

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.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS.

Associate Editors: T. I. STOCKLEY, ALEXANDER THOMSON, W. GORDON BROWN.

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

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

Vol. 8. No. 36.

TORONTO, JANUARY 23rd, 1930.

Whole No. 401.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL'S LEAVING McMASTER

Professor L. H. Marshall has resigned his Chair in McMaster University, and has accepted a call to the Victoria Road Baptist Church, Leicester, England. This is probably the most important event which has taken place in Baptist circles since Professor Marshall's arrival in Canada in the autumn of 1925. Elsewhere in this issue we publish an address delivered in Jarvis Street Church last Sunday evening, therefore in this article we shall endeavour to touch upon matters not covered by the address, or perhaps here and there to amplify some things therein suggested.

We begin by saying that, in our judgment, Professor Marshall has been very badly treated. A man of his views ought never to have been brought to Canada. Professor Marshall has been lauded by many as a very brilliant scholar. If that be so, we are sorry he has so successfully hidden his light under a bushel. But we are willing, if need be, to accept these reports on faith, seeing that in this matter we are unable to walk by sight. Notwithstanding, we are confident that Professor Marshall has learned far more during his four years in Canada than he ever learned in his somewhat extended academic course. He is undoubtedly a wiser, if a sadder, man to-day than he was four and a half years ago.

Professor Marshall Not Fairly Treated.

Had Professor Marshall known the actual condition of affairs theologically in the Baptist denomination of Ontario and Quebec, we are confident he would never have accepted McMaster's call. Those responsible for his coming have not dealt fairly by him. Of course, we ourselves have known too well both the "spirit" and the "methods" of those who have used Professor Marshall as a tool. As we shall later show, they brought him here to fight their battles; and had they dealt honorably by him, they would not only have supported him to the last, but would have made him Dean in Theology, or, if necessary, even Chancellor of the University, rather than permit him to return to England. He deserved no less than this at the hands of those who have made use of him. But they have done with Professor Marshall as they have

done, and will do, with all others: having eaten the orange, they will throw the peel away; having obtained what they wanted for the thirty pieces of silver, they will say to all their tools, "What is that to us? see thou to that." Yes: there are good men on the Board of Governors whose pride and social affiliations have blinded them to the fact that they have been used by as sinister a spirit as ever cursed a movement, or an institution. They pride themselves on their independence not knowing that by flattery and fawning they have been hypnotized into puppets by an evil mind to serve his anti-Christian, malignant purpose.

If Professor Marshall were now to speak his own mind with absolute frankness he would, without doubt, admit that the Editor of this paper had more accurately appraised the quality of those with whom he contended than he himself, on his brief acquaintance, had been able to do. They accepted Jonah's fare—a very real Jonah, by the way—which fare entitled him to travel all the way to Tarshish; but they have thrown him overboard, on finding themselves very much "at sea".

We shall probably return to the Jonah story, for we still believe that wonderful book is a record of literal, historical, fact; and we are greatly mistaken if, in its modern application, Professor Marshall has not ceased to think of it as an allegory! To him it will henceforth be historical fact.

Tried to Save Him from Present Plight.

The Gospel Witness herewith extends to Professor Marshall its deepest sympathy. We tried to deal leniently with him. When we asked the Senate to reassure itself of Professor Marshall's agreement with our Canadian Baptist theological standards, though we had never met him, and knew nothing of him, as a purely humanitarian act, we desired to save Professor Marshall from the plight into which he has been drawn by his supposed friends.

We regret that we are unable to agree with those who say that Professor Marshall has always behaved as a Christian gentleman. Of course, as he did not understand the denominational situation, he may have

thought he was unfairly provoked. But when the true character of his teaching was unmasked, and he was clearly shown to be an anti-evangelical and a Modernist of the deepest dye, he showed, as all disciples of the evolutionary jungle theory do, and perhaps with some inward justifying of the conscience on the "survival of the fittest" plea, the true jungle spirit.

But we forgive him all that. We readily admit he did well to be angry—only his anger was misdirected. It was his friends who were responsible for his predicament.

Finds Himself a Prisoner in Samaria.

Professor Marshall confessed his difficulty in believing that "the iron did swim". He may perhaps more readily believe the miracle of the same chapter which records that the king of Syria sent horses and chariots and a great host by night to Dothan, but when at last their eyes were opened, "Behold, they were in the midst of Samaria. And the king of Israel said unto Elisha, when he saw them, My father, shall I smite them? shall I smite them? And he answered, Thou shalt not smite them: wouldest thou smite those whom thou hast taken captive with thy sword and with thy bow? set bread and water before them, that they may eat and drink, and go to their master. And he prepared great provision for them: and when they had eaten and drunk, he sent them away, and they went to their master."

We hope someone will prepare a similar banquet for Professor Marshall. Though we fear we should not receive an invitation, we would very gladly make a contribution to the feast. Though Professor Marshall has had no eyes for the horses and chariots of fire, they have been very real; and notwithstanding his great scholarship, it will always be a geographical puzzle to him to discover how, when he supposed he was going to Dothan to take the prophet captive, he found himself a prisoner in the midst of Samaria! Be that as it may, as the Syrians returned to their master with opened eyes, Professor Marshall will return to England with a better appreciation of the forces of Evangelical Christianity than he had when he came to Canada. He may still insist that the conflict is one between "education and ignorance". British officers trained in military schools, and with a fine contempt for all others, went to South Africa to subdue the Boers. But they soon discovered that men who perhaps had never been trained on rifle ranges had such a deadly aim that they wasted no cartridges. The farmer-soldiers were possessed of the spirit of the ancient Benjamites, who could sling a stone to a hair's breadth and never miss. The fact is, a church made up of Bible-believers, and led by a believing Pastor, cannot be subdued by any sort of political conspiracy or parliamentary measure. Professor Marshall sees the Union of Regular Baptist Churches growing by leaps and bounds. He has discovered that in at least ninety per cent. of the churches of the old Convention his teaching is as unwelcome as it would be in Jarvis Street.

Who Brought Prof. Marshall to Canada?

But why was he brought here? and by whom? Those responsible for his coming were actuated by two distinct motives. One was represented by Dr. Frank Sanderson, and the other by the late Dr. J. H.

Farmer. Before we name those motives we must review a little history. Because we had protested against McMaster's honouring the notorious Modernist, Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, on January 14th, 1924, the Senate of McMaster University passed a resolution, the last two clauses of which were:

"That this Senate call the attention of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec to the manner in which Dr. Shields has discharged the responsible tasks imposed on him by the Convention, and express the opinion that the circumstances hereinbefore recited are but symptoms of a general attitude toward the University, characteristic of Dr. Shields. That this Senate further declare its belief that the actions and attitude of Dr. Shields make it obviously impossible to co-operate with him longer in any constructive work with any hope of success.

"And be it further resolved: That the Chairman of the Senate be authorized to communicate this resolution to our constituency through *The Canadian Baptist*, or by other means, together with any relevant documents or resolutions which he deems proper."

Could No Longer Work With Dr. Shields.

It will be observed the Senate criticized the way in which Dr. Shields had "discharged the responsible tasks imposed on him by the Convention", and declared it was not possible longer to co-operate with us. From then until the next October representatives of McMaster busied themselves throughout the Convention territory, trying to get support for its position. But at the Convention in London, in 1924, after nine months of debate, the Convention passed two resolutions. The one on *The Canadian Baptist* was as follows:

"Whereas matters of vital importance to our denominational life, requiring free and frank discussion, frequently arise between the annual meetings of the Convention: and whereas the only forum where such discussion between Conventions on a Convention-wide scale is possible is *The Canadian Baptist*, therefore be it resolved:

"That this Convention respectfully suggests to the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* and to the Publication Board that they should encourage the discussion of denominational problems in the columns of the paper; and that where such discussions are of a controversial character, the utmost care should be exercised to give equal opportunity for discussion of both sides of the controversy. And further, that since *The Canadian Baptist* is the official organ of this Convention and is published for the propagation of Baptist principles, this resolution is not intended to propose the opening of the columns of *The Canadian Baptist* for the expression of principles subversive of Evangelical Faith."

This resolution was not put to a separate vote, but by consent of the Chairman, was included in the Publication Board's report.

Honouring Dr. Faunce Not Approved.

The resolution relating to the University's action respecting Dr. Faunce was in the following terms:

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

This resolution was moved by the writer, and because the tide was running so strongly, seconded by Chancellor Whidden; and, at eleven o'clock at night, after a five-hour debate, was carried unanimously. Later, the Editor of this paper was re-elected to the

Board of Governors. Thus the Convention of 1924, like that of 1919, marked a great victory for the truth.

Must Get Shields Out of Jarvis St.

But the enemies returned from that Convention, as they had done from the 1919 Convention, gnashing their teeth, and resolving—as they had resolved in 1919—that the verdict of the Convention should be reversed. After the 1919 Convention they said, "We have got to get Shields out of Jarvis Street." In this attempt they failed. After the 1924 Convention they sought some means by which the controversy could be reopened. In an editorial in *The Canadian Baptist* following the 1924 Convention this paragraph occurred:

"There is one thing absolutely essential now. The past must be forgotten. It must remain forever a closed book. The denomination is sick and tired of this strife. It longs for peace that it may carry on its real work with a united front. The bones of contention have been buried. The battle axes have been destroyed. Woe betide the ghoul, whoever he may be, who digs up the horrible past or forges new axes for more conflict. Let there be peace. Let suspicion and hatreds be forgotten, and with a solid, unbroken, front, let the whole church line advance."

In *The Gospel Witness* of November 13th, 1924, we commented on this paragraph as follows:

"We regret very much the tenor of this paragraph. We have no doubt that 'the denomination is sick and tired of this strife.' We have been 'sick and tired' of it from the beginning; but loyalty to principle compelled us to take the stand we have taken. We believe a sound conclusion was reached at the London Convention. By that, we are prepared to abide; and upon the basis of the principles there expressed, to co-operate in our educational work. But we do not propose to throw away our battle-axes. Our sword is unsheathed against Modernism. We believe the decision at London makes it perfectly clear that the Convention is determined that it will not suffer Modernism to find a place in McMaster University. We hope everybody concerned will respect the Convention's expressed will, in which case our sword, at least, will be employed in fighting Modernism elsewhere."

Why Was Professor Marshall Brought to Canada?

