

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. 31.

TORONTO, DECEMBER 15th, 1927

Whole No. 293.

THE DANGERS OF A RUBBISH HEAP

Providing Material for the Incendiary

For some years the life of Canadian Baptist churches has been characterized by an almost entire absence of discipline. The number of members reported in many instances has borne little relation to the vital membership of the church. Many churches are now awakening to the danger residing in dead branches and paralyzed limbs.

Jarvis Street Church was rudely awakened to this peril in 1921. When we assumed the pastorate of the church the nominal membership was about one thousand, but at least three hundred and fifty of these were either non-resident, or had no vital connection with the church, or else were entirely lost, having left no address. We made a determined attempt after opening a church office to have the Roll purged of its lumber, but were only partially successful. In many instances, names were retained on the Church Roll for sentimental and other reasons. When our great conflict came in 1921, those who opposed a spiritual ministry, and a spiritual interpretation of the church's mission, canvassed the church and found their allies in those who did nothing for the church but, by their worldly lives, discount the church's witness for Christ.

When we granted three hundred and forty-one letters for the formation of a new church, giving each individual member's standing in the church, for we could not grant letters in good standing to many of them, as we recall, at least one-third of the number had represented nothing in Jarvis Street but names on a book. And while they had been unresponsive to a gospel appeal, they were used by the enemies of the truth to swell a vote in opposition to a biblical ministry.

The same principle characterizes the present McMaster campaign throughout the churches of Ontario and Quebec. If anything were wanting to prove how utterly alien to the Spirit of Christ the present official attitude of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec is, it would be supplied by the character of the people who, in the churches of the Convention, are being enlisted in its support. We marvel that men

like Dr. Langton, Mr. Fromow, Mr. Burrell, and many others, should not be utterly ashamed to be in alliance with the kind of people that are dragged out to vote.

But we suggest to churches everywhere that if this conflict teaches us nothing else, it will teach us the necessity of keeping a clean church roll. When a great fire breaks out in the city, destroying a vast amount of property, it seldom begins in a well-built, clean, structure, but almost invariably in some group of shacks which had too long been permitted to disfigure the city. When some contagious disease becomes epidemic, its origin can frequently be traced to some unsanitary buildings which ought to have been condemned and removed in the interests of public safety. When a bush fire spreads disaster and death like a devouring plague, it will generally be found to have had its beginning in the dry branches which bore neither fruit nor leaves. When disease fastens upon the human frame, it often finds lodgment in the unused cells of the lung, or in some other portion of the body whose health was defective. And when trouble arises in a church, or in a denomination, it will invariably be found that it began, not with the praying, Bible-reading, membership, but with the carnal and worldly element whose religion had little relation to their hearts and lives.

The record of Acts 17: 4, 5 may be taken as an inspired anticipatory report of occurrences in Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec under the leadership of Convention representatives: "And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few. But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people." Moral: Clean your church roll before its accumulated rubbish burns down the house.

DR. HUNTLEY BECOMES NOTORIOUS.

We have recently had a striking example of the "reasonable liberty" which certain supporters of Modernism would allow to Baptist churches. The church at Westover, Ontario, is one of three churches served by the same pastor. A few weeks ago the Westover church passed a resolution at one of its regular meetings, declaring itself to be "out of harmony" with the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. One day last week a group of the members, some of whom at least belong to the dead wood class described above, undertook to call a special business meeting of the church. At that meeting they attempted, by resolution, to overrule the decision of the church regularly taken, and that without rescinding the earlier resolution; which, of course, could not be effected unless some two who had formerly voted for that resolution, should move for its rescission.

(Incidentally, let us remind our brethren of this principle, that a motion can be rescinded only when its rescission is moved and seconded by one who has voted for the resolution. Otherwise, no decision worth registering could ever be made. Therefore let it be remembered that when a church, at one of its regular meetings, has, in a legitimate and constitutional way, reached a decision with respect to any subject, that decision can be revoked only if two of its supporters change their mind, and sponsor its revocation.)

The pastor of the Westover church manfully led the church in maintaining its position, and the irregular meeting unceremoniously adjourned.

But the battle was not yet over. Rev. R. D. Campbell, Pastor of the Westover Church, read in the Hamilton papers on Saturday, December 10th, that Rev. J. Austin Huntley, D.D., Pastor of James Street Baptist Church, Hamilton, would preach in the Westover pulpit Sunday morning. This announcement was made without consultation with the pastor or deacons of the church. Mr. Campbell telephoned Dr. Huntley, informing him that he, the pastor, would preach Sunday morning, and that his presence was not required. To this, we are informed, Dr. Huntley replied that he would have to consult certain people before reaching a decision.

When Sunday morning came Mr. Campbell was in his pulpit, but Dr. Huntley, uninvited by pastor or deacons, walked down the aisle, and impudently ascended the platform. Mr. Campbell quietly informed him that he would not be allowed to preach, but permitted him to explain his presence. Whereupon Dr. Huntley informed the congregation that he had come to the church as representing the Home Mission Board. Having offered this explanation, he resumed his seat; and when Mr. Campbell began to preach the supporters of the Convention left the church in a body.

In the James Street calendar, dated December 11th, we find these words:

"Dr. Huntley is at Westover in response to an invitation from that church to aid them at this time. He goes there as representative of the Home Mission Board."

This, therefore, is the official explanation of Dr. Huntley's unwarranted interference in the affairs of an independent Baptist church. We have understood that the James Street brethren determined to keep the controversy out of James Street, and that the pastor was apprised of this decision when he assumed the pastorate. If such a decision was reached, so far as Dr. Huntley was concerned, it resembled the famous Home Mission Board Resolution which instructed the Home Mission pastors to keep the controversy out of their churches. This did not prevent Home Mission representatives, including the Superintendent, from introducing the controversy into their speeches.

Dr. Huntley came to this Convention a short time ago. In the nature of the case, he cannot possibly know the roots of the present controversy; but he has been very conspicuous at Conventions, if for nothing else, for his vigorous hand-clapping support of anything that emanated from McMaster. We never understood why baseball enthusiasts who shout themselves hoarse, and vigorously clap their hands—and everything else in sight—were called baseball "fans". We seemed to see some appropriateness in this when we saw Brother Huntley clapping his hands, as, outstretched before him to their full length, they were brought vigorously in collision with each other like two great palm leaf fans.

But will the Home Mission Board accept responsibility for Dr. Huntley's interference? The Westover Church is not a Home Mission church. It receives no help from the Home Mission Board, and is under no obligation to them. What right has the Home Mission Board to send a representative to Westover? Dr. Huntley's presence in the Westover Church has afforded another mighty argument for the withdrawal of all support from the Home Mission Board. It is evidently the intention of the Board to do everything in its power, even though it involve the violation of the established principles of Baptist polity, to bring the churches into subjection to McMaster University. The Home Mission Board must bear the responsibility for the official announcement in the James Street calendar, that Dr. Huntley had gone to Westover as the representative of the Board.

Nor can we see very well how the James Street Church can wholly escape responsibility for this strange action of its pastor. His visit was announced in the calendar, apparently with the full approval of the officers and members of the James Street Church. Thus we see that the churches which support the Boards, co-operate with the Boards in meddling in the affairs of other churches, instead of minding their own business.

The story of Dr. Huntley's impudent meddlesomeness ought to be published throughout the length and breadth of the land; and it should be made perfectly clear that this is the kind of thing the Home Mission Board is sponsoring.

It is not without significance that Dr. Huntley's pulpit, during the time of his uninvited visit to Westover, was supplied by Professor A. L. McCrimmon of McMaster. Thus we see the Home Mission Board, McMaster University, and James Street Baptist Church, Hamilton, having part in what would seem to be a conspiracy to deprive a little country church of its God-given liberty.

DR. W. B. RILEY, THE SOLDIER.

There is perhaps no man in all the world who has done so much to awaken evangelical believers to the perils of the hour, and to set Fundamentalists on guard against Modernism, as Dr. W. B. Riley, of Minneapolis. Dr. Riley was the founder of The World's Christian Fundamentals' Association, and was perhaps more than any other one man responsible for the organized effort of Baptist Fundamentalists to stem the tide of unbelief in the Northern Baptist Convention.

There is scarcely a city on the American Continent which has not heard Dr. Riley's personal testimony. He travels probably fifty thousand miles a year in carrying on his fight for the faith. As President of the World's Christian Fundamentals' Association he has directed the energies of that Association for the last two or three years particularly to an anti-evolution campaign.

Quite incidentally, we were recently afforded opportunity of observing its effectiveness. When in a certain city in the United States, in the middle west, we were interviewed by several newspaper reporters. One of them proudly acknowledged he was of the Jewish race. He said that a day or so before, Dr. Riley had spoken in that city on the subject of evolution. A reporter of one of the papers had been sent to cover his speech, and had attended the meeting as one who was perfectly indifferent to the subject under discussion. But he was soon gripped by Dr. Riley's arguments, and was led on from step to step until he found himself at the conclusion of the address an enthusiastic anti-evolutionist. He went back to the newspaper office to write his report of the meeting, and told his fellow-craftsmen something of what he had heard. An argument immediately ensued. But the reporter repeated Dr. Riley's arguments, according to my Jewish interviewer, and succeeded in convincing the whole newspaper staff that evolution was, to use his own term, "bunk". Although this Jewish reporter represented another paper, he had also fallen an indirect victim of Dr. Riley's logical shafts. We do not suppose Dr. Riley was aware of the tremendous explosion effected by one of his anti-evolution shells.

This, however, we have no doubt is representative of the work Dr. Riley is accomplishing. Dr. Riley's whole ministry forms a striking commentary of the fallacy of the view that a revival can come only through a non-controversial ministry. Dr. Riley's ministry has been a controversial

one almost from the beginning—as must be the ministry of any man who is true to the New Testament.

