devotees of heathenism ascend in the chariots of salvation even to the throne of God. Earnestness has no efficacy in itself. Gospel doctrine is the only means of gospel blessing. Error may be a factor in man's creed, but it can be no factor in his salvation. The truth, the truth only, the truth rightly apprehended, is that by which a soul is saved.

In the work of sanctification the same instrumentality is used. It is by the clear light of truth that the great artist photographs the divine image upon the soul. It is by the power of Christian doctrine operating upon the heart, that we have the result of Christian character and life. Men may say, "It makes little difference what man believes providing he lives right." Such empty philosophy amounts to no more than this, that, there is no necessity for a cause, so long as we have an effect. The only possibility of right life is through belief of the truth. That man may be "perplexed in faith, but pure in deeds" is a statement which receives little sanction from divine authority. The fruit of perfect deeds is not a growth from doubtful principles. "Either make the tree good and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt." The faith which purifies the heart is not that which rests on false assumptions, not even that which dwells in "honest doubt," but that which draws its life from the uncorrupted spring. The sanctification of the spirit is through belief of the truth.

Apart from sound doctrine, there can be no God-accepted service in life. This is not saying that a perfect knowledge of all revealed truth is necessary to any single act of Christian worship, but that the sphere of acceptable service is limited to that of apprehended truth. If the object of our worship be not the God of the Bible, but merely our mistaken notions of deity, then we bow down to a god of our creation. The object is false, and the homage rendered, however sincere and correct in itself, is nothing but idolatry. If, having a true knowledge of God, we adopt other forms of worship than those which he has enjoined, then the service is false, and however devoutly offered can be nothing but an abomination. The human estimate of orthodoxy may be so low, that men may think lightly of having violated the perfection of the divine arrangement; but God says,

"In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Orthodoxy is given as the only bond of Christian union. The attempt to effect harmony in the Christian world on any other basis, either by a compromise with error, or by a suppression of principle, is an unhallowed experiment, altogether foreign to the truth-loving spirit of the Gospel. Truth and error can never be made one. Each unholy wedlock of what God hath not joined together is not Christian union. It is false in name, and false in principle. The fellowship of saints is a fellowship of heart, in truth, not a sinful reticence of belief. It is not by concealing differences, but by coming to the truth, that the church is to gain her real concord. Departure from the truth is the cause of all the schisms in Christendom. A return to the uncorrupted faith can be the only cure. He, who steadfastly opposes error, and faithfully declares all the truth, may be branded as narrow and sectarian, but he is really the true champion of Christian union. The divided Church of God cannot be one till it finds completeness "in the unity of faith." In the fact that salvation, sanctification, all acceptable service, and all real Christian union, are conditioned, for all time, and for all people, upon belief of the truth, we read once more the high importance attached to orthodoxy, by Him whose estimate is infallible.

The corroborative testimony to this written estimate is given, by the Spirit, in the whole history of the church. Truth believed and proclaimed is that alone by which the divine conquests are effected. None other than the living blade is acknowledged by the hand of Him whose might alone can give success. The sword of the Spirit is the word of God. How he proves the power of this weapon through all time! A few fishermen are called from their nets, and, by the simple declaration of the truth, they shake the world as conqueror never shook it before. While that truth is held uncorrupted the church advances, nor can the combined opposition of all her foes retard her progress. But when once the standards of orthodoxy are fallen, she sinks, nevertheless, into the darkness of the middle ages. Once more the Reformers lay firm hold upon the great doctrines of the Gospel. The same accounts which first shook the world are heard again. They are the very trumpet-blast of heaven summoning divine might to the conflict. The Spirit acknowledges the truth and the world trembles before his power. Through all subsequent time the same invariable testimony is given. Every awakening of Christian life and thought that marks the centuries, every conquest that the church has effected in the world, has been accomplished through the truth. Lest such results should be attributed to mere human power, lofty genius is permitted to exhaust itself in fruitless effort, while attempting reformation by "enticing words of man's wisdom." Then the divine Spirit compels acknowledgment of the superiority of gospel doctrine, in that he sends it forth dependent on no excellency of speech, to revolutionize the world.

While the worth of orthodoxy is thus clearly attested, what more execrable daring, than that the professed ambassador from God to men should tone down the message fraught with life and death, lest it might grate too harshly upon the ears and hearts of those to whom it is delivered? What more sinful

presumption than to venture change in any department of Jehovah's plan? Ye who are musicians, what think ye of the mere juvenile performer who would throw in his own variations, while attempting to render the sublimest strains of Handel or Mozart? Ye who are painters, what think ye of the raw beginner who would daub the finished works of Raphael into his own ideas of perfection? Ye who are Christians, what think ye of the finite creature who would dare to work his own ideas of improvement upon the crowning effort of infinite skill? It is not a small thing, that men should apply the distorting rack of a biased mind to the faultless form of truth, and mar its God-given beauty. It is not a thing of little moment, that men should fail to embrace any part of truth, or, by specious argument, lead others from it. When the divine instructor propounded the laws of the kingdom he was about to establish, he said, that he who would break one of the least of his commands, and teach men to do so, should be least in His kingdom; but that he who obeyed and taught His commands, should be accounted great. While this simple condition of divine approval and preference is thus plainly declared, by Him who is king in Zion, if we prize the honor which cometh from above, let us strive to win it, by holding fast, and holding forth, the truth as it is in Jesus. Let us scorn the attempt to attract human attention by mere novelty of thought. Let it be ours to proclaim "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." Let it be our high ambition, as it is our highest honor, to hold taintless and intact the doctrines committed to our trust, to contend earnestly for the faith delivered once for all.