We faithfully observed that resolution, and when we were advised of Professor Marshall's appointment, and it was suggested that he was a Modernist, we said not one word publicly, but very quietly, and as politely as we knew how, asked the Senate to re-examine Professor Marshall's credentials to make sure no mistake was being made. The Senate pounced upon us like a pack of wolves, and declared that Professor Marshall was perfectly orthodox; Dr. Farmer alone inadvertently letting out the secret that Mr. Marshall's view of the Old Testament was that of Canon Driver.

Why, then, was Professor Marshall brought to Canada? We are absolutely certain that his coming was deliberately planned in order to re-open the controversy, and to compel the fighting of the battle over again around the personality of a professor instead of on the basis of abstract principles only.

Dr. Farmer admitted that he had had a struggle in his own room, and that he had fought it out on his knees, and that he said he could not "turn down" a man like that—"his spirit was so fine"! He also said that he knew Professor Marshall's coming would make trouble. Of course he knew; he brought him for that express purpose. Dr. Farmer is gone, and we need not discuss him further. What we have said has been

written with the stenographic record of Dr. Farmer's address before us.

Evil Genius of the Denomination.

But there was another moving spirit—who is still active—to whom we have often referred as the evil genius of the Baptist denomination. Every man who has ever trusted or followed him, sooner or later, will find him a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet him. His is the brain that has planned this whole campaign; his the spirit that has polluted the life of the whole Denomination; in him, infidelity is arrogantly aggressive. He writes nearly all the resolutions which are passed by the Board of Governors; and his evil influence has been, and still is, more deadly than a hundred Professor Marshalls could ever be.

Who Re-opened the Controversy?

In the paragraph from an editorial in *The Canadian Baptist* following the 1924 Convention, quoted above, the Editor said: "Woe betide the ghoul, whoever he may be, who digs up the horrible past or forges new axes for more conflict." It was not the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* who forged a new axe: it was the authorities of McMaster University. That is precisely what Professor Marshall was intended to be,—a new axe to be used in felling trees to build a new school of the prophets. And now, behold, "as one was felling a beam, the axe head fell into the water"; and it may again be said, "Alas, for it was borrowed"—from across the sea. But of course the Modernists find difficulty in believing that "the iron did swim". And no wonder, for in this case it did not swim: it is "sunk"!

Prof. Marshall's Frog Story.

Professor Marshall's departure from McMaster University is another proof that the days of miracles are still with us. In the address appearing in this issue we refer to Professor Marshall's story of two little frogs. Let us give the story from the verbatim report of Professor Marshall's speech at Stanley Avenue, Hamilton, October 21st, 1925. Professor Marshall said:

"Mr. Moderator and my dear friends: I am very sorry to have been the innocent cause of all this terrible commotion to-day. May I just lessen the tension a little bit both in you and in me by telling a tale? I hope I shall not be accused of heresy when I say that this tale is legendary and not a historical fact.

"It is said that once upon a time on a very rainy day two frogs went out for a walk, or rather for a leap, and they eventually found themselves in the dairy of a farm, and on the floor of this dairy there was a bowl of cream. Moved by curiosity, both these frogs desired to know what was in the bowl, and in trying to find out they both fell into the cream. One of them said, 'Well, this is a sorry mess, there is no getting out of this'. And so, of course, it sank and was drowned. The other said, 'Well, this is very bad, but after all things might be worse', and it swam and it swam and it swam until it turned the cream into a pat of butter, and gracefully leaped out.

"When I landed in Canada I want to tell you I felt in a very sorry mess. I was like the frogs in the cream—and the cream was very sour cream—but I just want to tell you my spirit is the spirit of little frog number two."

McMaster Butter Not Popular!

Though Professor Marshall's tale was legendary, it was prophetic—and will soon be "historic fact", for ere many months have passed the Professor, like little frog number two, will have "gracefully leaped out"!

The webbed feet of little frog number two, during these four and a half years, may have proved a fair substitute for the blades of a butter-churn, but we can see no evidence that the finished product is likely to increase the demand for McMaster butter. On the contrary, in days to come, we fear there will be many like a young man with whom we sat at table a little while ago. He declined the butter when it was passed, saying, "I never use it." Then, in explanation to us, he said, "I got a taste of bad butter once."

But we remember Professor Marshall did not long remain little frog number two, but was metamorphosed into a lion, for, but two or three sentences later he said:

"I come before you to-night with all Christian charity and with all Christian humility, but at the same time I am as bold as a lion on this issue."

Prof. Marshall Always a Christian Gentleman?

Let us see how this little frog, metamorphosed into a lion, proceeded at the First Avenue Convention in 1926. He is said by some to have behaved always as a Christian gentleman. We had criticized Professor Marshall for saying, "I believe that we are so made by our heavenly Father that the spiritual instinct is an inalienable part of our nature", against which we had quoted the text, "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing." Commenting upon this, Professor Marshall said:

"Did I say that the spiritual instinct was in the liver? Did I say that it was in the lights? Did I say that it was in the blood? I said nothing of the sort. I quite agree with the Apostle Paul: in this flesh of mine dwelleth no good thing. I sometimes look forward to the day when I will be rid of it. But I am not all flesh; of course not. You must again get Paul's conception of human nature—flesh, mind, spirit. In the flesh, of course, dwelleth no good thing. But that does not say there is nothing good in the mind and nothing good in the spirit of man. Of course it does not. Dr. Shields' interpretation of Scripture is pretty well on a par with that of Mrs. Eddy—

(Cries of "Oh! Oh!" and "Hear, hear!")

—who says—

(Cries of "Oh! Oh!")

Let me finish my sentence.

(Cries of "No. No. Take it back.")

No, I want to finish my sentence.

THE VICE-MODERATOR: "Gentlemen"—

(Cries of "Take it back.")

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: "I want to finish my sentence.

THE VICE-MODERATOR: "You have been exceedingly courteous. Continue your courtesy.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: "I say, let me finish my sentence. I am not going to take it back yet. I will take it back in a moment if you think it unfair. I was not meaning Mrs. Eddy generally. I mean in one particular case—(Cries of "Oh! Oh!")—Wait a minute. Will you let me finish my sentence? Mrs. Eddy at one point in her book says—I cannot remember the words exactly, but she says you never want to use ointment for the skin. Why? Because Jesus said, 'Take no thought for the body.'

"Now, that is a false use of holy scripture entirely, and all that I am maintaining now is that there is a false use of holy scripture in Dr. Shields' quotation: 'But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.' I am not suggesting that Dr. Shields' general method of interpretation is on a par with that of Mrs. Eddy at all. I am simply meaning in these particular cases he is just as wide of the mark as Mrs. Eddy so often is."

Further Proof of His Gentlemanliness.

In the same address, referring to our many charges against his Modernism—which charges he has made futile attempts to deny—Professor Marshall said:

"I take all those suggestions which have been taken from *The Gospel Witness*, and I thrust them back again down Dr. Shields' throat, and I say to him: 'Thou liest!'"

Not Easily Frightened Away!

At the First Avenue Convention, October 19th, 1926, Professor Marshall said, among other things:

"I have never in my life received a heartier welcome than I have had here in Canada, but at the same time there have been those who have been barking against me and trying to frighten me away. But at any rate if I am not a Christian I am an Englishman, and it is very hard to frighten an Englishman away."

Bold As Two Lions!

Professor Marshall seemed to think he was the only Englishman in Canada, but we are not bold enough to assume that we have frightened him away! How could we?—for did he not say in that same speech:

"Last year I said I came to you in all humility and charity, but that I felt as bold as a lion. Well, I come to you to-night, I trust, in the same humility and charity, but I feel as bold as two lions."

Is Victoria Road an Attraction or an Asylum?

But notwithstanding the boldness of two lions Professor Marshall is leaving McMaster. Again, we are constrained to enquire, Why? Has dear old England offered a superior attraction? Certainly it has supplied an attraction of some sort. But in our former article on Professor Marshall's leaving, we pointed out that by the latest statistics available the Victoria Road Church, Leicester, is a pretty small affair, smaller and less important than Queen's Road, Coventry, that Professor Marshall served before coming to Canada. According to the official records, Victoria Road seems to have been a sort of forlorn hope for many years. It appears probable that it is an asylum rather than an attraction, more of a refuge in the time of storm than a garden of delights; so that Professor Marshall's change of position and occupation, we venture to believe, will be accounted for by the discovery of a reason for his leaving, rather than for his going. In other words, the reason must be found in Canada, not in England.

Professor Marshall is going, and we wish him well. Notwithstanding his having claimed the courage of little frog number two, the boldness of many lions, plus the staying qualities of an Englishman, Professor Marshall is leaving us; and we wish him well. Even as these words were contemplated there came into our mind some stanzas from an unpublished Whittier poem. A Mrs. Nulcina, back a century ago, established herself in a certain boarding house, and the story is that "she possessed an autograph album, which was somewhat of a curiosity in its way. Among its contents was a poem written, as she said, by a very prosy, awkward young man who boarded in the same house with her, and at whom she was in the habit of poking fun rather mercilessly. The evening before leaving her Boston boarding-house she gave him her album, requesting a slip from his pen, upon which he wrote the following lines, which, it is believed, have never been published:

"Thou art going hence—God bless thee!
Thou art going hence—farewell;
May the devil ne'er distress thee,
May the wide world use thee well.

"Thou are going hence forever,
And thou sheddest not a tear;
'Tis well, for tears shall never
Lament thy leaving here.

"Yet some will not forget thee,
A torment as thou art;
And some will e'en regret thee
Who do not weep to part.

"They will miss thy merry laughter,
As the schoolboy does his rod,
And the jokes which follow after
Thy visitings abroad.

"Farewell, the Lord be near thee
In thy future goings on,
And the pious shun and fear thee,
As thy Quaker friend has done.

"Thy life—may nothing vex it—
Thy years be not a few,
And at thy final exit
May the devil miss his due."

Baptist Climate in Canada Uncongenial.

We would not be as severe with Professor Marshall as was the gentle Whittier with his boarding-house torment. But we doubt whether, in church history of recent years, any one man has wrought such havoc in the space of four years. Notwithstanding, we believe him to be much less blameworthy than the men who borrowed him as an axe with which to fell a tree of particularly tough fibre. Professor Marshall has undoubtedly found the Baptist climate uncongenial. He has discovered that Convention votes amount to very little, that only a very small fraction of the members of Baptist churches go to a Convention; and he has learned that more Baptists in Canada, especially in Ontario and Quebec, believe the Book and rejoice in salvation through the blood of Christ, than he supposed.