But this Minnesota preacher's controversialism has not at any point interfered with his evangelism. Great as he is as a controversialist, we think Dr. Riley is greater still as an evangelist. How he loves to preach the gospel! With what persuasive power he calls sinners to repentance! His great church at Minneapolis is a monument to his faithfulness in this respect. It was our great privilege, to preach one of the dedicatory sermons in connection with the opening of his new great auditorium. Dr. Riley preached in the morning, and we preached afternoon and evening; and in the three services, by actual count of the ushers, there was a total attendance of within five or six of eight thousand people.

Such a church is not built up, however, by an evangelism of a superficial character. The explanation of the marvellous success which has attended Dr. Riley's ministry, is to be found in the fact that side by side with his evangelism, he has exercised an expository and teaching ministry. Indeed, we believe that New Testament evangelism must be expository. It was so Peter preached on the day of Pentecost. The same characteristic marked the ministry of the incomparable C. H. Spurgeon.

This fact gives special value to the work in which Dr. Riley is now particularly engaged, namely, the production of forty volumes entitled, "The Bible of the Expositor and the Evangelist". The work of the scholastic recluse must not be undervalued but Dr. Riley's books will be especially prized by practical men, for these volumes will inevitably largely reflect the experience of one of the most successful pastor-evangelists of this century. We most heartily commend the works of Dr. Riley to our readers. Particulars may be obtained from L. W. Camp, 1020 Harmon Place, Minneapolis, Minn.

But in this connection we would call special attention also to Dr. Riley's monthly magazine, *The Christian Fundamentalist*. It is a forty-four page magazine, and is always full of good things. The subscription price is \$1.50 per year. We believe every Fundamentalist in America, to be thoroughly up-to-date, ought to take: *The Christian Fundamentalist*, edited by Dr. Riley; *The Baptist Fundamentalist*, of Texas, edited by Dr. J. Frank Norris; and may we modestly suggest *The Gospel Witness* would make a good third. The printed page goes farther than the spoken word, and is even more effective than the radio; people may forget what they hear over the radio, but what they read will abide with them.

We publish elsewhere a characteristic article from the pen of Dr. Riley, appearing in *The Christian Fundamentalist* of December, entitled, "The Canadian Baptist Constrictor."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

ANOTHER "UNVEILING" SOON.

The Gospel Witness announces that it will be necessary to perform another operation in the immediate future. For the present the patient's name is withheld. Every other means has been employed to reduce the patient's temperature, but the continuing fever proves the existence of some hidden centre of infection which will have to be dealt with heroically. The operation will be postponed for a few days pending the arrival of certain finely-fashioned instruments necessary to its successful execution. A full account of this surgical "unveiling" will be published in this paper at an early date. It may appear next week if the instruments arrive in time, though it may be postponed till after Christmas.

THE UNNAMED BUT NOT UNKNOWN TROUBLER.

The police sometimes publish circulars descriptive of offenders who have come under the law's condemnation. At an early date *The Gospel Witness* will publish a description of the unnamed troubler of Israel who is responsible for wrecking the Baptist "denomination." The description will be accompanied by the record of his nefarious work. All this to put our people on their guard.

DON'T GET EXCITED.

We have observed that amateur photographers are often impatient for the prints of their negatives. Some people seem to have a passion for getting before the camera, and—explain the psychology of it if you can—the less of beauty there is in the countenance the more eager for its photographic reproduction they seem to be. It may be that some of McMaster's supporters feel slighted that we have not yet published their photographs. We ask all such to be as patient as possible, we cannot do everything at once, and their turn will come in due time. This paper goes to not a few historical societies. We believe we are making history in these days, and all who have a part in these events should receive honorable mention that their names may be preserved in the various denominational archives for the approbation or reprobation of posterity. McMaster supporters who distinguish themselves in her destructive service, therefore, will "have their pictures took" in due time.

JARVIS STREET GREATLY BEREAVED.

One of the noblest of Jarvis Street saints, and one of the most influential of her members, Mrs. John Lillie, after a prolonged illness, quietly fell asleep in Christ about one o'clock Tuesday morning, December 13th. The funeral service was held from Jarvis Street Church, after a brief service at the house, Wednesday afternoon; and was conducted by the Pastor.

We cannot at this moment trust ourselves to attempt an adequate expression of our appreciation of Mrs. Lillie; but we shall give some account of her splendid life and work in next week's issue. We must be content just now to say that she was one of the truest and noblest Christians we have ever known. No church ever had a more loyal and devoted member, and no pastor ever had a truer friend. We were constrained to say to her sons at the grave that her Pastor loved her only less than her own sons, and that we share their sorrow to the utmost. We shall hope, not only to publish a sketch of Mrs. Lillie's life from our own pen, but tributes from some of the noble band of women with whom she wrought in the Lord's work so many years.

NEWS FROM THE FRONT.

At this writing, in addition to the news from Westover, since our last issue, we have reports from meetings at St. Catharines, Dunnville, Aurora, Stratford, and Bobcaygeon.

The ST. CATHARINES meeting was addressed by Revs. C. J. Loney, J. G. Connor, and Jas. McGinlay. The hall was unlocked and lighted by the caretaker, but someone who had a key locked it up again and people were kept standing outside while some doubtless went away. This will necessitate a return visit to St. Catharines which will be advertised throughout the city.

At DUNNVILLE on Friday night last we had a fine meeting. The weather was very cold, but many Baptists were there to hear the story, and much good was done.

At AURORA Monday evening there was a good meeting addressed by Revs. E. A. Brownlee and W. A. Gunton and by Mr. Thomas Urquhart. About three-quarters of the audience were members of the Aurora Baptist Church. At STRATFORD the same evening we had a congregation which comfortably filled the city hall, including the gallery. The speakers were Pastor Jas. McGinlay, Mr. Wm. Fraser, and the Editor. On Tuesday evening the same three speakers motored one hundred and four miles to BOBCAYGEON (Mr. Donald Fraser, Pastor). The dense fog made travelling slow—delaying our arrival till ten o'clock. Although a few had left after nearly two hours' waiting, the church was still full, and we went on with the meeting until midnight. The Bobcaygeon Church sent an offering for Missions to the new Convention of \$50.00 and the congregation gave a substantial collection toward the Campaign Fund. Brother Donald Fraser (a brother of our own Mr. William Fraser), was a genial host and we believe will have a fruitful ministry in Bobcaygeon and Scotch line.

FENELON FALLS REPUDIATES CONVENTION'S ACTION.

While the above notes were being written (midnight, Wednesday) we received a despatch from Fenelon Falls Church, Ontario, of which our beloved Rev. C. M. Carew is Pastor, informing us that at a very largely attended meeting of the Fenelon Falls Church, by an overwhelming majority, the following resolution was passed:

"WHEREAS, the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec has adopted and approved of the application of the amending Bill recently secured from Parliament, against which this church voted solemn protest;

"AND WHEREAS, said Bill involves an endorsement of Modernism, by making it possible in the future if any church makes protest against any irregularity in doctrine or practice, such action would be considered sufficient ground for a church's exclusion, thus destroying all freedom of discussion within the Convention;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we repudiate such action, and that we cease as a church from this date, in all its departments, to contribute to any of the Boards of the said Convention; and that we declare our agreement with the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec."

We have known Brother Carew for more than twenty years; for eight years of that time he was associated with us in the pastorate of Jarvis Street Church. No truer servant of God, we believe, ever lived. We have several times been asked what Fenelon Falls would do; and we have always replied that C. M. Carew would do right.

The Canadian Baptist a few weeks ago said:

"FENELON FALLS, Rev. C. M. Carew, pastor, where an effort was made to draw the church away from the Convention, developed a vigorous and effective opposition to such a proposal, and it was decided to take no action."

And at that time we expressed our conviction that more would be heard from Fenelon Falls. But we held no communication with Brother Carew. We have yet to ask the first man or woman, pastor or otherwise, personally, to take their stand on this matter: all that we have ever said on the subject, we have said publicly. We congratulate Fenelon Falls Church, and we are confident that God will set His seal upon their decision.

THE CANADIAN BAPTIST CONSTRICTOR.

(Reprinted from *The Christian Fundamentalist*.)

The convention of the Ontario and Quebec Baptists is now a matter of history. It is doubtless a history which will be known and read for centuries to come and will constitute one of those pages of shame which will be read by future Baptists with a blush. It is also a perfect illustration of the method of modernism, the Boa-Constrictor method—the method of crushing the victim.

For several successive years Dr. T. T. Shields, Pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, won, in his convention, for fundamentalism; but with modernists, the vote of the convention means nothing until it goes their way, and then instantly it is converted into the serpents' coils, and woe be to the man that falls into their contracting folds.

It is most amusing to read the multiplied appeals for "peace" put forth by modernists, and then see how absolutely impossible "peace" is until their will is done. No convention vote, unfavorable to modernism, has ever settled anything to date. They will do, as one man in Minnesota threatened to do, keep an issue alive for twenty-five years, unless it goes their way. Some of us, therefore, are beginning to see clearly that, in this controversy now dividing the churches, we face an enemy that must be defeated and put out of commission before the war will end. In other words, we are beginning to believe that we will have to employ their own tactics and when we come into our power, dispose of them once and forever. We could have done this at the Northern Baptist Convention in Buffalo; we could have done it easily at the Convention in Des Moines; but we thought then we were dealing with "brethren" and we exercised an unappreciated mercy. The time has come to declare war in good earnest, and have it understood that no quarter will be given, and the Modernists are setting us the example. No sooner did they get a majority in Ontario

and Quebec than they used it to exclude Dr. T. T. Shields and the Jarvis Street Baptist Church. The offense of Shields and his Church was their refusal to accept the anti-biblical theology of Prof. Marshall.

Thomas Urquhart, ex-Mayor of Toronto, a Baptist of profound convictions, of unimpeachable character, and a legally trained mind, writing in the *Toronto Globe* November 1st calls attention to ten separate instances of unfair play in this procedure.

First, the Convention tried to force their own scrutineers upon the minority, refusing minority representation until the uproar compelled minority recognition.

Second, the Convention excluded these delegates by an Act of Parliament surreptitiously secured.

