

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, Canada.

Vol. 9. No. 5.

TORONTO, JUNE 19th, 1930.

Whole No. 422.

Why is McMaster Sending Prof. Marshall Back to England?

In our issue of January 2nd we reported that Professor L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, had been called to Victoria Road Baptist Church, Leicester, England. We had information at the time which made us sure that Professor Marshall would accept the call to Victoria Road. In our issue of January 23rd we published an article entitled, "The Significance of Professor L. H. Marshall's Leaving McMaster". We now write to acquaint our readers with the true story of Professor Marshall's departure.

The *Toronto Daily Star* of December 26th last published interviews both with Professor Marshall and Chancellor Whidden, and made its own comments upon the prospect of Professor Marshall's departure. Commenting upon Professor Marshall's going, *The Star* said:

"Professor Marshall's coming to McMaster in 1925, it will be remembered, was seized upon by the fundamentalist group in the Baptist denomination as further evidence of McMaster's apostasy, and a violent attack upon the university and the new professor followed. Prof. Marshall's brilliant platform gifts, his evident sincerity and fine Christian character were great factors in the victory won by the university in the bitter three-year controversy, which finally resulted in complete victory for the university and the formation of a new denomination by the fundamentalists. Dr. Shields, head of the new body, has never admitted permanent defeat, and has prophesied repeatedly that he would some day drive Prof. Marshall out of Canada. The latter's acceptance of the Leicester call would undoubtedly be interpreted by the fundamentalist chieftain as a personal victory."

The Star, it will be observed, credits Professor Marshall with having contributed to McMaster's "complete victory", and, at the same time, refers to "the formation of a new denomination by the Fundamentalists" as one of the "results" of Professor Marshall's presence in McMaster.

The Star reported Chancellor Whidden as having spoken as follows:

"Professor Marshall's leaving McMaster at the present time is unthinkable", said Chancellor H. P. Whidden, "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."

Chancellor Whidden's Statement.

Before we go farther, we must deal with Chancellor Whidden's statement. He rightly acknowledged "the services already rendered the University" by Professor Marshall,—if, indeed, it was a service to assist the University in its utterly wicked course which involved the violation both of the letter and the spirit of its charter. Beyond all question, Professor Marshall helped them to do that. We do not mean to say that Professor Marshall came to Canada to do it, but that the Professor's position on the University's staff involved such violation because of his theological position.

But Chancellor Whidden says that "Professor Marshall's leaving McMaster at the present time is unthinkable". We charge that when Chancellor Whidden said that he must have known that he was stating what was contrary to fact. The Professor's leaving was not only not "unthinkable": it was altogether "thinkable", because the authorities of McMaster University were "thinking" of that very thing—and had been thinking of it for a good while.

Chancellor Whidden said further:

"I am confident every member of the board and senate feels just as strongly as I do."

We declare emphatically, on the basis of facts within our knowledge, that "every member of the Board and Senate" did *not* feel as Chancellor Whidden professed to feel. On the contrary, we affirm that Professor Marshall was officially informed, or informed by an official, or told by one or more who was or were not without membership on the Senate of McMaster University, that he did not enjoy the confidence of the churches of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, and was advised to accept the call to Leicester.

WE HEREBY CHALLENGE CHANCELLOR H. P. WHIDDEN TO DARE TO DENY THE TRUTH OF THIS STATEMENT.

Again, Chancellor Whidden says:

"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."

Again, we affirm that whatever may or not be true of the McMaster Faculty, the Governing Bodies of McMaster University and the Convention officials whose duty it is to get money from the churches, were *not* "disappointed" when they heard that Professor Marshall was returning to England,—unless, indeed, a man may be said to be "disappointed" when another person does exactly what he has been told to do!

WE CHALLENGE CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN TO DARE TO ATTEMPT TO PROVE HIS ALLEGATION THAT "WE" (PRESUMABLY THE GOVERNING BODIES OF McMASTER, OR THE CONVENTION OFFICIALS) ARE "DISAPPOINTED" BY PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S RETURNING TO ENGLAND.

Once more, Chancellor Whidden says:

"Professor Marshall has won all along the line."