—Memoir of Daniel Arthur McGregor.

**MR. JAS. MCGINLAY WILL ANSWER
McMASTER'S CHARGE**

at a Public Meeting in
JARVIS STREET CHURCH
Wednesday Evening, Nov. 30th.

Charged with having made "untrue and grossly insulting" statements respecting officials and professors of McMaster University, Mr. James McGinlay was last week expelled from that institution. Mr. McGinlay will reply to this and other charges at a public meeting in Jarvis Street Church next Wednesday, November 30th. Mr. McGinlay will strip the mask from McMaster University, and show up that institution as it really is. In an interview with the press Chancellor Whidden is reported to have stated that "cancellation of McGinlay's registration did not permanently preclude the possibility of reinstatement on proper conditions." Come next Wednesday night and judge whether or not Mr. McGinlay is bidding for "reinstatement"! The Editor of this paper will preside at the meeting.

Through an error on the part of the press, a great number believed the meeting would be held November 23rd. From the interest manifested, and the scores who arrived on this uncertain information, the meeting promises to be one of the largest ever held in Jarvis Street. The doors will be open at 7.30, and Mr. McGinlay will speak at 8 o'clock.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. II. T. T. SHIELDS, Editor. No. 4
Lesson 10. Fourth Quarter. December 4th, 1927.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE CONTINUED.

Lesson Text: Romans, Chapter 13.

Golden Text: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Rom. 13:9).

I. THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTY TO THE STATE.

1. The state is a divine institution. In this day when opposition to constituted authority is being so generally represented as a virtue, it is well to remember that, except for the family, the state is the oldest of all divinely established institutions. After the flood the state was set up when God committed His law to human hands for enforcement. The state was founded upon a law designed for the preservation of human life. Our greatest enemy admitted that "all that a man hath will he give for his life"; hence the protection of human life is the fundamental duty of the state. And the first law committed to human hands for enforcement was this: "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made He man" (vs. 4-6). Recently we came upon a church magazine in which the writer denounced capital punishment. Capital punishment is entirely scriptural, and wherever it is done away the state crumbles. 2. The state being of divine ordination it is a Christian's duty to be subject to the powers that be, for such are "ordained of God". Anarchy and Bolshevism find no sanction in the Word of God. 3. Law is designed for the suppression of evil, and rulers are a terror only to evil doers. We once met a Syrian who told us that in England there was no law at all. When asked to explain, he replied, "Mind your own business, no law at all!" And that is the perfection of law. Laws should not interfere with the legitimate exercise of human freedom and initiative. They should be of such a character as to be a terror only to evil doers. 4. The sword of the state therefore is a legitimate weapon (v. 4). We should remember that this is written in the New Testament. There are many superficial thinkers who would apply the principles of the Sermon on the Mount to the state, whereas the principles of the Sermon on the Mount have force only in a regenerated society. Paul tells us in Galatians that the law "was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made". But for the law the race would have exterminated itself; and the principle of compulsion, of physical force, still has a place in properly organized human society. When the lion eats straw like an ox it will be possible to beat all swords into ploughshares, but until that time someone must bear the sword, as "the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." 5. We should put conscience into our civic duties, and obey the law of the land for conscience's sake. This applies even to the paying of taxes (vs. 5-7).

II. THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTY TO HIS NEIGHBOUR AS AN INDIVIDUAL (vs. 7-14).

1. We are to owe no man anything but love. This is a great saying, but to fulfil one's every obligation to his neighbour is a Christian duty, and then to love him over and above such just relation. In this sphere the principles of the Sermon on the Mount obtain, and when the law has compelled us to go a mile and pay our debts, we should go the second mile and actually love our creditors. 2. To love one's neighbour really means the fulfilment of all other obligations (vs. 8-10). 3. The duty of spiritual alertness is enjoined upon us (vs. 11-12). 4. Moreover we are required to walk honestly before our fellows, and to put on the armour of light. Deception and double-dealing should have no place in Christian character or conduct. As children of the day we should cast off the works of darkness and come to the light that our deeds may be manifest that they are wrought in God. 5. We are to put on Christ, and make no provision for fulfilling the lusts of the flesh, which is another way of saying that we must be spiritually minded. We must mind the things of the Spirit rather than the things of the flesh. We must set our affections on things above and not on things of the earth. The old man is not to be pampered and indulged. When we go to market we must buy nothing for him, for he is under sentence and must be crucified.