Third, it excluded the Church without notice to the Church of any charges against it.

Fourth, it gave the minority no adequate opportunity to present their side.

Fifth, it passed a resolution condemning independent Baptist churches for joining a regularly constituted Baptist Missionary body.

Sixth, it gave the delegates of Jarvis Street Church practically no opportunity to defend themselves.

Seventh, the action was taken without notice even being given to the Church of such intention.

Eighth, an appeal for a vote by ballot was refused.

Ninth, it took action of exclusion before the main subject had been up for discussion.

Tenth, it permitted Professor Marshall unlimited time, but laid the strictest limitations upon his opponent.

For some reasons we are rather glad to see these high-handed methods employed by Modernists. Fundamentalists have been altogether too soft. Half of them have imagined that this was a little family dispute and that it would finally blow over and leave no one with a black eye; but time is revealing the fact that the war in the churches is the bitterest that has been known to the centuries, and it is a war that can never be settled until a final and fixed separation is accomplished.

Fundamentalism and Modernism cannot live in the same church nor continue in the same denomination; and since this is not a battle with guns, where one party can be wiped out of existence, but of ideas instead, it is increasingly evident that the camp should divide. That's what has occurred in Canada already and the Modernists have divided Baptists; they have forced Shields and his Church out of the Convention and hundreds of others will follow him and an orthodox convention will be the result.

Shields' newly founded school will provide the ministry for that Convention, and ten years from now it will outnumber the convention that forced its existence.

We congratulate Dr. Shields and the Jarvis Street Church on their exclusion. McMaster University is not an asset, but is a liability and we think that its opponents should count themselves happy that they will no longer bear its burdens nor blush for its opinions. Dr. Shields will go down in history as the leader of Canada Fundamentalists and his great church—already the greatest in Canada—will receive unthoughtof accessions as a result of this diabolical endeavour to crush it out of existence.

Fundamentalists' Victory in Oklahoma.

The Oklahoma Baptist Convention behaved itself differently. Its leadership is in the hands of Fundamentalists; and being believers on Christ and in the Bible, they naturally behaved like Christians. They hold that their money is a gift from God and should not be contributed to institutions that refuse to honor Him as man's Creator and Redeemer; consequently as a result of the refusal of the Baptist Seminary at Louisville and also the one in Fort Worth to sign up the article passed by the Southern Baptist Convention at Houston, declaring that "man came by divine creation and not by evolution," they voted five to one to withhold further funds from the Louisville and Fort Worth Seminaries until such signatures were forthcoming.

The importance of this vote can hardly be overestimated. The forces of the Southern Baptist Convention have been supposed to be largely under the control of President Mullins, late President of the Southern Convention also, and

Dr. Scarborough, chairman of the South-wide Seventy-five Million Campaign! But the Oklahoma Convention declared its independence of both, and stood by the sound Baptist principle of giving money to such institutions as honor God and his Word, and not to others. J. B. Rounds, therefore, one of the few State Secretaries who exhibits any independence whatever, not only accepted the action of his Convention to the effect that he was to give no further moneys to these schools until they cleared themselves of every suspicion of scepticism, but he accepted it with pleasure, for it was in accord with his own convictions and leadership.

In this connection, it will be known by every Baptist in America, that Dr. C. P. Stealey, editor of the *Oklahoma Baptist Messenger*, was the one man who had most to do with Oklahoma's attitude. He measured his strength against Mullins in the Memphis Convention, and only lost by unfair political methods. At the Houston Convention, Mullins and his following went down to defeat. From that moment they have been trying to recover. The late Dr. McDaniel of Richmond, President of the Convention at Louisville, Kentucky, delivered a body-blow to Modernism which almost exceeded that which he had given it at Houston. At Houston he came out clearly for Divine Creation *vs.* Evolution, and at Louisville, just as clearly for the principle of Evangelization *vs.* Institutionalism. Never in the history of Southern Baptists has any man revealed more courage than McDaniel exhibited on both occasions, and never in Baptist history has any man spoken with more sagacity or more in line with Scriptural teaching than did McDaniel in both of these deliverances.

Undoubtedly Modernists in Oklahoma will keep up their fight—that is their method. Our advice now, to Fundamentalists in every denomination, is this—give no further quarter; we are not fighting brethren—these men are not advocates of the Christian faith; they are apostles of a pagan philosophy, and if we cannot force them from the denominations, then the time for a division is on.

Dr. J. Frank Norris of Fort Worth, went to the Oklahoma Convention. His addresses, largely attended, dealt some hard blows to the evolution tendencies of Mullins, Sampey, Robertson and others. Frank is often reviled, but he is difficult to reckon with. He fights on the right side!

DES MOINES UNIVERSITY NEWS.

Dr. J. E. Hampton, who was for a number of years the beloved pastor of the First Baptist Church, Bowling Green, Kentucky, arrived in Des Moines, Thursday, December 1, where he becomes head of the Bible Department of Des Moines University. In taking up this work, Dr. Hampton brings into this department a fruitful maturity as a student and preacher of the gospel.

Dr. Hampton's early training and foundation work was received in William Jewell College and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. In speaking of his work, an intimate friend said, "Dr. Hampton has been a student of the times and the Bible in a very thorough way. He has laid broad the foundations of scholarship; while his life service was that of a skilful and loving pulpit witness to the eternal verities of redemption, and a gentle shepherd of the flock."

In Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, Mr. Hampton was thrown in vital touch with institutions of education—thus affording a rare opportunity to minister to, and know the hearts of, the American youth. His work with young life has been signally blessed of the Lord. Hundreds have gone from these colleges, irrespective of denomination, saying, "He was my friend, counsellor, pastor, and 'big brother' at all times." Dr. Hampton's success with young people has been outstanding in his work.

The work at Bowling Green was no exception. Within the past four years 719 have asked for membership in this great church. Five hundred and sixty-eight have taken special training and examinations for the Bible work in the church school. Also 554 young men and women took special studies in the Bible in order to render more efficient service in soul-winning and religious activities.

Furthermore, as a pastor Dr. Hampton has been untiring in his services to those in need. The sick and sorrowing have found in him a comforter; the spiritually depressed have found in him an enlightened guide. Hence, with this type

of work, the church has grown under his ministry. In all three of the above church and college activities, the students and membership increased in interest and gifts to Bible study and missions more than one hundred per cent.

Dr. Hampton comes with a heart warm with interest in the young men and women who are in the University and will attend in coming days. He stands ready to help fathers and mothers to realize the very highest in their children along spiritual and religious lines. Knowing Dr. Hampton as we do, we hope fathers and mothers will feel free to write him, as well as the young men and women who contemplate work at Des Moines.

Rev. Minor Stevens, of North Platte, Nebraska, was a chapel guest Tuesday. The University people are glad to learn that Mr. Stevens is moving to Des Moines, having been called to the pastorate of Calvary Baptist Church, the charge formerly held by Rev. H. O. Meyer, who has removed to Pasadena. Mr. Stevens is also a member of the Board of Trustees of the University.

Dean Arthur E. Bennett, the week of November 16th to 23rd, at the invitation of the Baptist Bible Union of the state of Michigan, made a tour of the state in the interests of Des Moines University. He spoke in eight different churches, his itinerary including Muskegon, Grand Rapids, St. Johns, Rochester, Grand Ledge, Pontiac, and Jackson. He had fine audiences in the churches and found people interested in the work of Des Moines University. He received encouragement everywhere, and promises of placing Des Moines University on the budget for next year; so that the institution may receive financial help as well as the accession of a fine class of students from the high schools of the wolverine state.

One Sunday the dean had a rather stressful day in that he spoke in three different churches and travelled over three hundred miles by auto in order to meet these engagements. He spoke over the radio at 10.30 at Pontiac, Michigan, where the radio hookup gave him an audience estimated at ten million hearers. He returned much encouraged over the prospects of a large patronage from the state which is so generally known as the "home of the automobile". He had the most rapid experience in automobile riding, in that part of his journey was made at the rate of a mile a minute.

Professor Harold P. Chaffee, Dean of Men at Des Moines University, supplied the pulpit of Brother Kinney, at Eldora, Sunday, December 4, taking as his morning subject: "The Present Situation at Des Moines University as a Classroom Professor Sees It". Coming direct from the institution where he is so closely connected with its every activity, and where he is so intimately acquainted with the members of the faculty and student body, he was able to present every phase of the University's life and its needs in a most interesting way, in fact, his message gave the congregation a new viewpoint of Iowa's only Baptist College. In the afternoon he was north of Eldora. An evangelistic meeting, which met with a fine response, was held in the evening. The Eldora church has four students this year at Des Moines University.

The Fine Arts department, under the direction of Dean Brown, are holding several rehearsals a week for the rendition of "The Messiah", which will be given in the University Auditorium the evening of December 20. There will be no charge of admission, but a free-will offering will be taken to help defray the necessary expenses.

LAST SUNDAY IN JARVIS STREET.

Sunday was a showery day in Jarvis Street. We had a time of blessing at the morning service, when several confessed Christ. Immediately following the service we motored to Brantford, sixty-nine miles distant, for a service in the Brant Theatre, and returned, arriving just in time for evening service. Following the sermon—the second sermon appearing in this issue—about twenty confessed Christ; about thirty came forward, but perhaps ten of them were workers who accompanied enquirers. There were many glorious conversions. There is a sound of abundance of rain.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

The Fundamentals of Modernism

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, November 27th, 1927.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"

"And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:

"But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

"And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die:

"For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."—Genesis 3:1-5.

Prayer Before the Sermon.

We remember, O Lord, it is written in Thy Word, that after His resurrection our risen Lord consorted with His disciples; and opened to them the Scriptures; and that He opened their understandings that they should understand the Scriptures. We pray for this twofold ministry of the Spirit this evening, that we may be very conscious of His presence, that He may open to us the Word of the Lord; and that, as He opened the heart of Lydia that she attended to the things which were spoken by Paul, so may every heart in Thy presence be opened. Help us, by Thy Spirit, that we may receive the truth in the love of it, that the word preached may be with profit, being mixed with faith in those who hear it. Make this service one of blessing in the upbuilding of Thy dear children; and especially may the eyes of the blind be opened to behold the Lamb of God Who taketh away the sin of the world. May unconverted men and women be converted to-night, and may Thine own people be built up in their most holy faith and be set on guard against the evils of the day. In Thine own way, we beseech Thee to glorify Thy great name, for Jesus Christ's sake, Amen.