If by that the Chancellor means that the delegations from the churches to the Convention were manipulated by Convention officials and members of McMaster Alumni, and that afterwards the Convention vote was managed in such a way as would put terror into the hearts of the timid and compel a reluctant acquiescence in the will of the Baptist Soviet dictators, Professor Marshall may be said to have "won all along the line"; but if to "win" in such a case means to earn the confidence and hearty, prayerful, and financial support of the rank and file of the members of the churches, and if the "fruits of victory" consist in the solid and joyous support of united churches in a united Convention, then Professor Marshall has "won" nowhere, and there are no "fruits of victory".

WE CHALLENGE CHANCELLOR H. P. WHIDDEN TO PROVE THAT THE MODERNISTS OF McMASTER, PROFESSOR MARSHALL INCLUDED, HAVE WON ANYTHING BUT THE DISTRUST OF EVERY LOVER OF THE BIBLE, OR THAT THEY HAVE ACHIEVED ANY VICTORY THAT HAS ANY SPIRITUAL VALUE.

Who Was The Little Bird?

Many of our readers, especially those in the old Convention who do not like us, while they will openly loudly declare that this article is not true, privately will enquire among themselves, "How in the world did he find it out?" To all such we venture to say, It is useless for them to enquire. Did you ever throw a piece of bread into your garden when food was scarce and multitudes of sparrows were roundabout, and see them, like a cloud, pounce down upon it, and quickly rise, leaving the ground bare of the bread you had thrown? Who will dare to swear which sparrow got the piece of bread? Were our sanctum like Noah's ark, visited by a solitary dove with an olive leaf plucked off, it would not be difficult to identify that single bird; but, as we have before said, our *Gospel Witness* office is very much like Jack Miner's

bird sanctuary: it is a place to which all sorts of birds love to come. And, being of a naturally tender disposition, whenever we hear that little "Tweet! Tweet!" at the window, we find it impossible to harden our heart against that appeal. Therefore we let the little bird in.

By the way, talking about birds, someone told us the other day of finding a robin in the garden that had apparently fallen out of the nest. It hadn't many feathers, and it hadn't any mother to look after it, and it was not strong enough to dig its own worms; so this compassionate lady had pity on the bird and fed it, until now it is a lovely robin that sometimes perches in the trees during the daytime, but always comes indoors at night.

Suppose that robin had been a pigeon with a homing instinct, would you wonder if, after roaming abroad, it should come home again bringing messages from the seat of war?

"Tweet! Tweet!"

Oh, but we have had all sorts of birds come to see us. In fact, one little bird came not long ago and said, "Tweet! Tweet!"—and we let the little bird in. And the little bird said—in bird language, of course, which we translate something like this: "We have been something like a sparrow on the housetop, or like a pelican in the wilderness; we have been in strange company. We have seen unusual sights, and have heard extraordinary words. But in the bird conference which we attended, or in the bird conversations we were forced to hear, it was understood that all that was said must be regarded as strictly confidential, and nothing must be repeated. And of course that confidence forbids my even saying where I have been, or what I have heard; and I can only say this, that I would give a great deal to be free to tell you."

We said to that little bird, "Do not violate that confidence for the world. It would be dishonourable in you to repeat it, or in me to listen to it; knowing that the tale was confidentially told. But, on the other hand, if you will sit on your perch for a little while I will tell you all the little bird told you." So this little bird put its wise little head on one side and listened,—and we told that little bird exactly where he had been, and all he had heard, and what he had seen, and what he was pledged not to tell, saying, "So that you see we know all about it without your telling us." And that little bird replied, "I think I shall not be violating anybody's confidence if, after hearing what you have said, I simply remark, You are dead right."

That is really the wonderful thing about our *Gospel Witness* radio. It is a different sort of radio from any that ever was known. Its wave length is a secret, and nobody knows how to tune in—or, perhaps what is more to the purpose, how to tune out! We are sorry often to have to disappoint many of our little birds, for when they come so gleefully with their "Tweet! Tweet!", to tell us something that is entirely new, it is almost unkind to have to say, "You are altogether too late; that news has already been received."

That Other Little Bird Still Unidentified.

Some time ago we told the story of a little bird that heard two Convention officials talking, Rev. R. R.