Over the signature of Chancellor Whidden a statement was issued expressing the regret of the University authorities over Professor Marshall's leaving, but we are not told of any particular effort having been put forth to retain him. He was not, for instance, so far as we can learn, offered the Deanship in Theology. If any special inducements were put before him, they have not been mentioned.

Who was the confidential friend who whispered to Professor Marshall that his going would not be wholly unwelcome? Who was the intermediary in England who whispered to Victoria Road, Leicester, that perhaps Professor Marshall might consider a call? Some people wonder where *The Gospel Witness* gets its information. They only know we get it! A year or so ago we described what happened in the Nominating Committee of the Baptist World Alliance, when Dr. John MacNeill was nominated for the Presidency, and we told our readers that it was a nomination made by Dr. Scarborough, made off his own bat, made without consultation with anybody, and made for the purpose of delivering a blow—as

he supposed it would—at one who was known to be a firm friend of his hated Texas critic, Dr. J. Frank Norris. More than a year later we were asked how we obtained that information, and were assured that had we been sitting in the committee meeting we could not have described the situation more accurately. Of course we did not divulge the source of our information—nor shall we now. But we know that this non-allegorical, literal, visible, tangible, ponderable, historical, froglike, lionlike, scholastic, Jonah is being thrown overboard with the deepest regret and the unanimous consent of the entire denominational crew. May the whale bring him safely to shore!

Try to Regain Confidence.

There is little doubt that the representatives of the various denominational interests will now go up and down the Convention, trying to regain the confidence of evangelical Baptists whose trust they have so flagrantly betrayed. They will tell them that all is now well with McMaster University. History will repeat itself—as we now repeat what we said in the former article dealing with Professor Marshall's leaving. When Dr. Cross and Dr. Matthews were members of the McMaster Faculty it was insisted that they were perfectly orthodox, but after they had gone the argument was, Why complain? You had something to complain about when Matthews and Cross were here, but we are perfectly orthodox now.

Prof. Marshall Standard of University.

Some new professors have come to McMaster whom we do not know. They are not on the Theological Faculty,—but where is there an orthodox man in McMaster-to-day? Within twelve months it will be generally acknowledged in the old Convention that Professor Marshall was a Modernist, but is there one man on the Faculty of McMaster University who has not defended him? Drs. McCrimmon, New, Wilson Smith, Findlay—we had almost forgotten Dr. Whidden—have all been his champions. There is a Professor Orchard there who was once a missionary secretary. He has been acting-pastor for a group of people who broke from the Fenelon Falls Church because the church, as a church, refused to fellowship Marshallism. So far as we know, there is not a man on the Faculty of McMaster who has not aligned himself with Professor Marshall. Indeed, he has set the standard for the whole University. The Chancellor himself has unmistakably endorsed him. In an interview with *The Toronto Star* he said:

"Professor Marshall's leaving McMaster at the present time is unthinkable in view of the services he has already rendered the university, and of the increasingly valuable contribution a man of his scholarly attainments and outstanding gifts of expression can make in the future. I am confident every member of the board and senate feels just as strongly as I do. Having been the target of such bitter attacks we would naturally be disappointed, if now when Prof. Marshall has won all along the line, he would not remain with us to enjoy the fruits of victory and have the satisfaction of carrying on his regular activities as a scholar in the midst of normal conditions."

What Efforts Were Made to Retain the Professor?

And in a statement in *The Canadian Baptist* he said: "Professor L. H. Marshall is resigning the chair of New Testament Interpretation at McMaster University in order to accept the pastorate of the Victoria Road Baptist Church, Leicester, England. He will, however, complete the work of the present session here.

"Ever since it became known that a pressing call from Leicester had been received by Professor Marshall, efforts were put forth to persuade him that the enlarging opportunities now opening to our University, and the natural extension of his own academic duties and influence in the Faculty of Theology made it altogether desirable that he carry on his work at McMaster for years to come. The Board of Governors have unanimously expressed their appreciation of the value of the heroic and effective service which he has rendered in our midst, and are genuinely disappointed that he has found it necessary to accept the post offered in his native land. His going means an incalculable loss.

"At a later date a fuller statement concerning the value of Professor Marshall's services will be given to the readers of *The Canadian Baptist*."

It is folly therefore for anybody to say that the trouble leaves the old Convention with Professor Marshall. What Professor Marshall is, McMaster University as a whole has become; which means that it is on the high-road that leads to a complete denial of the supernaturalism of Christianity. We do not say they have arrived. This writer must leave for Montreal in a couple of hours. He will not arrive at Montreal tonight, but he will set out in that direction, and if the train stays on the track he will arrive there in the morning. The McMaster train is headed in the direction of Modernism,—the Modernism that has all but ruined the Baptists of England, and which, to repeat Dr. Douglas Brown's saying, will make English churches "as dead as a dodo in ten years".

We have been suddenly called out of the city to attend a funeral service, so that we have not time adequately to describe the situation created by Professor Marshall's departure, but it must be abundantly evident that his going will make things no better, because it is practically certain that with the Convention's mandate to be as modernistic as they like, and with provision made in the new Constitution Soviet-like to line up every protester against the wall and shoot him at daybreak, they will almost certainly fill Professor Marshall's place with a man who is worse than he.

One Man Manipulates Affairs.

Many of the men on the Board of Governors are the dupes of one who manipulates the whole programme. He is a Deacon of Walmer Road Church, and we are greatly mistaken if Dr. MacNeill has not his hands quite full with him in the church without combatting him on the Board of Governors. Dr. MacNeill was once an evangelical. We dare say that, at heart, he is so still; but "evil communications corrupt good manners", and he has shown that he cannot be depended upon to stand against the aggressions of Modernism.

We should like to take the Governors one by one and write a sketch of each. What does Mr. Gordon Edwards know about theology? What does he know about the religious tendencies of the day? And what is still more to the point, what does he care? Oh, but time is too short for us to analyze them. Taken altogether, they are just so much putty in the hands of one man. As to the Chancellor: in any company of mediocrities he is hopelessly dwarfed by the smallest of them. There is not a man in the whole aggregation who can be depended upon to stand for evangelical principles.

What Will Follow?

What will follow? This is McMaster's last year in Toronto. They have violated all the principles for

which Baptists have professed to stand,—even that of separation of church and state. The acceptance of a section of land at a nominal rental for twenty years, or whatever it is, is nothing but a compromise. Who supposes that at the end of twenty years they will be required to pay? By that time there will not be enough Baptist principle left about the new institution to offend the sensibilities of the most pronounced anti-Baptist to be found anywhere on earth; and we doubt whether there will be enough religion of any sort to differentiate it from a secular institution, except perhaps in the Theology Department.

Removal to Hamilton a Blunder.

From a business point of view, the removal of McMaster to Hamilton will yet appear to be the most stupendous blunder of which the management has ever been guilty. They may gain a few students from the Niagara Peninsula and elsewhere; and from a city of a hundred and fifty thousand, they may have a local following; but they must sacrifice all the advantages of the capital of the Province, and the second city in population of the entire Dominion.

Educationally, the move will prove to be more foolish still. Just as the small stores, nestling under the wing of the big departmental stores, are more prosperous than those widely separated from them, because the multitudes pass that way, so the closer a university like McMaster can keep to an institution like Toronto University with all its ramifications, the better it would be for its life. A week or so ago General Smuts spoke in Toronto. Whenever any man of distinction comes to Canada, he always comes to Toronto. Of course. Who could see Canada without seeing Toronto? Is it not the finest city in the world? We would not offend Hamiltonians, but McMaster University will be shut off from the inspiration which must come to students who come under the influence of the world's leaders as they visit this continent.

The Die Is Cast.

If McMaster University continues its present policy of making its Theological Faculty a kind of ecclesiastical senate to which missionary secretaries who have worn out their welcome in all the churches may retire, academically it will rank at the very bottom of the list. Twenty-five years from now men will say, "What strange blindness ever possessed the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec when they moved their University from Toronto to Hamilton?" But the die is cast. The buildings are already in course of erection. We are putting this down now in black and white. It will be a matter of record and of history. We have tried to save McMaster from the precipice, theologically and academically, but apparently they are bent upon their own destruction.

What will it mean? It will mean that such ministers as McMaster graduates will be men without a message, without a gospel, without the fire of the Holy Ghost. They will not be prophets, but morticians. We noticed that word in the papers recently—a polite disguise for the commoner word, undertakers. When such graduates have done with their churches as Mr. Greenhaugh did with his throughout the twenty-five years of his ministry (the church to which Professor Marshall is now going)—when they have brought the churches to spiritual, numerical, and financial bank-

ruptcy, the Convention of Ontario and Quebec will learn in its own experience the meaning of that prophetic utterance respecting a destroyed nation, "Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off."

If we had the cause of a particular institution to plead, were we seeking, for instance, the advancement of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches or of the Toronto Baptist Seminary, as over against the success of the Ontario and Quebec Convention or McMaster University, we could not recommend a course more likely to contribute to that end than that which the old Convention and McMaster University are now pursuing. The Seminary will remain in Toronto, the educational centre of the Province. It will remain in Toronto, in touch with inspirational centres such as Hamilton is never likely to possess. And, being in the premier city, it will very soon be regarded as the premier institution. Moreover, its evangelical message, its whole attitude toward the Bible, and toward the gospel of salvation, will differentiate its students from those of Modernist institutions; and they will everywhere be in demand.

God has no respect for great names or denominational traditions. Though the temple was built according to divine specifications, and though Jerusalem was chosen from all the cities of the earth as the place where God should set His name, when His name was profaned by His own people, the testimony of His prophets rejected, and God Himself despised, He destroyed the temple, and even after its rebuilding, so completely removed it by a later judgment that not one stone was left upon another. When a denomination despises the Book, and mocks at the precious blood, or supports those who commit these iniquities, God will visit that denomination with judgment if they do not repent. It may become rich and increased in goods materially, and flatter itself that it has need of nothing; but, forsaken of the Spirit of God, it will soon become poor and miserable and blind and naked.

Sorry For Prof. Marshall.