* * *

This is a very familiar Scripture which I have read to you. It recounts the story of man's first disobedience in partaking of the fruit of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste brought death into the world and all our woe.

I am frequently asked for a definition of Modernism. "What do you mean by Modernism?" I am asked. It is assumed, in some quarters at least, that it is an expression of some new religious idea, that it is peculiar to modern times. The truth is, of course, it is as old as human sin; there is nothing modern about it. Nowadays it is dressed up in academic robes, with cap and hood, and is supposed to be the product of modern scholarship; it is supposed to be at home in university circles, and to be the inevitable result of education. The fact is, stripped of all euphonious verbal disguises, it is plain, simple, unbelief. It is the story of the garden over again. So far as its human source is concerned, it does not issue from some superiorly displayed intelligence: it is nothing but the issue of a dark and evil heart of unbelief. It is not from above, but rather from below.

We have in these five verses an epitome of the world's religious history. There is no pagan religion that is not

here defined, there is no error which has afflicted the Christian church from its inception which is not germinally contained in these pregnant verses. It is no new thing for men to disbelieve God, to pour contempt upon His Word, and to set up an attitude of rebellion toward God Himself—it began with the life of the first man. So I should like you to examine it a little this evening, to ascertain how up-to-date the Bible is. You remember how the apostolic preachers said that the people of their day fulfilled the Scripture by denying Christ? There is a sense in which Modernism is a fulfilment of that which the Word of God declares and predicts.

I.

Where did all the trouble begin—in McMaster University? O dear, no! In Germany? No! Long, long before that, it originated, so far as this earth is concerned, in Eden; and IT BEGAN WITH THE SUGGESTION OF A DOUBT. We must remember that there are degrees of Modernism as there are degrees of sin in general. No disease displays its full virulence in its insipient stages; no fire leaps into full fury immediately from its first tiny spark; the great python that wraps its fatal coils about the strongest man and crushes out his life was once a tiny creature which that man might easily have crushed beneath a conquering heel; the mighty river, like the Mississippi, for example, whose overflow recently brought death and destruction to many people, somewhere began as a tiny stream. And so all movements of good or of evil are small in their beginning; and to understand their character we must trace them to their source and examine them in the germ.

Here is how unbelief began—and before we have done I will show you that it is quite up-to-date—it began with the suggestion of a doubt; not with a blatant, outspoken, repudiation of God and His Word, but with a very deferential and simple enquiry; it came into the garden in the form of an interrogation point. It asked an apparently simple and harmless question, "Are you quite sure that you have heard the voice of God? Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" "Hath God said?"—that is quite up-to-date! Has God spoken at all? Have we a divine revelation? Is there any voice from God? Have we any authority,

or are we a law unto ourselves? That is how it begins, merely with a suggestion that we had better be sure.

It disguises itself, indeed, with a certain profession of truth, a passion for the truth! No university professor in our day deliberately sets out to destroy the faith of his students, certainly not! "Oh", says one—I heard him say it in a very solemn fashion—"we live in an age of quest, when nothing is settled, when the foundations must be re-examined, when every man has an enquiring mind"—and he proceeded to magnify and glorify "the modern mind", whatever that is, as though it were peculiarly a modern habit of humankind to ask questions. If you had the record of the history of your great-great-grandmother and her family, she would tell you that her little children asked just as many questions as yours. They do not need to go to university to learn to ask questions! That is why you have to lock the pantry doors sometimes, and that is why it is a very difficult matter to get ready for the coming of Santa Claus, because even little children are very enquiring; and they always have been from the beginning.

One wearies of this assumed superiority, as though wisdom were unknown until certain people arrived! It is as old as Eden, but can you not hear them saying it?—"Make sure now. Of course, what you want is the truth. And that is what we desire to do for you, young gentlemen, we desire you to know what is truth. We do not want you to accept things merely because it is in a book"—as Professor Cross says, Men cannot be called upon to believe things simply because of the name that is attached to them. Oh no! They tell us we must be at pains to make sure, to ask over again, "Hath God said?" That is the tendency of the day, and it was said in the garden of Eden as truly as in our day.

That, at bottom, is the first suggestion of Modernism, that there is a possibility after all that no word has come from God. Of course, they do not say that it has not! Take, for instance, that saying of Professor Cross which I quoted in *The Gospel Witness* some time ago:

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

The gentleman who said that preached in Bloor Street Baptist Church a few weeks ago! The Modernist tells us that nothing is settled, not even that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. "Do not go away and say that He is not", Dr. Cross says in effect, "all that I said was, that after the lapse of all the intervening centuries, it is still an open question whether after all it was not misleading to call Jesus the Christ"! That is the voice of the serpent over again; that is the devil whispering his first suggestion, not merely with respect to the written Word, but to the Incarnate Word Who is the certification of the word written: "After all, perhaps He did not come from God; after all, perhaps He is not the Messiah; after all, perhaps it is not true that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." But if it is not true, then this Book is not true; and if this Book is not true, we have no word from God at all. But it is only a suggestion! Please do not go away and say that the professor denies the Word: he simply says, "Make sure, young gentlemen, you are here to learn the truth"—"Yea, hath God said?"

Then another thing: *it calls in question the prohibitions to which we have been accustomed to ascribe divine*

origin and sanction. Modernism does not take that long leap at once, but, with the serpent, says, "Are you quite sure? Can you see that tree yonder? How attractive! It is pleasant to the eye, and to be desired to make one wise—are you sure that the word which forbids you to partake of that is from God? Hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? Are you not depriving yourself of a world of pleasure by submitting to that which you imagine to be the word of God? And may it not be possible that there are realms of delight awaiting your occupation and enjoyment from which you are foolishly excluding yourself because you have given credence to that idea that God has said something?" That is the tendency of the day.

I will show you an extreme case. A man who is called in the United States, Judge Lindsay—I think he is a judge no longer, to the honour of the United States be it said—wrote a series of articles on what he called, "Companionate Marriages", and recommended that children of seventeen should be mated and married until they came of age. If there were children they should be the joint obligation of the two families concerned, but at the end of the four years, at twenty-one years of age—or whatever term might remain from the time of the marriage to twenty-one, the marriage would automatically cease unless they wished to continue. A Toronto newspaper called me up the other day to ask my opinion on companionate marriage. Haldeman-Julius, the modern Ingersoll, editor and publisher of one of the most blatantly infidel periodicals on the Continent, has just come into the limelight again because his daughter and some young college man—both college students, in fact—had effected a companionate marriage, and a Toronto paper asked me, what I thought of it. Well, I said simply this, that I think the decalogue is still in force. Listen to the modern serpent: "Hath God said? Are you sure that even the moral law itself is fixed, and infallible, and absolute? or is it open to revision? Is it a matter of majority opinion? Is there anything in the world that is fixed? Hath God said it?"

But you say, "We do not see that expression of it here in Canada." There are a great many things in Canada you do not see. This plague is spreading; and when authority is repudiated, it opens the floodgates. And the day will come when the world will see that Modernism is not an intellectual refinement, that Modernism does not belong to the higher realm of man's thinking. Already the modern psychologist is tracing every thought and action to a physical basis; and by what they call psycho-analysis, they are accounting for every kind of iniquity, every kind of satanic manifestation, by tracing it to a gland or something of the sort. The day will come, I say, when it will be apparent that Modernism has its foundation, its basis, in the lowest part of man's nature; and that it is a protest against any kind of restriction, or restraint, or control.

Are we sure there are any prohibitions? Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick is preaching the doctrine of self-expression. Oh, that is what we need nowadays! Every young man, every young woman, is to be given full liberty to express himself or herself. "Hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Get away with that prohibition, and go and help yourself! But break down the restrictions of the home, of the family, and of the state, and you will come to see by and by

that Modernism, when it is finished, is anarchy; it is simply lawlessness; and it is of the Lawless One. Certainly it is no new thing.

The question is, What is the seat and source of authority? We talk much of liberty. Among Baptists they call it "Baptist" liberty. I suppose Presbyterians and Methodists have a brand of liberty that belongs peculiarly to them. In educational circles they call it "academic freedom"! Men are a pack of hypocrites anyhow, they are always trying to dress things up and to cover up the truth. I was staying in a home some years ago when I first met with the phrase, "paying guest". The people with whom I stayed had been well-to-do at one time, but when I was there they were somewhat reduced in circumstances. I was staying in a certain Canadian city for a couple of months and so found a room in this home. My hostess said, "You are the first paying guest I have ever had"! Was that not fine?—that euphemism of reduced respectability! A guest! A paying guest! "We do not take lodgers, we do not rent rooms, we do not have boarders—we have a paying guest"! It is not bold license our modernist friends are pleading for, but self-expression, if you please; not liberty to trample under foot every law of God and man, but "academic freedom"! "Baptist" liberty! "Are you sure there is any higher authority than your own will? Hath God said, Ye shall not? Are you sure that you are not justified in being a law unto yourself? May you not enthrone reason upon revelation's throne? and put your will as the supreme power in your life?—Hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"

You quote Scripture to someone to-day, and he says, "That is a matter of opinion; I am not sure whether God said it at all or not." It is to that Modernism leads—and mark you, it is all suggested with the air of a ministry of good. "Now the serpent"—oh, hear it—"now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Of course that was written before there were any university professors! They belong to another order! But the subtlety of it! You have heard of the old Scotsman, have you not, standing before a great painting representing the temptation of Christ? The devil was represented as a hideous creature with horns and hoofs and tail; and the Scotsman looked at him with a feeling of revulsion, and said in his Scotch way—but I will say it in English—"Oh, if he had come to me in that guise, he would have had a difficult time with me too." But the devil does not come like that: he comes in the form of a university professor who is "such a charming man." Have you noticed that they are all represented as men of "fine spirit", men of winsome personality? I suppose some of us could never have qualified as Modernists! But how attractive they are with their subtil suggestions. "Now, young gentlemen, you have come to this college to learn. You must take nothing for granted at all"! In the biology class, the biologists will tell the student to assume certain things. He talks about hypotheses, and argues from his assumptions in an endeavour to establish their truth. But in general the professor will say, "You must assume nothing; you must enquire; you must ask, Hath God said? And it is all for your good, for we want to train you to think." When I hear some men say that, I wonder how in the world they expect to train people to think when they have done so little thinking them-

selves! Ninety-nine out of every hundred are like gramophones, just repeating over again and again the same things. If the printing presses could speak, I think they would rebel sometimes.