McKay and Mr. W. C. Senior; and we understand the old Convention has had a veritable army of bird-catchers trying to put some salt on our little bird's tail. But for their information, we here record that they have not got within leagues of where he lives, and their guesses as to the identity of our little bird are so far from the facts that they would need an astronomer's rule to measure the distance; or perhaps an understanding of Einstein's theory of relativity. We have said this simply to save the time and ammunition of foolish Convention officials who would go gunning for little birds.

Sherlock Holmes Outclassed.

Some day, if ever we can get a holiday, we may be tempted, if not to "drop into poetry", at least to drop into historical fiction. If ever we do the story we shall tell will make Sherlock Holmes look like a blundering town-crier or a village gossip. We are sure we have material enough at our command, growing out of the last nine years' experience, to write a series of detective stories that would thrill the ecclesiastical world. Who knows? perhaps we may do it.

Why Is Professor Marshall Leaving McMaster?

But to get back to business, Why is Professor Marshall leaving McMaster?

First of all, it may be useful to enquire whether this is a sudden decision, or whether he has from the beginning entertained the idea that his stay in Canada was only temporary and likely to be of short duration.

Professor Marshall's First Speech.

In his first speech, at the Stanley Avenue Convention, Hamilton, October 21st, 1925, Professor Marshall, among other things, said:

"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."

Poor "Little Frog No. 2"!

It seems to us that it is scarcely fair for McMaster University to permit "little frog number two" to turn the cream into a pat of butter, and then, without letting him have so much as a taste of it—that is, as Chancellor Whidden would say, "to share the fruits of victory", to permit little frog number two "gracefully to leap out".

In that same address Professor Marshall said:

"But let me say, if there is a change in my theological convictions and outlook, you may rely on me as a man of honour to resign my position at once."

Has Professor Marshall Changed?

Has Professor Marshall changed his convictions? If he has, no such reason as that has been assigned for his resignation either by himself or his friends.

Professor Marshall's First Ave. Speech.

In his speech before the First Avenue Convention, October 19th, 1926, Professor Marshall began his address with these words:

Mr. Moderator and fellow delegates of this Convention: It is very kind of you to give me so hearty a welcome and to show me beforehand that I have not forfeited the confidence which you reposed in me last year.

I am sure you will all agree that I have had a most extraordinary welcome into Canada.—(Laughter)—In fact I have thought again and again of an instance referred to and illustrated in that English comic journal, Punch, some time ago. A man was paying a visit to his friend, and no sooner had he got to the garden gate than his friend's dog advanced to greet him in a rather aggressive manner, and the visitor hesitated to go forward until his friend came to the front door and said, "Now, come along, never mind, he won't hurt you." And the visitor noticed that although the dog was barking very furiously he was wagging his tail just as vigorously, so he called out to his friend and said, "I don't know which end of the beast to believe."—(Laughter and applause.)

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.

But we must give honour where honour is due, and I think I ought here to express my thanks to Dr. Shields for many great services which he has done me, unwittingly. In the first place he has been my publicity agent; I have had wonderful congregations wherever I have gone.—(Laughter and applause)... (The emphases in the foregoing are ours.)

It is becoming increasingly evident that Professor Marshall believed the wrong end of the beast! He thought that when McMaster wagged its tail, it was welcoming him; but apparently he has had a taste of the other end of the dog!

Who Has Frightened Professor Marshall Away?

We agree with his sentiment: "It is very hard to frighten an Englishman away." Who has frightened Professor Marshall away? Why is he leaving? Will Chancellor Whidden please tell us? We are grateful to Professor Marshall for his expressed appreciation of our great service in serving as his publicity agent, but if he has had "wonderful congregations" wherever he has gone, why is he leaving "those wonderful congregations" to go back to England where the churches are nearly empty? Surely Walmer Road is looking for a minister who can assemble "wonderful congregations", and as we have made Professor Marshall so famous wherever he goes that "wonderful congregations" gather to hear him, why should he leave them? Why does not Walmer Road Church call Professor Marshall?

Again in that same speech Professor Marshall said:

"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."

Why Should a Lion Run Away?

Why should a man with the strength and boldness of two lions run away from a quiet little mouse like the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*?