We are sorry for Professor Marshall. We are sorry for the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. A hatred of evangelical principles on the part of a few; personal animosity—we have hesitated to say this before, but we say it now—personal animosity, growing out of envies and jealousies, on the part of others; a passion for place and position, combined with a blindness respecting the true values of life in another group; ignorance of spiritual things and of present-day religious tendencies on the part of others; downright, unmitigated cowardice animating the spirits of some—all these combined have effected such a wreck of the old Convention as has not been witnessed in many generations.

Professor Marshall is merely the man who was chosen to light the fuse. Poor man, he had nothing whatever to do with storing up the dynamite. We shall send this *Witness* to England, we shall give our testimony across the seas. We shall try to let the brethren in the Old Land know that while the plague of Modernism is rampant here, God has reserved to Himself a great body of Baptists who, having bought the truth, will not sell it; having received the gospel as a sacred trust, will keep it until the Lord Himself shall come.

Battle Same Everywhere.

Those who have but a narrow and partial view of these matters may think a disproportionate space has been given to the Marshall matter in view of the cosmopolitan character of our circulation, but although this battle has been fought under the Baptist name, the principles which have come into conflict are the same as have come into conflict in the United Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Anglican Church, and all other churches. It is one battle; we fight for one Book and for one common Saviour and Lord.

Visitation From God Only Remedy.

Is there any remedy at all? Can anything stop the mad stampede for the precipice? We can see only one hope, and that is a visitation from God, a great spiritual awakening, an old-fashioned revival. Will the day ever come when, like the two branches of the Scottish Church, the old Convention and the Union of Regular Baptist Churches will unite into one? The probability seems to us to be very remote. Union on any other than one condition is an absolute impossibility. There must be a whole-hearted, uncompromising, manifest, public return to the fundamentals of the faith. If McMaster University would only cast out Modernism, but alas, to do it would mean the dismissal of the entire Faculty, and of practically the whole Board of Governors. Nothing but an earthquake could do that.

But if it were possible, if together we could bow at one common Cross, and put our trust afresh in the precious blood, and seek once more the anointing of the Holy Ghost, the power from heaven to break men's hearts, to transform human lives, and change the sons of penury and want into children of God and heirs of glory—if that could be, how gladly would we sacrifice anything and everything! How gladly, in such circumstances, would we see the closing of the Seminary doors! How gladly would we use *The Gospel Witness* as an advocate of an evangelical McMaster! How gladly would we accept all the censure and condemnation successive Conventions might choose to pour upon us personally! How gladly would we promise, though we should live to be as old as Methuselah, never to seek—as we have never sought—and never to accept any kind of office on any terms in the old Convention, and never to get in anybody's way, but just to retire to the back-ground and find a quiet place somewhere where we could sing our Hallelujahs because the Lord had returned to His temple! No terms could be too exacting for us to comply with. We would sign an armistice to-morrow, asking for no reparations, object to no deprivation of possession or office, if but the one indispensable condition could be complied with, that Baptists of Ontario and Quebec would once again accept the Bible as the infallible, inerrant, authoritative word of God, avow their allegiance to the central truth that the world witnessed the death of Incarnate Deity Who His own self bear our sins in His own body on the tree—on those terms we would gladly join hands with the brethren from whom necessity has separated us by reason of what we conceive to be loyalty to the truth, in setting up a Baptist testimony in Canada which should shine to the uttermost parts of the earth.

(Continued on page 14.)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHY IS PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL, OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY, RETURNING TO ENGLAND?

An Address by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields.

Delivered in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 19th, 1930.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered (once for all delivered) unto the saints."—Jude 3.

PRAYER BEFORE THE SERMON

O Lord, we have come into Thy holy presence this evening sincerely desiring to worship Thee in spirit and in truth, to give unto Thee the glory that is due Thy name. We thank Thee for Him Who is our Saviour, in Whom God was manifest in the flesh. We rejoice in the knowledge of the great fact that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and that we have beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. We bless Thee for the gospel of which He is at once the Author and the Theme. We thank Thee that once in the end of the age Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. We rejoice in the assurance that our debts are paid, that our obligations on account of sin have been cancelled.

We thank Thee for the completed work of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the great truth which is symbolized in the ordinance we have just witnessed: that He died for our sins according to the Scripture, that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scripture. We thank Thee that He is seated on the right hand of the Majesty on high, from henceforth expecting till His enemies shall be made His footstool.

We come to worship Thee, Thou Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We rejoice that Thou hast sent the Holy Spirit to convict men of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; to enlighten our understandings, to engage our affections, to energize our wills. We bless Thee that we are not left alone, but that the Comforter has come to stand by. We pray that everyone within these walls this evening may be made aware of the presence of the Holy Spirit. We pray that Thou wilt speak to every heart, and that Thou wilt glorify the Lord Jesus Christ. We ask it in His name. Amen.

Any man who is privileged to occupy a pulpit of any sort, whatever the extent of its influence, bears a very heavy responsibility. Any man who writes for others to read should use his pen with a proper sense of the responsibility involved in his privilege. I think I recognize that to the full this evening, as I have had occasion to do now for a good many years. It would be especially unfair for a man to use his advantage, the advantage which belongs to him in the fact that he has a pulpit from which to speak and a large company of people to hear, or the advantage which inheres in the fact that he is able to write and to reach a still larger constituency through the printed page—I say, that in view of those advantages, it would be unfair for any man to use them to the damage of another.

It is unfair to discuss the personality of anyone else except under very special circumstances. Men become identified with movements, and certain movements are inseparable from certain personalities; hence it is impossible to discuss the one without the other. It would be impossible, for instance, for anyone to appraise, or in any way to discuss, the political situation in England, and refrain from mentioning such an outstanding person as Mr. Lloyd George; or one so influential in public life as ex-Premier Baldwin; and certainly it would be im-

possible to ignore the present Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. We could not possibly discuss affairs in Russia and ignore the influence of Trotsky, though now he is exiled from that greatly distressed country. One could not understand Bolshevism in Russia and, at the same time, ignore Stalin, the dictator of that country; while, of course, in the thought of the majority of people, Mussolini and Italy are almost synonymous terms; you cannot speak of one without thinking of the other.

Thus, in religious movements, men who may not, of themselves, be especially responsible for assuming any kind of leadership, by virtue of their own views and opinions and convictions, become part of a movement; and the movement can be understood only in relation to them.

I regret the necessity, and have always regretted the necessity, for discussing one who came to this country less than five years ago as an entire stranger. I think my natural instincts are to be hospitable to strangers; and, though an Englishman by birth, I am very much of a Canadian, and very proud of the country of my adoption. I am, in fact, a little disposed sometimes to boast of it. If I thought there were a better country than Canada, I would go and live there. It is because I think this is the best that I live here. I have no doubt that you are like-minded in your relationship to this land.

It is a joy always, when people visit us from afar, to welcome them to this Dominion. When a man comes as a visitor, while on personal grounds, of course, it would be a delight to know that the man is a believer, and that he is in agreement on the great essentials of the faith, yet when a distinguished man like General Smuts comes to Canada, everybody, without thought of race or of creed, delights to welcome and honor him as a distinguished stranger, and as one who has wrought great service for the Empire. But of course, if one should come on a political mission propagating principles destructive of the Constitution of the country,—for instance, if Trotsky should come, and should propose to undo our Constitution, to destroy our system of government, it would be impossible for us to bid him welcome. It would be equally impossible to discuss his political creed, if I may so put it, without discussing the man who had come to propagate it.

I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman of whom I speak this evening should ever have been brought to Canada under the circumstances. Of course, it is a free country, and anyone may come and go as he pleases; but when such an one is brought under certain auspices, and for a certain specific purpose, then the persons who, by virtue of their relationship to certain institutions and organizations, are especially affected by his coming, have

the right to discuss him, and to protest against his advent if that be necessary. I think it is unfortunate, I repeat, that Professor Marshall should ever have been so misled as to be brought to this country and established in a professorial chair in McMaster University.

I say that in order that you may clearly understand that I have no personal antagonism toward Professor Marshall. Meeting him under other circumstances, although we could not agree theologically, I have no doubt I should have found many admirable qualities in him, and very probably many things very likeable. And I hope that he would not have been able to discover in me the hoofs and horns which have so often been assumed by my opponent in this warfare. I shall not discuss personalities for the sake of discussing them: I discuss a man only as he is related to, and identified with, a certain movement of which his name has almost become a synonym.

Professor Marshall has come to be regarded in the popular mind as representative of Baptist Modernism. There was a day not so very long ago when those against whom we contend denied that there was any Modernism in the old Convention. They made a desperate effort, first of all, to establish their own orthodoxy; but at last, being unmasked and clearly revealed, they were driven to the necessity of taking another position. They have since been attempting to justify their departure from the faith. I do not believe there are very many people in official positions in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec to-day who would be so bold as to deny that Professor Marshall is an out-and-out Modernist, and that by his appointment and retention and persistent defense, the Convention of Ontario and Quebec has committed itself to a Modernistic programme.

Let me say a word or two further in justification of the principle of religious controversy. How terribly afraid some people are to take the truth out for an airing, to give it a constitutional, to let it be seen on the public streets! But the truth has never yet been injured by discussion. We have high authority for believing that we can "do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." I quote to you in that saying the words of Holy Writ. Yet there are some people who say, "Let us have no controversy." Anybody who takes that attitude, who demands such a programme, by that very fact proves that he himself does not know the nature—I use the strong word, not *character* but *nature*—he does not understand the nature of the gospel, because the gospel at its very heart is controversial, and it can never be preached anywhere without provoking controversy; for the reason that the gospel is not evolutionary in principle: it is revolutionary. It always demands in the individual life an upheaval, a right-about-face, a change of government, a change of kings. One cannot preach the gospel to an individual, or to a company of individuals, without, by that very fact, beginning a controversy with all that belongs to the carnal mind.

How foolish it is to decry and to oppose controversy! That is how the world makes progress. Nobody objects to political controversy. Before an election the parties discuss their respective programmes, and they appeal for the suffrages of the people on the ground of the alleged superiority of one or the other. It is not possible to put that programme forward without combatting the views that are contrary thereto.