II.

Modernism proceeds from the suggestion of a doubt to a POSITIVE DENIAL. "Ye shall not surely die. You say you have heard the word of God?" This is what the woman said, this is the woman's answer, "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." And the serpent said unto the woman, "Ye shall not surely die,—even if God did say it, it is not true." First the doubt, and then the positive denial. That is Modernism.

Let me give you one or two sentences:

"There is no Baptist church in the world that fastens upon itself the doctrine of the absolute infallibility and inerrancy of Holy Scriptures."

* * *

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

* * *

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

* * *

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

The Bible speaks about natural phenomena, it actually presumes to tell us how the worlds were made, it deals with matters which properly come within the scope of scientific enquiry; but this writer says, "It is dangerous to the cause of religion among men to put the alleged authority of the Bible on such matters against established scientific facts"!

Or again:

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

Even if the Bible said the axe-head did swim, and the professor said it did not, you must not say the professor does not believe the Bible! What on earth did the writer of those words mean if he did not mean that in some particulars the Bible is not true? Is not that what he means? How many of you believe that that is what those words mean? (Apparently the entire congregation raised their hands) "The Bible is not a textbook of science"; it is "not authoritative for instance where scientific questions arise"; it is not to be put against "the established scientific facts",—"Ye shall not surely die." God says one thing, but Mr. Professor says another, that is all—and that is Modernism. I leave you to guess where I got that!

But I think I ought to give you this other quotation:

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

But the Word of God is specifically denied by Modernism in connection with sin and its consequences; it always has been. "Ye shall not surely die." The woman said, "God says that if we disobey Him, we shall die; and the serpent said, "No, you will not; not at all." That is the point of attack of Modernism always; that is the deepest thing in human life, after all. When you touch character and conduct, you touch the man himself; and Modernism always makes light of sin. Oh now, it cannot be such a terribly evil thing for a young fellow to have his fling, and to sow his wild oats! "That little baby boy of mine", says Mr. Professor, "is not altogether depraved. I know he is pretty bad sometimes, but sometimes he is pretty good. There are good and bad in him, but you must not tell me that the doctrine of total depravity applies to him"—it would be rather a reflection on his father, no doubt! But if he is his father's son, he is probably a pretty bad lot, as Moody used to say. But if we can repudiate the early record, and persuade ourselves we are the somewhat remote production of a process of evolution, that we have reached the aristocratic stage, when we have sloughed off the disabilities of our progenitors, and we have been climbing the golden stairs and are very near the top landing—that is a flattering doctrine in one aspect of it. But there is no place in the teaching of evolution for the doctrine of sin. "For . . . by one man's offence death reigned by one"; "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." That is what the Scripture says; but the serpent says, "Ye shall not surely die. There is no punishment for sin."

A certain professor says that still! He believes in the sufferings of Christ, he believes in substitution—Modernism steals every word that orthodoxy has used, and empties it of its content—but when driven into a corner he says, "No, I do not believe that Christ paid the penalty of sin." That is only another way of saying that there is no penalty to pay. That is only an up-to-date Toronto edition of the Eden lie, "Ye shall not surely die." There is no gospel if that be true; there is no gospel unless it be true that somebody died in my place in the sense of paying the penalty my sin had incurred. The death of Christ was expiatory in the sense of honouring the law of God.

Modernism's doctrine of last things is wholly opposed to Scripture. I have not heard anybody call attention to this fact, after hearing a confession of faith that was circulated among our Baptist churches, that the confession was void of any reference to the second coming of Christ. I am not going into it, because most of you have read it, but I should like to call attention to this, that from beginning to end there is no suggestion that this Professor has heard the promise that Christ is coming again. There is no word about the personal return of Christ, not a word. Modernism does not believe it. You cannot find a Modernist professor anywhere who believes that Jesus Christ will literally, personally, come again. When a confession of faith is made, surely it ought to include such a matter as that. But there is no punishment; no hell; no literal, personal, return of Jesus Christ the Lord,—“Ye shall not surely die.”

III.

I have done when I have suggested this, that our text implies that *life and liberty lie in the direction of a man's*

own will, rather than in the direction of faith and obedience. Is this up-to-date? "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened." If you want a larger intelligence, if you want to be educated, you must get away from the idea that God has spoken! If you believe that Jonah is an historical book, you will expose yourself to ridicule, and, in certain quarters, will be esteemed an "uneducated fool"; for the battle to-day, says Mr. Professor, is between ignorance and education. Have your own way, delete what you like from the Word of God; and your eyes shall be opened, you shall become really intelligent! Are we not being told the same thing to-day?

And then, "Ye shall be as gods." We used to speak of the divinity of Christ; then the Unitarians stole that word from us and said, "We believe in the divinity of Christ, and of all men"! Then we used a stronger word and spoke of the Deity of Christ; and they stole that. They believe in the Deity of Christ—and the deity of all men! That is the tendency of Modernism, the deification of man, the elevation of man to an equality with God. It is the old lie of Eden, "Ye shall be as gods."

And it issues at last in a *misrepresentation of God*: "God knows that if you do your own thinking, and do your own will, you will be on an equality with Him. He is jealous of you; and even if He has said it, I would not have such a God as that." Whereas the truth is that every law of God is framed in man's interests. I remember being down in Houston with my friend Dr. Ragland. They have electric signals at the intersections—we have a few of them here, but their city is equipped with them. I had been in Houston before, but Dr. Ragland had not. As we walked along the street we came to an intersection, and the signal was against us. I stopped, but he went right across; and the policeman went after him and caught him in the middle of the street. He said, "Did you not see the red light?" "No, I did not. Are pedestrians supposed to obey the signal?" "Certainly, are you not a Texan? Are you a stranger in the city?" "Yes", said Dr. Ragland, "I am visiting here for a few days." "Oh", said the policeman with a smile, "if you are our guest, Houston would like to take care of you. We should not like you to meet with an accident while our guest. Will you please observe the signal?" Dr. Ragland saluted him and said, "Thank you."

What was the signal for? It was not an arbitrary prohibition. It said, "Keep back on the sidewalk until danger is past." The law was framed in the public interest. And all God's laws are framed in our interest. When God says, "Thou shalt not", it is because behind that lies ruin and death; and He has put a fence about that which would harm us. But the devil says, "Have done with all restriction, have done with these old-fashioned doctrines. Do your own thinking. Even though God does say that in the day ye eat thereof ye shall surely die, let me assure you that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

My friends, we had better get back to the Book, we had better listen to what God has to say. He has spoken clearly here as well as in other Scriptures. I read to you to-night of the temptation of our Lord, and there is an interesting parallel between the temptation of the first Adam and the temptation of the second Adam. In

the first instance, it was the word of God as spoken—"Hath God said?"; in the second instance, it was the Word Incarnate, "If thou be the Son of God". "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." And you remember the devil was driven from Him with that last triumphant word, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve"—and he spread his black wings and flew away, and left the second Adam the victor.

The way of victory, the way of joy, the way of peace, the way of life, yes, and the way of intelligence and of larger liberty, is the way of absolute submission to God as He is revealed to us in Jesus Christ the Lord.

Will you have Him? Will you trust Him? He lived our life for us; He died our death for us; He paid our debts for us; He accomplished our redemption for us;

He opened a path into the glory back into the Father's presence. Will you have it? Ask for the old path, the tried and the true. Listen to Him Who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

Let us pray: O Lord, we thank Thee for the light that shineth from the open door of the Father's house; and lights the pathway even to the remotest bounds of the far country. Having spent all and wasted our substance in riotous living, show us how we may still come back with empty hands and find acceptance in the Father's house. Save us from this folly of listening to other voices than Thine, setting ourselves against Thee. May many turn unto Thee to-night and find salvation through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, Amen.

The Modernness of Fundamentalism

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, December 11th, 1927.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;

"But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot;

"Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you."—I Peter 1:18-20.

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."
—I Corin 11:26.

Prayer Before the Sermon.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for the return of this hour of holy privilege, when we are permitted together to come into Thy presence and plead the precious promise which Thou hast given those who meet in Thy name. We would understand Thy Word. We pray that this evening we may not come with presumption to Thy holy Book, but rather in the spirit of him who was commanded to remove his shoes from his feet because the place whereon he stood was holy ground. Make the bush to burn with fire. May every heart in this house hear the still small Voice. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

You will find the text this evening in two places: the first epistle of Peter, chapter one, and I shall read from the eighteenth to the twenty-first verses: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you"; then the twenty-sixth verse of the eleventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." From before the foundation of the world—"till he come". That is a wide stretch, and that is the extent of the duration of God's plan of saving men.

Two weeks ago I spoke to you about, "The Fundamentals of Modernism", and I think we saw, with some degree of clearness at least, that Modernism is after all a very ancient thing, that it dates back to the garden of

Eden. It is said that those who hold to the doctrines of evangelical faith, hold to that which is antiquated and obsolete; the gospel is not up-to-date. The answer we make to that is, The gospel is always modern; it is always up-to-date; and there can be no substitute for it. It is God's way of saving men from before the foundation of the world until He shall come again. So that Fundamentalism is modern, and I desire to try to prove it.