In his First Avenue speech Professor Marshall, referring to the statement of his belief which he had made formerly, said:

"It was satisfactory to Dr. John MacNeill, it was satisfactory to Dr. Farmer, and I do not think I need worry about it being satisfactory to anybody else."

Has He Discovered MacNeill Is Not The Churches?

Has Professor Marshall discovered that Dr. MacNeill and the late Dr. Farmer were not the whole Convention?

And has he discovered that that which was satisfactory to Drs. Farmer and MacNeill is most unsatisfactory to the rank and file of the members of the churches of the Ontario and Quebec Convention? If not, why is he leaving? Certainly not because of a superior attraction in Victoria Road Church, Leicester. We dealt with that in our article back in January, wherein we showed that it is a still smaller church than that which Professor Marshall left to come to Canada.

Once more, in that speech Professor Marshall said:

"The Convention agreed last year to my staying. If the Convention had not agreed to my staying, I should have gone; but I am not going. I have no desire to set this Convention at defiance; I will be governed by the Convention absolutely; but I will not be dismissed by a minority of the Convention. And I say this in the presence of the Convention: As long as the Senate stands by me I will stand by the Senate."

Does Not The Convention Want Professor Marshall?

Let us examine that statement a little. The Convention of Ontario and Quebec has not by formal vote requested Professor Marshall's departure. So far as the Convention was concerned Professor Marshall was quite right in assuming that he was wanted in Canada. But *ever since he came here we have been trying to tell him that the Convention does not represent the rank and file of the members of the churches.* We have repeatedly affirmed that at least ninety per cent. of the members of the churches were doctrinally sound; and we reaffirm our conviction that if the churches of the Convention had been merely given the facts, and had been permitted to express their judgment on the basis of the facts, if the churches had not been politically manipulated in the most unscrupulous fashion by the agents of McMaster University, if such delegations to the Conventions as were prepared in advance to vote for McMaster and anything McMaster advocated whether it was right or wrong, had not been secured by methods of which Tammany Hall in its worst days, and on its lowest level, would have been ashamed, Professor Marshall would have known as long ago as 1925 that his theological position would never be acceptable to the churches of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

The London Convention Resolution.

The churches of Ontario and Quebec expressed themselves, very clearly at London in 1924, when they condemned the action of McMaster University in honouring Dr. Faunce, and refused a vote of confidence to McMaster University. Professor Marshall was deliberately brought to Canada for the purpose of reversing that verdict, and of re-opening the question by making the issue a human personality instead of an abstract principle.

We pleaded with the authorities of McMaster University, through *The Witness* and later in the Senate, while as yet the vacant chairs had not been filled, to deal with principles apart from personalities; and to

take such a course as would absolutely ensure that only sound men should be appointed. Our advice was utterly disregarded, and the Baptist Soviet minority brought Professor Marshall here for no other purpose in the world but to use him as a cat's paw to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. They have so used him, and now he finds himself dismissed.

Refused to Be Dismissed By a Minority of the Convention.

In that speech, as we have already quoted, he said:

"I will not be dismissed by a minority of the Convention."

By whom is he being dismissed? Twelve thousand Baptist church members at least have left the Convention because of his presence in it. Dr. MacNeill and others have since glowingly described the wonderful unity of the Convention. The Editor of this paper, his church of more than two thousand members, and at least ten thousand other church members, no longer have a vote in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. Who, then, is driving Professor Marshall out?

Majority of Convention Opposed to Prof. Marshall.

We shall later show that Professor Marshall has discovered that what we have all along contended is true, and that the majority in the old Convention, even when twelve thousand members have withdrawn, are utterly opposed to his theological position. Had it been possible we would have saved him the humiliation of this late discovery. We take second place to no man in our knowledge of the general doctrinal position of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec. They are waking up. They are being heard from. And they will make themselves heard more and more distinctly and emphatically in the future.

Will Stand By Senate As Long As It Stands By Him.

But once more: in that speech Professor Marshall said:

"I say this in the presence of the Convention: as long as the Senate stands by me I will stand by the Senate."

What will the Senate say to this? They surely will not charge Professor Marshall with not being a man of his word. We have not agreed with Professor Marshall's theological position. Doctrinally, we are not aware that we have anything in common with him. But we have sympathized with him profoundly from the beginning. We knew the temper and the character of the aggregation he was dealing with. We knew that they would use him—or anyone else—as the Sanhedrin did Iscariot, to accomplish their purposes, and respond to any complaint by saying, "What is that to us? see thou to that."