We had a bit of controversy here in Toronto two or three weeks ago. We have four newspapers in this city, and not one of them was neutral; nor did they refrain from discussing personalities, because the municipal programmes proposed by the respective parties were inseparably joined to certain men, and we could not vote for the programmes without voting for certain men; nor could we vote for the men without voting for their programmes. I did not hear it said anywhere that it was altogether a wicked thing to discuss the candidates! I think there was a pretty general controversy on that occasion. The principle is inevitable. It is only by that means that the truth emerges, that the truth makes progress, and is ultimately triumphant.

Of course, if you have something that you want—what shall I say—to "put over", that is the phrase I think—if you have a programme of some sort that you desire to effect, whatever it is—and I am pronouncing no opinion on the merits of the respective programmes that were before us municipally a few weeks ago—but I say, if anybody has some pet scheme or another that he desires to see adopted, right or wrong, of course he does not want it discussed. He wants to have the thing done before there is a chance to discuss it. But if a man is straightforward, and desires the best in the public interest, and has no ulterior motive and no selfish end to serve, he is willing to put all the facts before the people and say, "Come and discuss it, and let our collective wisdom prevail in the matter."

Why, then, should people so strenuously object to religious controversy? I repeat, the very principle of the gospel makes its propagation an agent of controversy always. You cannot do it otherwise. Look at the case of Stephen. Stephen preached the gospel. Stephen quoted Scripture. He declared that Jesus was risen from the dead. And he concluded his sermon, as every preacher ought to do, with a very personal application. He said, "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not yours fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers." He brought home to them the shedding of the blood of the Just One of Whom they had become the betrayers and murderers. When the people heard that they picked up stones and hurled at him. I grant you that his sermon was provocative to the last degree—as good preaching always is. We used to have a brother here whose testimony was always very interesting. I remember his saying in an after-meeting on one occasion something like this: "I would not give anything for a preacher who does not build me up or knock me down"! And that is the preacher's business, either to build people up, or to knock them down—to knock them down to build them up, for the Word of God wounds to heal, and kills to make alive again.

Study the history of the church, and you will find that the apostles Paul, Peter, John—all the New Testament preachers and writers were controversialists both in their preaching and in their writing.

I said a thing in Ottawa some years ago which somebody said was rather harsh. I confess I was perfectly unconscious of it. My friend said I dealt a certain gentleman a terrific blow—and I really thought I was giving

him a sort of love-tap. I did not know I was dealing him a deadly blow at all. When this controversy began at Ottawa there was a certain gentleman who preaches in this city, for whose spirit I have great respect, but with whose theology I have no agreement at all. He is a very excellent man, and I hope we are good friends. He is a subscriber to *The Gospel Witness*, and he has this merit that when his subscription expires he sends in his renewal. There are a number of others who would not read *The Gospel Witness*! But they find out everything it contains! They borrow it from someone else; and sometimes they go down to The Baptist Bookroom and read it, and put it back without paying for it! That is not particularly honourable. This gentleman at least has the spirit of a good sportsman, a very genial gentleman, but one who is more interested in the methods of modern prophets than in those of the Book. Now I did not say anything!

But on that occasion, when he proposed an amendment to a resolution which I had made, he said, "The church has prospered in time past just to the degree in which it has avoided religious controversy." Then he said, "I appeal to the professors of Church History to say whether or not this is so." When I replied I referred to that, and said that I could not help wondering if my neighbour had ever heard of a man called Luther! If ever, in the course of his reading, he had stumbled upon the name of Wycliff, or of Knox, or of any of the fathers—or of the martyrs either! I asked if he had ever heard of a man called Paul, and if it had ever dawned upon him that practically the entire Bible—a great portion of the Old Testament, and certainly all the epistles, were born in controversy, that they were written to set somebody right who was going wrong. Then I respectfully suggested to this distinguished Toronto preacher that he consider the advisability of taking a post-graduate course in church history, as I was of the opinion that he was badly in need of it. I still think so! But I like him. I like him so well I should like to lecture to him on church history myself. But it is surely evident to all who believe, that the church has made progress in the measure in which she has proclaimed the truth and combatted error. The Reformation is a case in point. Surely that principle does not need argument: it is self-evident.

What are we doing here? Are we under obligation to take up a pacifist attitude toward these things? Can you show me any scripture that would justify me in acquiescing in a policy of plunder? Why should I consent to see the church of Jesus Christ robbed of her heritage? The faith was once for all delivered unto the saints. It is a deposit of inestimable value. The man who is entrusted with uncounted millions of money has a stewardship much less important than that of everyone who knows the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.

The other day in Toronto there was a bank robbery. Somebody came in and got some money—and went away with it. When the police began to examine into the case they said, "This was not done by people outside: it was planned by somebody in the bank who knew the hour which would be most convenient for such a robbery." They began to investigate, and discovered that the teller of the bank was responsible for opening the doors, and laying the plan for someone from the outside to come in and take the plunder.

The church has been robbed. If you doubt it, read *The Toronto Star Weekly* any time you like. Read the writings of Dr. Salem Bland. Read the religious papers, and you will find that they are occupied with the justification of those who are guilty of robbing the church of its hope in Christ, and men of the hope of salvation through the precious blood. It is "an inside job", I tell you, it has been done by someone on the inside. That is what Jude says, "When I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints, for there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." As though he had said, "There is somebody on the inside who is robbing you, who is betraying his trust." It was so then: it has been so ever since. The devil has always done his work through inside men. He has got somebody to come in "unawares" to open the door and let the robbers in.

We are supposed to be rather peculiar in this place, but as a matter of fact we are not. We are not a bad lot—and yet we are! That is a contradiction, but I mean, in the scriptural sense, we are so bad that we need to be born again. If anybody around here thinks he has wings, I have not seen them yet—and I have none myself. But the position this pulpit occupies theologically to-night, the position which this Regular Baptist Church occupies, and the churches with which it is associated, is the position which, twenty-five or more years ago, practically all the Baptist churches on this Continent occupied. We have not changed. It is not an extraordinary thing, is it, for Baptists to believe that the Bible is the word of God? That is what we believe. Do you? We are not ashamed to confess that. You may call us backward—we confess it; we plead guilty. We are simple enough, childlike enough, "uneducated" enough if you like, old-fashioned enough, to believe that the Book, from Genesis to Revelation, was inspired by the Spirit of God, and that its original manuscripts were without error. We have no hesitation in subscribing to the inerrancy of the Scripture, to the infallibility of it, and to the final and absolute authority of the Word of God. That is the position we occupy.

So of all the other related truths. Jesus Christ is to us the Son of God. I read it to you this evening. Our hearts responded with a great Hallelujah when we read in the Book, "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." We rejoice in the deity of Christ. We believe in His virgin birth. We believe He was supernaturally born, that He died supernaturally, that He rose again by the exercise of a Supernatural Power—that from His advent into the world to His ascension to the Father's right hand, He lived and wrought and died and rose again as no other man has done or ever will in all the history of the world. We believe the hymn we sang just now without any reservation, and our hearts desire to bring forth the royal diadem, and to crown Him Lord of all. We have no hope but that the blood which flowed from His heart and from His other wounds, flowed for our cleansing, and that by the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, we are

cleansed from all sin. We believe that people need to be born again. I do not know who asked that that hymn you sang just now should be sung, but with all my heart I subscribe to it ("Hallelujah!"). I do not believe that anybody can come at last in peace into the presence of God without being recreated by the power of the Divine Spirit, having his sins washed away by the precious blood of Christ.

There is nothing new in these things. That is all we believe; that is all we preach. We believe what William Carey, and Andrew Fuller, and C. H. Spurgeon, and others believed and preached. We believe precisely the same doctrines as Dr. Fyfe, and Dr. Castle who built this building, and Principal McGregor of McMaster University, believed.

I printed in *The Gospel Witness* not long ago an article written by the late Principal McGregor, of McMaster University, on the subject, "What is a Regular Baptist Church?" I had requests for copies of that address from Fundamental Baptists all over the country, who said, "We have never seen our position put so clearly as it was put by Principal McGregor", of Toronto Baptist College, before it became McMaster University. And we in this place subscribe to every word of it. We have no reservation at all.

Had I time to go through the Trust Deed of McMaster University I should simply show you that that is the very thing that is written into the Trust Deed of this church, and that this church is committed to it. Upon that we stand with no desire to amend a word of it. It represents the deepest conviction of our souls. We stand where this church stood when it was built. We stand for what McLaurin and Timpany went to India to preach, and which was preached by our home missionaries all over this country. We have no new gospel to preach. Call us old-fashioned if you like, but do not suggest that we have departed from the old position, for we stand where Baptists have always stood.

Very well, then, Professor Marshall was introduced—and what have we? I took home with me to-day at noon a bag with a stenographic report of all that Professor Marshall has ever said at any Convention. I have every word he has ever spoken at Convention gatherings. We had parliamentary reporters there, and in order to make sure we had two of them report his addresses independently, and then check with each other. They are both reporters at Ottawa for *Hansard*. But, on thinking it over, I said to myself, What is the use? I have given it before, and I can summarize it in a sentence or two.

Professor Marshall does not believe in the infallibility of the Bible. He said at the Convention of 1927:

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

He has said that when science and the Word of God conflict, he would accept science. And what is science? It has not reached finality. I will wait until it reaches the end of the road before I bow to its authority. But he has no hesitation in bowing to the reason of man before the revelation of God.

Professor Marshall does not believe in the total depravity of man; but rather that underneath the ashes of man's soul is the angel, and that the business of

the church is to get rid of the ashes and to bring out the angel! He mocks at rebirth as a soul going through "the throes of a psychic revolution", and as a thing of the past. Worst of all, he despises—it makes me shudder as I think of it—the great central truth of the Bible, and of the gospel of grace, that we are redeemed by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. He has said emphatically that he does not believe that Jesus Christ paid the penalty of my sin, or of yours. I do not care what anybody says, I have a controversy with the man who takes that position, for that is my only hope, that Christ died instead of me, that He did actually cancel the obligation that was rolled up against me before the holy law of God which I had violated. I can see no chance, no hope at all, apart from the great truth that He died for me. Then why should we not protest as we have protested?