I.

Let us begin, then, with THE EVANGELICAL ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BIBLE. What is the Bible? Where did it come from? Who wrote it? What is its subject? What is the purpose for which it was given to men? We hold that the Bible is unique; it is not a book among books, but it is *the* Book, which is peculiar and distinct from all other books in this respect, that it was written by men supernaturally inspired as no other men were ever inspired. The Bible itself is the word of God.

I believe the Old Testament, just as truly as the New, is the record which God has given us of His Son,—He was foreordained before the foundation of the world, and the Old Testament is just as full of the gospel as the New Testament; and Jesus Christ is to be found on every page of it.

We believe the Bible was of supernatural origin, that it came down from above—not the paper, not the ink, but that the truth herein revealed was communicated to men by the Holy Spirit in such a way that when they wrote, their writings were free from all error; and that the

Bible is, in every part, true to fact, true where it touches natural phenomena, where it deals with matters which come within the scope of the scientist—wherever the Bible touches any one of them, what the Bible says is true. Therein our view is distinct and different from that of our modernistic friends.

I have been saying some things in other places, and I forget whether I have ever said them here or not; but if I have, perhaps they will bear repeating.

Fundamentalism accepts the Bible as being a record, a true record, of events. Understand, there may be the statements of men in it who were liars—there are some words which were spoken by the devil—for we have here the record of evil men. We have, at some points, their philosophies of life. For example, there are the arguments of Job's friends when they tried to explain the calamities which came upon him. Their arguments were not sound; the Lord Himself said they were not sound, and that they had not spoken the things which were right as Job himself had spoken. But the record of those conversations is a true record. When a record is taken in a court of the evidence adduced on either side, the evidence on the one side may be contradictory of the evidence on the other, but the report of the evidence adduced is true to fact. The report is a report of what the witnesses said, and therefore it is written down. God has preserved for us here a record of events, of the philosophy of history; but everything that is written here is true to the facts of the case.

Our friend, Professor Marshall, says, "I hold it is dangerous to the cause of religion among men to put the alleged authority of the Bible on such matters against established scientific facts." He says the Bible may not be true to science, and that it is folly to say it is; that it reflects the limited knowledge of the men who wrote it in respect to these matters which fall within the purview of science. He says, in effect, that the Bible is a good book—its authority, however, is limited to the realms of morals and religion; that it is not necessarily reliable when it deals with questions of science. He says it is not an authority on questions of science.

Let me give you a little bit of history. Some years ago at the conclusion of a morning service one of my deacons came up to me here and said, "I have caught you this morning." I said, "Have you?" "Yes, sir, I have." "What did I do to-day?" I inquired. "Well", said he, "you made a statement that was not accurate." "Oh", I said, "what was the statement?" "It was what you said about a compound engine." I do not know why I told this story, I do not remember what point it was intended to illustrate; but I told the story of a brakeman who said that sometimes, of a dark night when the train was passing through a country place where there were no illuminated objects along the track, it was very difficult to judge the train's speed. He said, "One time I was almost fatally injured by jumping off a train that was going twice as fast as I thought it was going. I could see no objects by which I could judge of the train's speed, so I listened to the exhaust, to the puffing of the engine, and measured the speed of the train by the frequency of the exhaust. I jumped off to set the switch, but forgot that the train was being drawn by a compound engine; and was nearly killed." In my illustration I said that a compound engine is one that uses its steam twice, and instead of exhausting twice to the revolution, it exhausts

only once; and therefore its speed, judged by the exhaust, is twice that of an ordinary engine. What application I made of that, I do not know; but it was the accuracy of the statement the gentleman questioned. I said, "What was the matter with that story?" "There was nothing the matter with the story", he replied, "except that there is no such engine." "Are you sure of that?" I enquired. "I believe you made a slip. There is no such engine as you have described." "Well", I said, "I am not going to dispute the matter with you. I do not spend my time, or other people's time, telling what I do not know—that would take too long! I confine myself to speaking of that which I do know. I would suggest therefore that you go and enquire somewhere, and come back and tell me what you learn about a compound engine." After a while he came back and said, "Well, Pastor, you score." "How is that?" "Why, about that engine." "Where did you find out?" "I went down to the Superintendent of the Locomotive Department of the Grand Trunk Railway, and asked him about it. He said, 'No, we have no such engine on the Grand Trunk lines; but there is such an engine in use on the Michigan Central.'" "Well", I said, "I was talking about the Michigan Central. Is it true there is such an engine?" "It is quite correct", my friend said.

Then he said another thing to me. He said, "I ought to have known better, because some time ago you preached a sermon on, 'They shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels'. And you talked a good deal about cutting diamonds, about the different kinds of wheels that were used in the lapidary's shop. There was a man present in the service who was an expert, who was a diamond merchant. I went over to him and said, 'What does the Pastor know about diamonds?' 'You would think he had worked in a lapidary's shop.' 'Was he correct?' 'Absolutely. I have spent a long time in Holland, and he described how diamonds are cut in a most accurate manner.' How did you find out? Did you ever have anything to do with diamonds?" "No", I replied, "but when that text spoke to me, I saw there was a great deal in it; and so I put it on one side and spent some time studying diamonds, and did not talk about it until I knew what I was talking about."

That illustrates one side of the principle, but let me give you another illustration. A man said to me once as I mentioned another preacher, "I would not cross the street to hear him." "Why not?" I enquired. "Because he is not accurate." "What did he say that was not accurate?" "I heard him speak once, and he referred to some incident in the Civil War. He did not know the difference between the blue and the gray. He put a blue coat on a soldier who ought to have been wearing gray. I have made the Civil War the subject of study for years, it has been a hobby with me. I know the names of all the outstanding generals on both sides; I have studied the plan of campaign; I have studied maps of the battle-fields; I know how the battles were fought. I claim to be an expert on the history of the American Civil War, and that man was not accurate." "Well", I said, "was the point he intended to illustrate well taken?" "That has nothing to do with it," he replied, "he referred to a question of fact, to a matter of history, and his reference was not historically accurate, that is all. If that man is not accurate in respect to matters concerning which I am fully informed, how can I possibly trust him when he speaks

of matters that are beyond my knowledge? If he is not accurate in one realm, what reason have I to believe that he is accurate in another?"

Professor Marshall and his school ask us to believe that the Bible may be full of scientific inaccuracies; it is not true to fact historically. It was not written to teach history, and it was not written to teach science; and all we have to concern ourselves with is the religious message! I call that sheer nonsense. I do not know that I should wholly justify the history expert who criticized my ministerial friend, because my friend was but a man; and a man may be wrong in one thing, and yet he may be dependable in other matters. But if the Bible be the word of God, if it was written by men inspired by the Spirit of God, then when the Spirit of God told men to write about the creation, He told them to write what was true; and if there is anything in the first book of the Bible that is untrue to fact, then it is axiomatic that that is not from God, for God cannot lie. Wherever the Bible touches matters of science, or of history, it is true, true in every particular, because it is the word of God.

I imagine a man who is, let us say, a professor of biology, or of geology—one of the physical sciences—and he has a little boy. He takes that little boy into his biological laboratory, or out with him to the quarry, or takes him for a walk through the woods. This great man of science may show that little boy some of the wonders that the microscope reveals, and he will explain, not in technical terms, not as he would speak to the advanced students of science in his classes, but he speaks as a father to a little child, and explains these things which the child's eye beholds. The child gets a mental impression of it all, he learns the truth his father desires to convey; but the deeper things which are open and manifest to the eye of the scientist are hidden from the eyes of the child. Or he takes him into the quarry and explains the different strata there, but he does not talk as though teaching geology in his classes, but as a father to a child. With an entire absence of technicalities, he explains the things which he points out for his child's observation.

Or in the woods, he plucks a flower, or a leaf from a tree, and says, "Is this not wonderful?", and tells him in simple language something about the flower, something about the plant life roundabout him. The little boy comes home with a larger knowledge of the world to which his father has introduced him, but he cannot use a microscope, he cannot tell you about the rocks or flowers; he is filled with wonder as the father has pointed out their peculiarities.

The boy goes to school, and grows up. Little by little he reads his father's books, he learns to use his father's instruments, until by and by he becomes a man of science and looks through the microscope or telescope with his father's eyes. He looks at the rocks and flowers, not with the eyes of a little child, but with the eyes of a learned man of science. And then he says, "I remember the day that my father took me into the laboratory, and into the woods, and into the quarry yonder. It is true, he did not explain things as I would now explain them to my students, but I have come to see this, that the background of knowledge out of which he spoke when, in the language which a child could understand, he explained these natural phenomena, was what gave force yet simplicity to his words. Not one thing my father told me have I found to be untrue to fact, because the perfect scientific knowl-

edge which lay behind his simple speech forbade that even in stooping to a child's understanding, he should say anything that was contrary to fact."

And can we suppose that He Who made the worlds and all things therein, Who said, "Let there be light", and there was light—if it be so that He divided the waters from the waters, that He was before all things, and in Him all things consist, will you dare to tell me that the Spirit of God, writing the history of creation, wrote into His book that which is untrue? If you tell me that, you may have your Bible. Is it modern to disbelieve God? Talk about the modernism of it! I do not like that word, it is too complimentary to these out-of-date ignor-amuses.

But now we can use the term advisedly. Listen: "And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day. And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years: and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so. And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also"—(I drove by moon-light the night before last, and the stars are still there)—"And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the fourth day"—(listen)—"And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth. And the evening and the morning were the fifth day. And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good."

That is the story of "the origin of species," and to this day science cannot improve upon it. Professor Wm. Bateson, who at one time was President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, declared in effect at Toronto University that as yet science had been unable to produce one single instance of the transmutation of species. There is a fixed law that hybrids are sterile. There may be, and is, variation within the species, but

the line of demarcation is as fixed to-day as it ever was; the last word of science on that subject is that everything brings forth "after its kind" exactly as the Bible says. The Bible is right up-to-date.