Professor Marshall Too Straightforward.

That may be an unfortunate comparison, but it is the only one we can think of. We use it because it describes the contemptible character of the Sanhedrin, ancient and modern. As for Professor Marshall: he has not been anyone's betrayer. We repeat: we do not agree with him, but he has at least been absolutely straightforward and sincere. In fact, we suppose that that is the complaint the enemy has against

him. Had he learned to be as tricky, as deceptive, as utterly untruthful, as the McMaster Soviet, he would have been more acceptable to them, and might have been permitted to serve them longer. But Professor Marshall apparently supposed that when they insisted that his position was in agreement with the position of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec, they were telling the truth. He therefore preached what he believed openly and without reserve, with the result that there are comparatively few Baptist pulpits in the old Convention open to him.

Senate Did Not "Stand By" Prof. Marshall.

Be that as it may, Professor Marshall promised to "stand by the Senate" as long as the Senate would stand by him. Now he has resigned his professorship to return to England. One thing is beyond question: Professor Marshall has not broken his word. *He is leaving because the Senate is no longer standing by him.*

Again we ask, Why? What has he done? In what respect has he changed his views? At what point does the Professor Marshall of to-day differ from the Professor Marshall of the Stanley Avenue Convention, or of the First Avenue Convention, or of the Temple Convention?

ONCE MORE WE CHALLENGE CHANCELLOR H. P. WHIDDEN TO DARE PUBLICLY TO SAY THAT THE SENATE HAS STOOD BY PROFESSOR MARSHALL, AND MADE ANY EFFORT, AS A BODY, TO PERSUADE HIM TO RETAIN HIS CHAIR IN McMASTER UNIVERSITY.

Be careful, Chancellor, please, for your own sake. Let us advise you, we are not going to report in this article all that the little birds have said.

ONCE MORE WE CHALLENGE CHANCELLOR H. P. WHIDDEN TO DARE PUBLICLY TO SAY THAT THE SENATE HAS STOOD BY PROFESSOR MARSHALL, AND MADE ANY EFFORT, AS A BODY, TO PERSUADE HIM TO RETAIN HIS CHAIR IN McMASTER UNIVERSITY.

Prof. Marshall Declared He Would Stay 17 Years.

Following his declaration that he would stand by the Senate, Professor Marshall said:

"This fight, I understand, is to go on for another seventeen years in all probability. Well, remember, if God spares my life, I will be here too."

Professor Marshall said that on October 19th, 1926. *The Gospel Witness* containing this article will bear date of June 19th, 1930, or *exactly three years and eight months from the day in which Professor Marshall said that, his life being spared, he expected to be still here to carry on the fight, if necessary, for seventeen years!*

Why Is He Leaving 13 Years Short of Date Mentioned?

Why is Professor Marshall leaving Canada exactly thirteen years and four months short of the date on which he said if he were living he would still be here? *The Gospel Witness* and Jarvis Street Church, and the ten thousand members who formed the new Union, with other scattered groups of perhaps a couple of thousands more, would frankly acknowledge they have done nothing to retain Professor Marshall in this country. But he

was going to remain in spite of us. We respectfully ask Chancellor Whidden why Professor Marshall is being permitted to leave?

"Do You Love Me Or Do You Love Me Not?"

At the Temple Church Convention in 1927 Professor Marshall said:

"Well, here am I again before this Convention for the third time, with the same old question: Do you love me or do you love me not? Do you wish me to stay or do you not?"

Twice Offered to Resign.

In that speech—which, by the way, was made after the Convention had adopted the Amending Bill and declared Jarvis Street Church no longer eligible to send delegates,—Professor Marshall said:

"I am told that I am the sole cause of all the trouble during the last two years. I think that is really too absurd to need any refutation from me. The controversy was here before I came, and if I were to withdraw the controversy would remain.—(Hear, hear)—There might be a slight lull in the storm, but in a very short time it would break out in a new fury, unless the man appointed as my successor won the approval of the recalcitrant minority.—(applause)—

"Then again, I am accused of refusing to resign. I think I can call this Convention to witness that I have twice offered to resign on certain conditions. I make that offer again publicly. I offer to resign if this Convention wishes. All I refuse to do is to be dismissed, as I said last year, by a minority.—(applause)—Therefore my position, I think, is thoroughly constitutional and perfectly in order. And after all, if a man has to resign his position because only 70 per cent. of the people in this Convention support him, I want to know what servants of the Convention will be left. We shall all have to resign. That is just the position."