Without dwelling further upon that, I remind you that the whole Denomination has lined up with Professor Marshall—I mean, officially. There is always a difference between the official expression and that of the rank and file. But there is not a Board of the Convention that has not been pressed into service for the defense and retention of Professor Marshall. The President of the Foreign Mission Board, Dr. John MacNeill, has been one of Professor Marshall's chief defenders. He cannot escape the responsibility of it. I certainly would not defend a man, endorse and hold fellowship with a man, who believed and taught things that are subversive of evangelical faith—would you? But Dr. MacNeill has committed himself irrevocably to the defense of Professor Marshall's position.

The Home Mission Board did the same thing, and muzzled its missionaries lest they should introduce the controversy into their churches. So of all the other departments. The poor *Canadian Baptist* has done the same thing! For a while it was so virulent that the people rebelled. Cancellations poured in upon them, and they had to stop their bitter attack. At the last Convention they had to report a deficit, and in doing so they actually acknowledged that it was due to the defection of those who had formed the Union of Regular Baptist Churches. I should think so!

There is no element of the denominational life that has not been requisitioned. They would not dare to defend Professor Marshall's teaching in some quarters. Mr. Schutt of the Home Mission Board has said again and again in effect, "If they appoint another man like Professor Marshall they will hear from me." I should be glad to hear from him! I have been waiting twenty years to hear from him! They would pay no attention to him now anyhow. But the point I make is this: If Professor Marshall is the paragon, if he is the acme of perfection, if he is the embodiment and incarnation of all Baptist wisdom, why object to having another like him? I should think they would want a carload of them—the more the better! Why object to another?

When McMaster University made its drive for money, and her representatives went to Dr. Stillwell asking for an article in support of McMaster—he has supported McMaster University wherever it was possible privately, but he refused to commit himself publicly. He said, "We cannot afford to do it." Of course he could not! Mr. S. J. Moore and Mr. J. S. Shenstone withdrew from the Board of Governors of McMaster University, two of the largest givers in the

Denomination, and refused further gifts to that institution. Why was the Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board afraid publicly to align himself and the Foreign Board with McMaster in its drive for money?

The Modernists with the aid of the *expedientists* packed the Convention with proxy voters as long as that was allowed. They denied the right of a ballot vote, in order that the religious Soviet might mark those who dared to vote against McMaster University. They went to Parliament and had their Constitution amended, and changed the Constitution of their whole ecclesiastical household—what for? To support Professor Marshall. And now he is going back to England!

Somebody handed me a clipping last night, and I think I will read it to you. If we were to lose our sense of humour, and if one could not see the humorous side of things sometimes, life would be very drab. This is from a Lindsay paper:

"Prof. L. H. Marshall of McMaster University, Toronto, after spending five years in Canada, has accepted the pastorate of Victoria Road Baptist Church, Leicester, England. Dr. Shields, the 'Mussolini' of Jarvis St. Baptist Church, will now breathe a sigh of relief."

Not at all! I am not disturbed whether our friend, Professor Marshall, decides to live on this side of the ocean or the other. It is a matter of supreme indifference to me so far as he personally is concerned. I refer to his going only because it is a symptom.

I lived some years within sight of a tidal river, and when a boy I used to be very much interested in the turn of the tide. The tide would come in and fill the river up to the brim. You could see it coming in; as it neared the turn its flow would become slower and slower; and then for a little while the water would seem to be stagnant. Sometimes one could see perhaps a few sticks of wood floating on the surface of the water. One could see them going around in circles, and would say, "Which way are they going? Are they going up-stream or down?" By and by, however, one could see them begin to move down-stream and one could then say, "The tide has turned; it is going out."

Professor Marshall is an interesting study on that ground, as an indication of which way the tide is going. That is why I have asked the question, Why is he leaving McMaster University?

When he came a little while ago, he told us a story about two little frogs. Do you remember? Two little frogs got into a bowl of cream. They both said, "This is a terrible mess." One said, "It is no use; we may as well give up"—and he went down to the bottom. The other little frog paddled about until he churned the cream into butter—and from the butter he leaped out and went away. (Laughter). Mr. Marshall, by a truer analogy than he knew, said, "I am little Frog Number Two"—having made the butter, apparently it is time for him to leap out!

At the Stanley Avenue Convention our friend said that he was as bold as a lion, and when the First Avenue Convention came a year later, in 1926, he referred to that remark and said, "This year I feel as bold as two lions." I was half-minded to announce another text to-night—it came to me, I did not look for it. But this was the text: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion." I wonder why Professor Marshall is "fleeing"?

Dr. Parker once quoted that text and made this comment on it, "The wicked flee when no man pursueth—but they make better time when somebody is after them"!

What interests me is to know why, in the face of all this, McMaster University should permit Professor Marshall to go? He has been supported by Convention after Convention. They actually went to Parliament to get things changed so he would be comfortable! They passed a resolution to put us out—but we are still here. *The Gospel Witness* is still being published—and still being read the world around. Why is Professor Marshall leaving? He came from England but four years ago last September. He left Queen's Road Church, Coventry, with six hundred and fifty members, to become a professor: he is returning to Victoria Road, Leicester, a church that has been stagnant for twenty years. I have its record on my shelves, which shows that it has been waiting for an undertaker for a long time! I wonder what has happened? Did we not hear that hundreds of thousands of dollars had been given for a new university? Have we not seen the new site between Hamilton and Dundas, and the buildings in course of erection? I drive past there frequently, and I always take off my hat—just as I do when I pass the Cenotaph! We ought always to have respect for the dead! That is not a joke by any means! The Chancellor of the University is himself authority for saying that they have won a glorious victory, and that Professor Marshall ought to stay and reap the fruit of it. Four years is a short time to be a professor, especially if one left the pastorate to become a professor—and more especially when one is returning to the pastorate, and to such a pastorate, with about three hundred and fifty members! Victoria Road has less than one-sixth of the membership of this church, and a Sunday School with an enrolment of about one-eighth the enrolment of our Bible School. What has McMaster done to Professor Marshall that he should leave us so soon? Has the "victory" been as complete as has been reported?

My dear friends, there is a great lesson for us? I know England. I know something about the religious life of England. I was born there, and for a number of years I went every summer to spend a month or two there. I have touched many of the religious leaders of England. I have spent, altogether, about six months in Spurgeon's pulpit in London, and have preached in other places in the Old Land. I love every foot of English soil, and the soil of Scotland and Ireland too. It is a beautiful land. I cannot understand why it is that the land that has produced such military and naval heroes, the land that has never been beaten, the rock upon which Napoleon split, the power that destroyed the Kaiser's ambition—with due respect to our American friends—in spite of all that, I think England has more religious cowardice to the square inch than any land I know.

Spurgeon made his protest, and one of the chief thorns of his flesh, and one of the principal down-graders, was the pastor of the church to which Professor Marshall is now going, Rev. John Gershom Greenhough. He never accomplished anything, yet he stayed on and on for years. The church did not grow. It never does—it never can—under Modernism. No miracles are wrought by Modernism. But from

the time that Spurgeon withdrew from the Baptist Union there has been no vigorous protest against Modernism. Here and there men have spoken individually, but there has been no kind of organized opposition to it. And for the most part the battle has gone by default.

When Professor Marshall came to Canada, I have no doubt that he supposed those who were opposed to the Modernistic view were but a handful who did not amount to anything, and that in a very little while he would have them all in his hand—and they would be silent. The fact is, to say nothing of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches, there is not a Baptist church in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec in which there is not a "remnant according to the election of grace". I think one could count on his fingers the pulpits, even in the old Convention, to which Professor Marshall would be welcome. I think he has discovered, notwithstanding the official action, that his view of things is unwelcome among Baptists in this country, and he has taken the very first chance of going back home again. It is an indication, I am sure, that we were not so far wrong as some people thought when we insisted—as we have done all the time—that the rank and file of our Baptist people, while they need a revival as we all do, so far as their views of truth are concerned, want to stand for the Bible.

I met a gentleman the other day who wanted to see me. He said, "I was glad to read of Professor Marshall's going. I thought we would get rid of the trouble, and everything would be all right. Then you wrote that article in *The Gospel Witness* and spoiled everything. You said that if Professor Marshall were to go, everything would be the same." And so it will! He is only a symptom. The man who is ever seeking to turn aside the Baptists of this country will remain, and unless God intervenes we shall have somebody worse than Professor Marshall, and perhaps somebody more subtle. The man with whom I talked said, "Why cannot we all get together and pray? (He belonged to the old Convention.) I wish Professor Marshall had never come. We do not want our young men taught that kind of thing; we do not want our pulpits manned by ministers like that; we do not want anyone to tell us that the book of Jonah is not true." He put it as strongly as I could have put it. Then he said, "But please do not say anything more about it. Let us just pray that God will purge McMaster." The man who said that is a farmer, so I said to him, "Suppose you were to come in some day and say to your wife, 'I have a field out there that is full of wild mustard; it is as yellow as a mustard can. I cannot raise anything in the field. We will pray three times every day that the Lord will clean up that field!' You are a farmer, what would you expect from that? The way to pray that that field may be cleaned up is with a plough and a hoe! I have prayed—and I have tried to clean the field; and I am glad there will be one bunch of wild mustard less."

Professor Marshall is going back to England, to become pastor of a Baptist Church in the land where Dr. Douglas Brown is President of the Baptist Union, and who was reported in a cable day before yesterday as saying the following:

The Baptist Church lost 4,450 church members and 11,000 Sunday scholars in the past year. "At that rate

it will be as dead as a dodo in ten years," said Rev. Dr. Douglas Brown, President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland speaking at Norfolk last night. The churches now-a-days had more social prestige and more organization than ever, "but they are not delivering the goods," he added.

English Baptists lost nearly five thousand members last year. Churches are poorly attended except where the gospel is preached. Sunday Schools are dwindling. There is a decrease of teachers and scholars and of church members all the time. I do not blame the people. I think if my wife were to put sawdust on my table three times a day instead of good food, I should be inclined to get my lunch downtown! I do not see why people should go to church to hear preachers tell what they do not believe about the Bible. The reason for going to church is to hear what the Bible says, and to believe it with all the heart.

When I read Dr. Douglas Brown's cable, I thought I had better get a few particulars about the dodo. The President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain says the Baptist denomination in England, if it goes on as it has been going, will be like a dodo in ten years. But the teaching which has brought the Baptist denomination in Great Britain to its present deplorably low state, is what was imported into this country by McMaster University in 1925. That is the thing that is going to be preached from Baptist pulpits in a little while. Here is what the dictionary says about a dodo:

"A large extinct didoid Columbine bird or pigeon of Mauritius, with short functionless wings, large hooked bill, clumsy aspect, and slow gait. It became extinct about the end of the 17th century."