I could go on to speak of its principles from Genesis to Revelation. For instance, "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation!" Is it true? I ask, is it true? One man said to me in Montreal when I quoted that, "I do not believe that is just." "Never mind", I said, "whether you believe it to be just or not, I ask you, Is it true? If you do not believe it, go to the hospitals, go anywhere, and you will find it to be true." "For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath." Is that true? Do you not know that the rich man who can buy wholesale, can get things cheaper than his poor neighbour? The man who has money enough to buy a carload of coal can get it cheaper than the man who buys it by the hundredweight. The Bible is the most modern book in the world in respect to the matters with which it deals, the Bible fits into every principle of life like a key into an intricate lock. It unlocks the programme of life like a key, it shows men the way through life as no other book ever did, as no other guide ever can. It is like the sun and the moon, fulfilling its duty as God has provided, without need of alteration or repair. It stands to-day as the word of God Who liveth and abideth for ever. The rest of you may have a mutilated Bible if you like, but I have gone through it a good many years—again, and again, and again—and I have never found a verse, or a single word, in it that we can afford to dispense with; there is not a superfluous word in it. "Every word of God is pure"; it is the word of God that liveth and abideth for ever.

II.

I have said it so often, but I repeat it; **THE CENTRAL THING IN THE WORD OF GOD IS THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST.** He is the theme of the Bible. You say, "He is the theme of the New Testament". I say He is the theme of the Old Testament as well as of the New; He is in the opening chapter of Genesis, and He is all the way through. I believe Christ is in the very first verse of Genesis. "In the beginning God"—He is there. "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made"; the Bible closes with the prayer, "Even so come, Lord Jesus"; and every page between the first and the last you will find packed full of Jesus Christ. It is bound to be so if He was foreordained before the foundation of the world and "Manifest in these last times for you."

Well then, if that be so, if that be so, He is more than a man. Before He said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness", before He actually created man, the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world. Just as He put into the cellars of this great house we call the world our winter's supply of coal, and furnished this earth for human habitation, and supplied it for our habitation according to climatic conditions, so He has provided for our spiritual need. What God has done for man materially in every case, in anticipating man's requirements and providing for them, He has done for him spiritually. It would be a strange thing if He had not provided for His spiritual requirements, would it not? It would be a strange thing if he had not provided for

our spiritual and moral needs when before He created us He provided for our physical needs? Before man was formed, in the mind of God salvation was planned, and little by little it was communicated to man until at last "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets", spoke unto us by His Son; and "when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

How wonderful that He was made of a woman! How wonderful that He was born of a virgin, conceived by the Holy Ghost! It was by the Seed of a woman—the Seed of a woman, that the serpent's head was to be bruised. And literally the promise was fulfilled, and Incarnate Deity appeared among men, born of the Virgin Mary, as no other man was ever born. It is an old story, it is an old story. It is contrary to nature; you cannot explain it on scientific grounds. Of course, it is perfectly true, as Dr. Fosdick says, that it involves a biological miracle that is unthinkable to the modern mind. He ought to have said the virgin birth involves a miracle unthinkable to the carnal mind, ancient or modern; it is entirely beyond the natural realm. The Book is supernatural, and the Person of Whom it speaks is supernatural—it is all supernatural.

Christ came to be the divine Saviour, and the miracle of His coming is up-to-date, for *there is a sense in which it is to be repeated.* Ah, let us beware of the tricks of the Modernists when they tell us that we are divine as Christ was divine, that we are a part of the Deity as He was part of the Deity. There is a way by which we may be made "partakers of the divine nature", there is a way by which the very life of God can be imparted to a human being. What is it? What is salvation? Subscription to a creed?—I should be the last to undervalue such subscription, but that is not salvation. Belief in a book? I shall never say a word that would lead men to doubt the trustworthiness of this Book. But these are but means to an end. What is salvation? It is a repetition of the miracle of the Virgin Birth. Let Christ be formed in you. We are to receive Him into our hearts; these natures, dead in trespasses and sins, are to be divinely quickened; and we are to be made—oh, the wonder of it—partakers of the divine nature by the overshadowing, quickening, recreative power of the Holy Ghost. Yes, the old gospel is right up-to-date, my friends.

You cannot have peace until you can change the natures of men, you cannot have a regenerated society until you have regenerated individuals; you cannot have a heavenly kingdom until you have heavenly citizens. The regeneration of the individual is the need of the hour. And, blessed be God, it is the message of the gospel: "Ye must be born again". If you deny the miracle of Bethlehem, then you deny the possibility of salvation, and leave human nature bankrupt. Oh, the wonder of it!—the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world. The death of Christ was no afterthought; He was foreordained before the foundation of the world.

I love to begin at Genesis, and see Him stepping down the centuries, revealing Himself in Adam, in Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Joseph, and Moses, and Aaron, and Joshua, the Jesus of the Old Testament, down through the Judges, and

the beautiful story of Boaz, the redeemer of Ruth the Moabitess who becomes his bride; then Samuel, and David, and by and by Solomon in one aspect of his character. So all the way down through the Old Testament there are foregleams of the coming Glory, preintimations of the advent of Him Who was ordained from the foundation of the world to be our Saviour. Then, coming to Bethlehem—what about Him? Where shall Christ be born? It was written in the Book. And after He came, a star guided the wise men, as it ever does, to the place where He was cradled, that they might bring unto Him gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Afterward we see Him about His Father's business. That is a wonderful touch in Luke: First of all, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." Then He went down into Nazareth, and was subject unto His parents. I used to hear my father pray for his children, "Let the blessing of the fifth commandment be theirs." You know what it is? "Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee". And when our Lord said so gently, and yet so firmly, to His mother, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? Do you not know that God must be first, and you afterward?" Then He went down into Nazareth and began His life of obedience—or continued it, rather, to the second table of the law, loving God and His neighbour as Himself. And when thus He wrought out a perfect righteousness for us, He set His face toward the Cross.

You cannot read any other biography that reads like that of our Lord. Read other biographies, and you will read the stories of mistakes, how the man of whom the writer speaks went into some bypath; how, like Abraham, he went down into Egypt, and had to turn back "unto the place of the altar, which he had made there at the first". Half man's time is spent going backward because he has made a mistake. But study the life of Jesus, and you will find that He came forth from God. "In the volume of the Book"—in the head of the book—"it is written, I delight to do thy will, O my God." And with undeviating straightness He goes right to the goal, never turning aside, saying at last—I have quoted it many times, and I love to quote it:—When Herod and the rest of them hated Him, and His brethren and His faithful disciples said, "Herod will kill thee", our Lord answered, "Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected".

He came to die; He chose the place of His death; He chose the maner of His death: "This he said, signifying what death he should die." He chose the date of His death; He chose how He would die, that He might be "numbered with the transgressors"; and where He would be buried: "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death"; "The third day I shall be perfected," and the time of His resurrection. Never in all history can you find a story like that. He is the Son of God; it was He Who said, "Let there be light", and there was light; it was He Who made the sun and the moon, and flung the myriad stars in the sky; Who carpeted the earth with flowers, and filled it with provision for His human creatures; and at last made man in His own image—never did He have to do a thing the second time. "I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever." You see Him going straight

forward, dying at last, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God".

And then some little bit of a professor comes along and says it is not true! Up-to-date? Yes! A great preacher once, lecturing to his students on the wisdom of reading the old books, was questioned by one of the students, "But, sir, do you not think we should keep abreast of the time?" To which the great man answered, "By all means, young gentlemen, but *get abreast* first."

I meet some ministers nowadays who talk about being "abreast of the times", "being up-to-date". We were holding a meeting down in Port Hope the other day, and we always give everybody opportunity to ask as many questions as they like. The Pastor of the church there got up and said, "I want to register my protest against what somebody said to-night. It has been said that Professor Matthews has been proved to be a Modernist." In reply I said, "Have you read his book, 'The Literature of the Old Testament'?" "No." "Well, go and buy it, and if you cannot buy it, I will lend you one." Then somebody quoted Professor Cross as saying:

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

Up jumps this pastor again and said, "Quote the context." I said that I had not brought the book with me, and asked him if he had read it. "No," he said, "but I have read the context." Then I said, "We will all wait while Brother Meldrum reads the context." He replied, "I cannot remember it." (Laughter). Some of the men opposing us in this battle for the Book seem to have read very little of anything except *The McMaster Monthly* and *The Canadian Baptist!* Really we have come upon a day when the church is cursed with a generation of ministers who are not informed on these great verities.

Here is a gem that I could not forebear giving you this evening, even though it be Sunday (I know Brother Stockley will appreciate this.) The speaker is Rev. G. T. Webb, at a meeting in Port Hope. The newspaper reports him as having said:

"The speaker showed in a very clear and forceful manner that Professor L. H. Marshall of McMaster University held substantially the same views of the atonement as Spurgeon, Luther, Calvin and T. T. Shields"—(I have got into distinguished company at last! (Laughter) Listen,—"accepting the substitutionary view although Professor Marshall being a finished scholar and a careful student of the meaning of the words expressed himself a little differently preferring to say that Jesus suffered for our sins than to say he was punished."

Brother Webb told the people in Port Hope that there was no comparison between Professor Marshall and C. H. Spurgeon! Had I been there I would have taken a megaphone and said, Amen. Spurgeon used to have W. E. Gladstone, and occasionally John Ruskin, and the intellectuals of his day, in his congregation, and John Ruskin once asked him how he contented himself with that mob in Newington when he might consort with the intellectuals. Anybody informed of Spurgeon's erudition knows he was the peer of the erudite men of his time. He reached by voice and the printed page, during his lifetime, according to Dr. Pearson's estimate, not less than three hundred millions; his sermons were translated into several languages; and he was regarded as one of the greatest masters of language

of the nineteenth century. I have heard of a distinguished professor who said that next to the authorized version of the Bible itself, there was no English in all the realm of English literature comparable to Spurgeon's sermons. Then some little bit of a man—some little bit of a man, I cannot describe him any other way—goes down to a meeting of unsuspecting folks in Port Hope, and says Professor Marshall is a student of language, and knows the meaning of words and therefore while meaning the same thing, speaks more accurately than Spurgeon! Really, I think I ought to send it to *Punch*! I never read anything funnier than that in my life.