"Are My Views In Harmony With Charter?"

Again in the same speech Professor Marshall said:

"The real issue is this—and I want if I can to make it clear; and if you are not satisfied with the statement when I have done, I will hand my resignation to the Chancellor this afternoon—the real issue is this: Are my views on the Bible in harmony with the charter? We generally say 'the charter' though, as a legal gentleman pointed out to me the other day, strictly we should talk about the trust deed. But everybody talks about the charter, so I will."

If Still "In Harmony", Why Is He Asked To Leave?

The question we venture here to ask is, Are the views of Professor Marshall still in harmony with the charter; and if they are, Why is he asked to leave McMaster?

"Alleged Authority of Bible".

Once more, in the same speech Professor Marshall said:

"The Bible is not a text book of science. It is authoritative in the realm of religion and of our moral and religious practices. And I hold it is dangerous—you can send me back to England for this if you like—I hold it is dangerous and fatal to the cause of religion among men to pit the alleged authority of the Bible on such matters against established scientific facts.

"I am not saying anything now which I have not committed to print—and committed to print with the full approval of Dr. Farmer and Dr. MacNeill."

Is Professor Marshall being sent back to England for that? He certainly stated his views with the utmost frankness both before the Convention, and, as he says, in print. And, as though they were the oracles, he declares he had done this with the approval both of Dr. Farmer and Dr. MacNeill. Still the Convention voted approval of his position.

Churches Waking Up.

But now that little by little the people of the churches have found out what Professor Marshall believes and teaches, and that he believes the Bible may be found untrue to "established scientific facts", have the sentiments of the rank and file of our Baptist church members been so expressing themselves through the Treasurer's books? And has that led the few liberal givers who put their contributions through the churches to which they belong, in order to disguise their personal character and make it appear that the churches were supporting the Convention—have these liberal givers refused longer to take the place of old-fashioned Baptists who will not give because such heresies are being propagated? All these things coming to pass, are they sending Professor Marshall back to England for that?

Convention Approved Prof. Marshall.

But did the Convention consistently approve Professor Marshall's position? It would interest our readers, if our space permitted us to quote from all the speeches delivered at the various Conventions in support of Professor Marshall. (It may also interest our readers to know that as we write, our desk is piled high with a stenographic report of every speech delivered on the subject from 1925 forward, both at Associations and at Conventions,—and that, in duplicate. What a library we have on, *The Art or Science of Religious Controversy!*) Our space, however, forbids that we should quote all these speeches. We may be tempted to dip into a few of them before we get through, because, when one sits long at the table, even after the meal is finished, if there should be left a dish of radishes or celery or olives within reach, one may be tempted to take an extra one. And there are such delicious appetizers in the speeches of Dr. MacNeill and some others, that we may be tempted to quote a few lines.

But first of all we set out here the clause in each separate resolution passed by successive Conventions in which the Convention commits itself to Professor Marshall's position.

From The Stanley Avenue Convention Resolution.

"This Convention commends the Senate and Board of Governors for their action in appointing to the chair of Practical Theology a Professor who, having considered that Declaration, sincerely accepted it."

From The First Avenue Convention Resolution.

"This Convention affirms its strong confidence in . . . Professor Marshall, and assures (him) of its sympathetic support in the work of Christian Education in McMaster University."

The Chairman of the Board of Governors on Professor Marshall.

Mr. Albert Matthews Before the Senate.

When Professor Marshall's appointment was under discussion in the Senate in 1925, Mr. Albert Matthews, among other things said:

"We paid the expense of Mr. Marshall out here, we were so nervous and anxious about his position then. And we were absolutely satisfied . . . I do not think the Senate is called upon to go over the ground again which they covered so completely before."

But they have gone over the ground again. Apparently they have discovered they had not covered the ground as thoroughly as was necessary.