I did not say that English Baptists would soon be like a dodo: Dr. Douglas Brown, who was given a degree by McMaster University, and who is President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain, said it. A dodo has "short functionless wings"—like Modernists! "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles." But a "dodo" does not mount up with wings! It has "short, functionless, wings"! Yet the President says that is what English Baptists will be like in ten years if they go on as they are now going.—He ought to have said, with the kind of preaching they have been having since Spurgeon was invited to leave. The Baptist Union chose Mr. Greenhough a man who, in twenty-five years, could not increase his membership beyond three hundred and thirty-three, instead of the man who, in the space of thirty-eight years reached, by voice and pen, three hundred millions of people with the gospel. How blind is unbelief! How set against God! That is what will happen in England,—the Baptist Union will become as dead as a dodo! And I fear, unless the Baptist denomination as represented by the old Convention of Ontario and Quebec, mends its ways, it will be as dead as a dodo, too, before very long.

But let us take courage. The gospel is still the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. The only defense of our position will be found in the fact that by our individual ministry and by our public ministry, by the ministry of individual Christians and by the collective ministry of our churches, God proves Himself to be to-day what He has always been, the Saviour of poor guilty sinners. There is no use of my preaching from the pulpit unless we see the power of the gospel in transformed lives, in men made new creatures in Christ

Jesus. Our saying we believe the fundamentals of the faith will be useless unless our lives harmonize with our testimony. Amid the almost universal defection, may God help us to be true to Him! I said "almost universal." Thank God He always reserves unto Himself the seven thousand who do not bow the knee to Baal. There are thousands in the old Convention. Professor Marshall's leaving is one indication of it. Many of the hundred whom the modern Obadiah hid by fifty in a cave are coming out of their hiding-places. Even yet they are not very bold, but their presence in the old Convention is becoming known. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites."

Let me exhort you who are unconverted. It is in the interest of your souls we contend for the faith. We fight for the springs without whose vitalizing draught the soul must perish. We do battle for the storehouses without whose supplies we are all dead men. We contend that we may keep open the line of communication with Heaven. Ours is a faith worth fighting for, worth living for, worth dying for!

"None but Jesus

Can do helpless sinners good."

Come to Him now! Trust Him now, trust Him always, trust Him for ever.

And as for those of us who are Christians, let us lay hold of our swords afresh, and in the name of the Lord set up our banners. Let the attitude and aspect of this church, and of the sister churches with whom we have the honour to be in fellowship, toward the world be such that men shall cry, "Who is she that looketh forth as the

morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?"—"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand."

Once again let us bear our testimony to the power of the gospel and to its central truth, as we sing:

"There is a fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
And sinners plunged beneath that flood
Lose all their guilty stains.

"Thou dying Lamb, Thy precious blood,
Shall never lose its power,
Till all the ransomed Church of God
Be saved, to sin no more."

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL'S LEAVING McMASTER.

(Continued from page 7.)

If that be impossible, we venture to call upon all the Pastors of our new Union of Regular Baptist churches, and upon their churches, solemnly to register the vow that they will stand on Zion's walls with sword and with trowel. When sacrifices of broken spirits and contrite hearts, which God will not despise, are presented, our gracious God will do good in His good pleasure unto Zion, and will build the walls of Jerusalem.

Note: The Editor was unexpectedly called out of town Tuesday evening after dictating the above article and was therefore unable to revise copy.

The Union Baptist Witness

These pages (14 and 15) are the Official organ of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches in Ontario and Quebec.
337 Jarvis St., Toronto, Canada.

W. GORDON BROWN, Editor.

HUGHSON STREET, HAMILTON.

We have been greatly interested in the Hughson Street Baptist Church of Hamilton, where Rev. H. Bower is pastor, especially because of the wide publicity which they have had through the recent court proceedings. Our readers will therefore be glad to know that the large attendance at the annual meeting, on January 9th, heard most encouraging reports. Sister churches brought greetings, with Rev. C. J. Loney, from Stanley Ave.; Rev. A. J. Milligan, from Immanuel; and other messages by mail from Rev. A. J. Loveday, of Boston; Rev. T. L. White, of Scotland; Rev. T. Summers, of Hespeler; and Rev. R. K. Gonder, of Flamboro. It is certainly a good thing to see the united spirit among the churches of our Union. The Hughson Street clerk reported that during the year eleven had been baptized and nine received by letter and experience. Financially, all branches of the church raised \$4,230.29, of which there was given to missions \$653.62. During the evening there was a fine spirit of Christian fellowship. The church supper, with which the meeting began, helped this along, as did the presentation to Pastor Bower and that to the church organist. The church budget presented

called for \$51.50 per week. All members were urged to adopt the tithing principle.

We are glad to notice that among the officers elected, Mr. C. Smith was asked to act as agent of *The Gospel Witness*.

The following Sunday morning was a special service, when Rev. C. J. Loney brought to a large congregation a message on, "Looking Back through Love's Windows," his remarks being based on John 14. The regular attendants of the church were surprised to find some ten of the old members at the morning service, among them three of the five men who took the church to court. They tried to make them welcome, and hoped that, with sincere hearts, they might turn from any bitterness. The church clerk has this important word to say: "The court trouble has affected our church very little, as we have good congregations, particularly in the evening." On the evening of the Sunday which we have mentioned, one young husband followed the Lord through the waters of baptism.

CALVARY, OTTAWA.

From January 6th to the 10th, our brethren in Calvary Baptist Church, Ottawa, observed the Week of Prayer, fostered by the World's Evangelical Alliance.

The feeling of the pastor was that the meetings were conducted under the leadership of God's Spirit. "It was a time of humiliation, and of much heart searching, and also of intercession. Sunday services, as a result, were marked by a deep reverence and much expectancy on the part of the very large congregations in attendance."

* * * *

WANTED, A PIANO.

Our brethren in the South Zorra Church,—for that is now its correct name,—where Rev. W. F. Mesley is pastor, expect to re-open their church, after extensive alterations to the building, the first week in February. Now that they will have a Sunday School room in the basement of the church, they are in need of chairs and of a piano. Many of the young people can manage a piano better than an organ. Perhaps one of our readers has an unused instrument which he would be glad to convert into an instrument of service in the work in Zorra. Pastor Mesley would be glad to hear from such an one, at Box 64, Hickson, Ontario.

* * * *

LINDSAY.

Our brethren in Lindsay "have a hard battle to fight", and therefore it has been

the more appropriate that they have been led by their pastor, Rev. J. M. Fleming, to wait on the Lord in prayer. Consequently, the services are growing in attendance, especially the evening one, and a spirit of expectancy is among the group of believers.

ORANGEVILLE.

Last Sunday evening a young lady who, for a number of years, has felt that she ought to be baptized, obeyed the Lord in the matter of immersion.

Last week's edition of *The Gospel Witness* carried a brief report of a recent meeting of the Pastors' and Peoples' Conference; nevertheless, these meetings seem to be of such importance in spiritual power that we venture to give a more complete report, as sent us by the secretary, Rev. R. E. Jones.

"On Tuesday, January 14th, it was a rainy morning, and well-washed, icy roads were not very inviting, even for Fundamental Baptist; but the people of these churches, in the country from Hamilton to St. Thomas, are not easily discouraged from attendance at their monthly Pastors' and Peoples' Conferences. When we met in Courtland, we learned that even these big-hearted folk had to exceed their calculations. Their entertainment committee were prepared to supply chicken dinner for about one hundred and twenty-five, but there were easily two dozen more who also enjoyed chicken! At the evening meal there were easily two hundred provided for! This is not an exceptional meeting. Every month, wherever we have gathered, in country church, town or city, for a period of over two years, we have enjoyed splendid attendance. I have mentioned the chicken dinner, and it was worth mentioning; but it does not matter much what the lunches are,—only that some refreshment is necessary,—the people come together for spiritual fellowship. And we have it, such as we never enjoyed in the old Convention or Association meetings, nor in the Pastors' and Deacons' meetings, nor even in the so-called 'prayer retreats'. Outside in the shed and yard, there was a most interesting assortment of cars from the 'high and mighty' all the way to the more venerable type known as Old Fords. These brought the people together from about sixteen churches,—Boston; Shenstone; Brantford; Brownsville; Courtland; Hughson Street and Immanuel, Hamilton; Hartford; Hespeler; Otterville; Scotland; Springfield; St. Thomas; Jarvis Street and Runnymede Road, Toronto; Walsh; Oxford St., Woodstock,—and from other places where as yet no associated church is formed,—Eden, Langton, Nixon, Simcoe and Straffordville.

"Our President, Pastor T. L. White, was unable to attend, being away for the funeral of a relative. He and the family were remembered in prayer. Pastor Bennett, of Otterville, presided. Several requests for prayer and praise were presented, some for the sick, others for churches. Then Pastor Bower brought to us a most powerful message on "The How and Why of Prayer". Many hearts were touched and consciences moved, while Brother Bower stressed the need

that we 'get down' before God. Then again a season of prayer and testimony followed before lunch.

"At the afternoon session invitations were received to meet with the churches at Springfield, Hughson Street and Boston, but Springfield was accepted for February. Pastor McNulty and his deacon, Mr. Misner, sang, "Marvellous Grace of Our Loving Lord". Then Mr. McNulty brought an earnest message on "The Things Spoken by Paul". In his message there was a note of certainty; Paul's was the same Bible as the Jews used, yet it was a different Book as illuminated under the teaching of Paul, when there were hearts opened by God to receive the truth. The Bible, thus used, brings the assurance of salvation, and satisfaction, and a blessed onward look toward Christ's coming again. The address was followed by a solo, "The Name of Jesus is So Sweet", by Miss Minkler, from Woodstock. About an hour in testimony and prayer preceded adjournment. At the close of the afternoon session Dr. Shields said what we all felt, 'How precious and blessed these simple meetings of Christian fellowship are, where Christ and the shed blood are honored'.