What have we in the gospel? We have God's remedy for sin. Christ died "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God". I was speaking in Brantford this afternoon, and a gentleman got up to ask a question. He said, "Do you mean to tell me, sir, that Professor Marshall does not believe in the substitutionary work of Christ?" I said, "Will you tell me first what you mean by the 'substitutionary work of Christ?'" "His sacrifice in our behalf" he replied. "In what sense did He make a sacrifice in our behalf? What did He die to do for us?" "Well, He made it possible for my sins to be forgiven." "Did He pay your debts?" I enquired. "Yes, sir," "But," I said, "Professor Marshall says He did not. Professor Marshall says, 'I do not care for the idea of the word punished'. He objects to the penal element in the Atonement. Christ did not die to cancel our obligations to the law, according to Professor Marshall." This gentleman asked a few questions, and at last said, "What difference does it make?", and walked out. I said to the audience, "There goes McMaster University. That is what it always does. It will not stay and face the facts."

This blessed old gospel does not need any amendment like the Constitution of the Baptist Convention! It will last for ever: from before the foundations of the world until He shall come again. ("Hallelujah!") There is nothing that will meet your need like that gospel; nothing in the world will touch our past like the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I had a thousand other things to say, but I suppose I have said enough, I have only touched two points: the question of the Scriptures, and of the Atonement. But you see the word of the Lord liveth and abideth for ever, and it is up-to-date; it is the most modern book in all the world; it is more up-to-date than last evening's newspapers; it is a true mirror of human life. As I come to men and women this evening I know—and who does not know?—that we have no power to touch our yesterdays. And yet, men, you are what you are to-day because of your yesterdays. You cannot divorce your present character from your record; your yesterdays are incorporated in to-day; and what you are to-day will determine, unless God shall intervene, what you shall be to-morrow. But however firm your resolution, whatever human remedy might be proposed for the prevention of the soiling of tomorrow's record, there is no one in the world who can turn the clock back; you cannot get back to Saturday when you have come to Sunday. You cannot un-write to-day what your sins wrote yesterday; and they are all open to the eye of Him with Whom we have to do.

Go to any court, and say when a man is charged with something he did yesterday. "But, sir, he is a respectable man to-day", and see how far the law is influenced by that. I read of a case here in Toronto of a man living somewhere in the east end, married with a family, living an eminently respectable life, having turned over a new leaf. Nobody knew anything of his past, but the law did; and one day there came an officer of the law and said, "We want you". Go to his wife, and she will say, "There never was a better husband; go to the children, and they will tell you there never was a better father; go to his employer, and he will tell you he was one of his best workmen; ask the neighbours, and they will say he was a good neighbour, a good citizen. But the law turns back the pages and says, "It is written in the book; he is a criminal; he is an ex-jailbird; he has escaped from the law." The law knows no mercy, and the law demands justice. There was no escape; and the poor man was taken back again.

There was a man converted in Yonge Street Mission some years ago with whom Mr. Davis talked. The man said, "You do not know what it would mean to me if I were to confess Christ." "What would it mean?" Mr. Davis asked. "I should have to go from this Mission to the police station. They have my fingerprints, they have my photograph, they know all about me. I am wanted by the police of this Continent, and if I confess Jesus Christ, I should have to confess who I am." But he did confess Christ. At last he went down on his knees and confessed Him as Saviour and Lord: then went down to the police station and said, "I am one of the men you are looking for." He was arrested and sent to the United States, and after a while Mr. Davis heard from him in Joliet Penitentiary, where he was placed, I think, to serve the balance of a twenty-year sentence. Mr. Davis showed me a letter he received from him after he had returned to jail in which he had been used of God to lead others to Christ. But though he had been saved, though parted from his old life, the law would have none of it, the law said, "Pay me that thou owest."

Was that right? Of course it was right. If you heard of the son of some wealthy Torontonion coming within the clutches of the law, having committed some great offence—if you were to hear that his father's money and the promise of his father's help had taken that boy out of the clutches of the law, you would say, "That is not fair. No matter how rich his father is, the law must be absolutely impartial, and must insist on payment of debt." And God's law does. If you doubt it, break any law of nature and see. Put your finger into the fire, and it will burn; take a drink of poison, and you will drop dead. You will need neither judge nor jury; it is written into the very constitution of things, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." The whole universe attests it. God cannot be God and forgive sin without its being punished; He must restore the moral equilibrium, He must balance the books; and the only way by which it can be done is by the death of Incarnate Deity. Christ died; and I say to you that whether you have come under the condemnation of the law or not, we have all come under the condemnation of the law of God. There is not a man or woman here who does not know that

he or she dare not, on yesterday's record, go into God's holy presence with an expectation of being able to stand. The Son of God was "manifest in these last times for you"; and the only hope for any sinner in this last day, or any other day, is the blood of Christ. There is no other gospel,—I should be,—

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

You have never seen Jesus Christ until you see Him as the Lamb of God Who taketh away the sins of the world. So far as I am concerned, I am going to hold on to that gospel; I am going to preach that gospel; I am going to fight for that gospel, if need be, until He come, without any amendment. How many of you rejoice in it? I do not know how you feel about it, but there is nothing in the world that thrills my heart like the mention of the atoning work of Jesus Christ. I would rather die than surrender that, for there is no hope for this sinner, and no hope for any other sinner, except through the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. How many of you believe it, and rejoice in it, from personal experience? (A great host raised their hands).

Before we sing I am going to ask Dean Stockley to lead us in prayer that God the Holy Ghost may give grace and strength to any who have never yet confessed Christ, to confess Him to-night. While we bow Dean Stockley will lead us in prayer.

Dean Stockley: O God of infinite grace, our hearts rejoice in the wonderful provision which Thou hast made for our salvation. We bow in adoring love and wonder, to praise and magnify Thy holy name. We pray now that Thou wilt drive home the message that has been delivered to the hearts and consciences of those who have listened to this word. And should there be any here now who have been convicted by Thy Spirit, who are being persuaded by the enemy to hold back, and to come to no definite decision now, O Lord, break the spell of the enemy, and set them gloriously free. Help them now gladly to welcome Thee as their Saviour, and then openly to confess Thee as Lord. Give courage to those who are faint-hearted and feeble. Make them strong to bear their testimony for Thee, make them not want to hide away in the crowd. May they come forth boldly and confess Thee. May those who have not yet been baptized, come out to follow Thy commandment, and to do Thy will. May those who have not joined any Christian church, join with those who are Thy people here. Lord, do a great work, we beseech Thee. May our prayers be abundantly answered. We ask it in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Amen.

EXPLANATORY NOTE:

The two sermons appearing in this issue are published together because of the close relation of the subjects discussed; and also in order to overtake arrears. The second sermon was especially blessed of God in leading about twenty persons to confess Christ, many of whom were directly converted through its teaching.

THE EDITOR'S ENGAGEMENTS.

With Revs. E. A. Brownlee and W. E. Atkinson, the Editor will speak in Peterborough, December 15, and with other brethren, the Editor will speak in Waterford, Ont., December 19th.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. II. T. T. SHIELDS, Editor. No. 4.

Lesson 13. Fourth Quarter. Dec. 25, 1927.

LOVING SALUTATIONS.

Lesson Text: Roman, chapter 16.

Golden Text.—"I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil" (Rom. 16:19).

I. PAUL'S REMEMBRANCE OF SERVICES RENDERED AND FELLOWSHIP ENJOYED.

1. The long list of names, each so fondly cherished, suggests the apostle's affectionate interest in individuals. We sometimes excuse ourselves for not being able to remember names. It is true there are some people who are not much more than a name, and give one very little to remember. But parents remember the names of their children and lovers have no difficulty in remembering the name of each other. The best way to remember is to cultivate an affectionate interest in people. It is difficult to forget those whom we love. But what a gift to be able to remember names,—and such names as these! 2. In his remembrance of his long list of Christian friends Paul was like His Master. He knew the names of people without being told. He is the Good Shepherd Who calleth His sheep by name. He taught us to rejoice that our names are written in heaven. We may be sure that God will not forget the names of His people, for it is written, "The Lord knoweth them that are His." 3. A great variety of forms of service is here recorded. Men and women are mentioned in the honour list. They are variously described: "a succourer of many", "my helpers", "well-beloved", "first-fruits", "fellowprisoners", "of note among the apostles", "my beloved in the Lord", "our helper in Christ", "approved in Christ", "labourers in the Lord", one who "laboured much in the Lord".

II. CARE IS ENJOINED FOR THE PRESERVATION OF UNITY.

1. Divisions are said to be caused by those who oppose the doctrines of the gospel (v. 17). In our day those who defend the faith and endeavour to conserve it are invariably classed as trouble-makers and promoters of division. But this inspired word recognizes that it is error and not truth that causes division, and they are the real enemies of Christian unity who teach and practice that which is contrary to the doctrine of the Gospel. 2. Such persons we are charged to avoid. It is useless to urge believers to agree with unbelievers, or to hope to establish any kind of fellowship between light and darkness. Those who believe in the finality of the Christian revelation cannot possibly be loyal to their Lord, and at the same time tolerate that which is contrary to the Gospel. 3. Such makers of division are identified as those who serve themselves and not Christ, and who, by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple. It would be difficult to write a more correct characterization of those who corrupt the Gospel to-day. And because of their fair speech the hearts of the simple are deceived.

CONCLUSION: The epistle concludes with further salutations from Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, and others, while the writer of the epistle, Tertius, also adds his person salutation. In the concluding paragraph the epistle commends his Roman brethren to the Lord, and ascribes all glory to God through Jesus Christ.

DES MOINES UNIVERSITY.

We remind our readers of the urgent need of financial support for this Institution, and ask them all to pray that God will move His stewards to give. We expect to give large space to the affairs of the University in an early issue.