Mr. Albert Matthews At Stanley Avenue.

At the Stanley Avenue Convention in 1925, Mr. Albert Matthews, Chairman of the Board of Governors, spoke in part as follows:

"Before adjournment of the debate this afternoon I myself and the other members of the Board of Governors who were present heard with the rest of the delegates the statement made that the Board of Governors was removed from the heart of the churches, or words to that effect; that we were not interpreting the thought and mind and spirit of the churches in our administration of the responsibilities to which you have nominated us.

"We feel very badly at a charge of this kind being made on the floor of this Convention. . . . I can only speak for myself, but I have the impression from my brethren also, that in the whole body of churches you will not find a body of men sounder in the faith than the men constituting the Board of Governors."

(We shall have something to say on this point a little later, but we call attention to the fact that Mr. Matthews also insisted that the Board of Governors, in the appointment of Professor Marshall, was rightly interpreting the spirit of the Convention.)

Later in the same speech, Mr. Matthews said:

"Now, sir, I feel personally greatly humiliated by this Marshall episode. I know my personal feelings mean nothing to the delegates of this Convention. I was personally responsible for making the introduction. I made enquiries throughout England and I found Mr. Marshall was just as I am myself in point of belief, as far as I could discover, and I think I can go as deep as most laymen, and I would fellowship our brother at any time and place."

IN VIEW OF THE FOREGOING, WHY HAS MR. ALBERT MATTHEWS CONSENTED TO PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S LEAVING McMASTER?

Mr. Matthews complained that it was contended that the Board of Governors were not properly interpreting the mind of the churches, and that he felt very badly on that account. He accepts responsibility for introducing Professor Marshall. He tells us he made full enquiry in England, and had conversation with Mr. Marshall himself; and discovered that they occupied practically the same ground theologically. And in the confidence that Professor Marshall was in harmony with the churches of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, Mr. Matthews has consistently and persistently supported him, while denouncing his critics as slanderers, blockaders, and we know not what else.

WE VENTURE RESPECTFULLY TO ASK MR. MATTHEWS IN WHAT RESPECT MR. MARSHALL HAS CHANGED?

And if he has not changed, and McMaster University is enlarging its sphere of operations and is not reducing the size of its Faculty,

WHY IS PROFESSOR MARSHALL PERMITTED TO LEAVE McMASTER?

In his Hamilton speech, Mr. Matthews scathingly denounced the Editor of this paper for holding up their Forward Movement Programme. In fact, every bit of the Denomination's trouble was laid at our door. Mr. Matthews supported the Amending Bill, in 1927, giving the Convention power to deprive Jarvis Street Church of the right to send delegates to

the Convention. The Pastor of Jarvis Street and from ten to twelve thousand Baptist church members are out of the Convention, so that we cannot be blamed for Professor Marshall's removal. But now that all the trouble-makers are outside of the Convention, this professorial paragon, this academic incarnation of all Baptist virtues, is not only permitted to leave McMaster, but actually invited to do so!

When the report of Professor Marshall's having been called to Leicester was first published, and the Professor was interviewed, he said he had not yet decided whether he would go or not. Mr. Albert Matthews, the Board of Governors, and the whole Senate, as well as the Chancellor, knew that Professor Marshall had the Leicester call under consideration. In view of Mr. Matthews's conviction that Professor Marshall was actually a Canadian Baptist grown in England, so true to the Canadian Baptist position that it was in agreement with the position occupied by Mr. Matthews himself—

IN VIEW, WE SAY, OF MR. MATTHEW'S STRENUOUS SUPPORT OF PROFESSOR MARSHALL FOR FOUR YEARS, WHAT DID MR. MATTHEWS DO IN ORDER TO PREVAIL UPON PROFESSOR MARSHALL TO REMAIN IN McMASTER.

We offer Mr. Matthews a whole issue of *The Gospel Witness* in which to answer our question, and

WE CHALLENGE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS TO SAY OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE THAT EITHER THE BOARD AS SUCH, OR THE SENATE AS SUCH, OR HIMSELF AS CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, DID EVER DO ONE SOLITARY THING TO KEEP PROFESSOR MARSHALL AT HIS POST IN McMASTER UNIVERSITY.