"The evening service began with a song service led by Pastor Guthrie, of Courtland. Two special messages in song were rendered in duets by Mr. and Mrs. Silverthorn, of Scotland, and by two of the Courtland young people. Dr. Shields' message was an exposition of salvation by grace through faith, based on Romans 4:16. The speaker clearly set aside superstition and credulity,—and showed that faith was only possible where there had been a self-revelation of God, that warranted trusting Him. Such revelation we have in the Living Word and in the written Word. Grace is God. Anything of man's works nullifies the principle of grace. And Faith is the only principle that can work harmoniously with grace. Faith always magnifies its object. This is why men hate salvation by grace: there is no glory for self in it.

"Now we are looking forward to the next meeting in Springfield, February the 11th."

WATFORD.

We regret to report that the church at Watford has been closed. Consequently, Rev. James Gibson is now open for supply work or a regular pastorate elsewhere.

THE INDIANA TRIAL.

Our brethren in the faith, the First Baptist Church of Indiana, Pa., have been haled to court, after the true apostolic fashion! As a matter of interest, and as a request for prayer, we give the following history of the case.

"About the year 1920, Pastor W. L. McKee of the First Regular Baptist Church of Indiana, Pa., led the church to reject the New World Movement, against the protest of a few members, who later withdrew from the church. Mr. McKee was followed as pastor by E. D. Ferguson in 1923, and Mr. Ferguson recommended to the church the fellowship of the Baptist Bible Union but the church never joined that organization, though about a dozen members did join

as individuals, and the church made some contributions to the work of the B. B. U.

"A group of people who had withdrawn from the church, brought a suit in equity against the church in 1923, asking that the building be given to them, as they were the church! This case was not brought to trial, as the plaintiffs asked permission to withdraw the suit, and agreed to pay expenses. Among the leading members of the church at that time, who denied the allegations made against us, were Joseph Weaver and C. C. Dinsmore.

"During Mr. Ferguson's pastorate a large number of persons withdrew from the church for various reasons, and had to have their names erased from our membership roll. Among the reasons for their withdrawal were the fact that our church refused to introduce worldly amusements, and worldly methods of money raising, personal dislike of the pastor, and perhaps in some cases the fact that we refused to support the denominational programme.

"Mr. Ferguson was succeeded by Arthur B. Fowler in September, 1928, and almost the very day of his arrival, a group of former members organized as 'The First Regular Baptist Church of Indiana, Pa.', taking our corporate name in the hope of later taking our buildings. This group went to the Indiana Baptist Association and to the Pennsylvania General Baptist Convention, and got themselves recognized as 'The First Regular Baptist Church of Indiana, Pa.', and then began to take legal proceedings culminating in the case now in court. The case occupied the attention of the court six days, and each side presented about twenty-one witnesses."

The testimony being all in, and the lawyers having presented their findings, the pastor sends us the following appeal: "Our case is to be argued, D. V., on January 27th., at 1:30 p.m. Please pray for us and ask the brethren to pray for us at that time".

WRITE TO THE MISSIONARIES.

Most people like to get letters; then they know that they are remembered. Contrary to the opinions that seem to be held by some, missionaries are quite human! We have been wishing that many of our readers, who have communication with our noble missionaries by way of the Throne above, would also communicate with them by way of the mails here below. Kind friend, you may not have met each of them, but you have read about them, and we are sure that they would find the day brighter and the work easier, were they to receive from you a note telling them that you love them and pray for them. Do it to-day; get paper and ink, and pen a letter to one of them at least. The address for Rev. A. J. Lewis, Rev. H. L. Davey and Mrs. H. L. Davey, is c/o Bank of British West Africa, Lower Buchanan, Grand Bassa County, Republic of Liberia, Africa. Be sure to put a P.S. on your letter,—not because you have forgotten something, but because you have remembered,—and let it be, "Don't bother to write me; I will hear from you through *The Gospel Witness*". Be sure also to put eight cents in postage on the letter.

Baptist Bible Union Lesson Leaf

Vol. 5.

No. 1.

REV. ALEX. THOMSON, Editor.

Lesson 6.

February 9th, 1930.

First Quarter.

CHRIST'S MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES.

Lesson Text: Revelation 2.

Golden Text: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God."—Rev. 2:7.

I. PROPHETIC OUTLINE.

In our Lord's message to the churches there is given the distinctive character of each local assembly, and in these in their due order there is portrayed in prophetic outline the character of the whole church age, showing the working of evil in the professing Christian body, and the struggle of true believers in the midst of adverse circumstances. In Ephesus with its loss of first love there is noted the commencement of spiritual decline beginning in the apostolic age, and in Laodicea the full fruit of this is seen in a lukewarm profession of Christianity, a condition prevalent in the present age.

II. EPHEBUS, (vs. 1-7).

Character of the Church, (vs. 1-3).

The title used by our Lord in each of His messages is taken from some particular phase of the vision depicted in the first chapter, and may be studied with profit in relation to the content of each message. In relation to the character of this church certain commendable things are stated. Its members were not idle, they laboured for the Lord's sake and fainted not. They manifested perseverance in the Lord's service. They also showed zeal on His behalf. They could not bear them which were evil, and they tried the false apostles and found them liars. There is no fault found with such activity and zeal, but more than this is required if we are to please our Lord and Master. There must be a proper motive. "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart"; (I Sam. 16:7).

The Complaint, (vs. 4, 5).

After the outward character of the church is stated the complaint is uttered. "Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee because thou hast left thy first love". In the sight of men this may not seem a very serious offence, but God looks upon the matter differently. Love for our Lord is the impelling motive of all true service, and when this is lacking, a less worthy motive is in its place. Backsliding begins in the heart before it is seen in the life. The warning is therefore given to this church to remember from whence it has fallen, and repent and do the first works or "else I will come unto thee quickly and will remove thy candlestick out of his place except thou repent". This was a church working for God but not with Him, (I Cor. 3:9). When a church gets out of touch with God the candlestick is withdrawn, and such a body is set aside, (I Cor.

9:27). Work may go on outwardly as usual or it may gradually die, but spiritual blessing is withheld until repentance is manifested. It should be noted that God is particular concerning the quality of the work, (I Cor. 3:10), also that churches as well as individuals require to repent of their sins.

The Commendation, (vs. 6, 7).

Our Lord does not forget to commend, even when complaining of that which is evil. "Thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes", He states, "which I also hate". The term Nicolaitanes denotes "people conquerors", and refers specifically not to any special sect, but rather to certain individuals who had exalted themselves in the assembly, the fore-runners of those who later divided the people of God into classes, as ministers and laity, etc. Believers are on one level in the church, and although a certain authority pertains to each office, this does not mean separation into classes. Note the universal application of the message, "He that hath an ear", and the blessed nature of the reward, "will I give to eat of the tree of life", etc.

III. SMYRNA, (vs. 8-11).

Two things, "tribulation" and "poverty" are especially noticeable in the reference to the church in Smyrna. This was a suffering church, being persecuted probably by the heathen and having to contend with blasphemers who said they were Jews and who were not, but were the synagogue of Satan. The latter were probably the harder with whom to deal. They were the servants of the devil masquerading as the children of God. There were some of this species extant in our Lord's day, (John 8:44), and there are many these days. They have a very thin veneer of religion, while at heart they are antagonistic to it, and they make it very hard at times for those who are of the real variety. 2. A predicting of further suffering in the future is made and encouragement is given not to fear on account of it. The instigator of the persecution is mentioned, "the devil"; the purpose is given, "that ye may be tried"; the duration of the tribulation is stated, "ten days", and the reward for faithfulness is promised, "I will give thee a crown of life". Suffering is not easy to bear, and its purpose is hard to understand while we are undergoing it; but God never allows anything to come upon us unnecessarily. "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose", (Rom. 8:28). The duration of the tribulation, "ten days", would seem to imply a short and stated time.

IV. PERGAMOS, (vs. 12-17).

Commendation, (vs. 12, 13).

The character of the place is first stated, "thou dwellest even where Satan's throne is", emphasizing the evil character of the place. Idolatry of a specially wicked nature was prevalent, evidencing the close proximity of the place to the author of all evil. In spite of this, however, the Lord's people held fast to His Name, and did not deny the faith even in a time of persecution, when a certain well known Christian was slain. God is able to keep His own in any place and under all circumstances, (Jude 24).

Complaint, (vs. 14, 15).

Notwithstanding the faithfulness manifested by this church to the name of the Lord, there are two distinct complaints made against it. First there were those within it who held the doctrine of Balaam. This hireling prophet was called by Balak to curse the Israelites, but being forbidden by God to do this, he informed the king how in a more subtle manner he could overcome the Lord's people in affecting their separated and pilgrim character, (Numbers 25:1, 2). The doctrine therefore would seem to be that of union with the world, the opposite of the separated Christian character, (II Cor. 6:14; 7:1). The second complaint relates to the presence of those who hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes implying evidently the teaching concerning the division into classes in the church, with the addition of certain other evil features of an unspiritual nature.

V. THYATIRA, (vs. 18-29).

Works, (vs. 18, 19).

"I know thy works and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience and thy works; and the last to be more than the first". In these words we have the picture of a real working church. There is much activity and love is also present with faith and patience. It would seem as if all the necessary qualifications of successful work were present, yet in spite of these there was that in the church of a serious nature which received our Lord's condemnation. This should make us most careful of the life of our assembly lest Satan gain a hold in our midst.

False Teaching, (vs. 20-23).

The complaint of the Lord is that in this church a certain false teacher was suffered to propagate her teaching. The name Jezebel by which she is designated reminds us of one in the Old Testament of the same name, the heathen wife of King Ahab of Israel, (I Kings 16:31). This woman was most wicked and succeeded in leading her husband's kingdom further into idolatry. Evidently there was someone in Thyatira doing a similar work and the church did not forbid her doing it. We learn from this that complacency in the presence of evil is condemned by God. No evil should be condoned in the assembly of God's people. Idolatry is present in certain sections of the professed Christian church these days, wherein images and men receive the worship which should be given to God. This is wicked and calls for repentance. Note the threat of judgment for this sin.

Exhortation, (vs. 24-29).

The message to this church though severe in its condemnation of sin is tender in its exhortation and promise of reward to the faithful, "Hold fast till I come", they are exhorted. There is the wonderful expectancy of our Lord's return, and His desire that His people remain true to Him till then. Then there is the promise to the overcomer of some day ruling with the Lord over the nations. The future is bright though the present may at times seem dull. The incentive to faithful service is very great. May we act accordingly.