There is only one possible answer to this challenge. The Board of Governors did nothing to keep him. What they, or some members did, to induce him to go, is another question. But they did nothing to keep him. We therefore ask,

WHAT CHANGE HAS TAKEN PLACE IN THE OLD CONVENTION TO EFFECT SO COMPLETE A CHANGE OF ATTITUDE ON THE PART OF THE GOVERNING BODIES OF McMASTER THAT THEY NOT ONLY DID NOT INSIST UPON HIS REMAINING IN CANADA, BUT DIPLOMATICALLY ENCOURAGED HIS ACCEPTANCE OF THE CALL TO LEICESTER. WILL MR. ALBERT MATTHEWS PLEASE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS?

What Part Does Dr. MacNeill Play in This?

We have already quoted Professor Marshall's speech at First Avenue in which, having referred to his statement of belief, he said:

"It was satisfactory to Dr. MacNeill. It was satisfactory to Dr. Farmer. And I do not think I need worry about it being satisfactory to anybody else."

In this statement Professor Marshall was undoubtedly correct. Evidence abounds that Dr. MacNeill had expressed complete satisfaction in Professor Marshall. Indeed, we doubt if Dr. MacNeill has ever been so enthusiastic about any other man in all the world—with the possible exception of Dr. MacNeill himself.

Dr. MacNeill's First Avenue Speech.

In his speech before the First Avenue Convention, Dr. MacNeill said:

"Now, about Professor Marshall, let me say that I believe he has given abundant evidences of his absolute loyalty to our Baptist position.—(Applause)—Just listen to me while I put the facts before you, and they are these. Before ever Professor Marshall left England a year ago last July to come over and look over the situation and meet a committee of the Senate appointed to meet him, the whole declaration of our trust was put into his hands, and he accepted that without reservation. Had he not been able to accept it he should never have taken his voyage across the Atlantic to meet us. He gave himself without qualification to the declaration that is within the trust deed of the University.

Dr. Shields attacked his appointment, as you know, upon the flimsy rumours of an unknown man at that time in the Old Land. Well, those have all been exploded and rejected, those rumours from the Old Land. But listen. Just to make assurance doubly sure Professor Marshall did what he was not called upon to do at all. Last year at our Convention he stood before our people and in a frank and open way he made the confession of his faith, and gave himself unreservedly to the declaration of it. . . .

Ah, my friends, as I think of the last year in relation to Professor Marshall, it seems to me that nothing has been more palpably unjust and more pitifully pathetic than the way in which Professor Marshall's opponents have been driven from pillar to post and from one position to another in a vain attempt to find out some count against him. Listen! The charge was made first of all that he did not believe in the new birth, in regeneration. That was exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge was made that he preached a bloodless gospel. That has been exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge was made that he denied the physical resurrection of Jesus. That has been exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge has been made that he did not accept the authority of the Word of God as the inspired truth of God. That has been exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge has been made that he denied the supernatural from end to end. That had been exploded, and something else had to be found. He was charged also with denying the necessity of baptism as a prerequisite for church membership. That has been exploded too. He did deny the necessity of baptism as a prerequisite for salvation, as every true Baptist will do; but he holds to baptism as a prerequisite for membership in the church.

But here is the point I make. Here is a man who stands absolutely foursquare on, say, the five great central facts of the gospel: the deity of our Lord Jesus; the virgin birth of Christ; the vicarious suffering of Christ as effecting the atonement and the reconciliation between God and man; the miracle, the physical miracle of the resurrection of the living Christ; and the Bible as the inspired word of God, as the last and final authority for all faith and practice.

That man stands foursquare upon those essentials of the gospel of Christ, and what I want to ask you to-day, you who have the final decision, is this: Do you want this gospel driven out of McMaster University? (Cries of No!) Dr. Shields has declared that it is his avowed determination that he will drive this man with his gospel out of McMaster University and he will not cease his agitation until it is done."

Professor Marshall and Dr. MacNeill.

These quotations are sufficient proof that Professor Marshall had good ground for saying that his statement of belief was satisfactory to Dr. John MacNeill.

WE, THEREFORE, ASK DR. MacNEILL WHY, AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS, HE CONSENTED TO PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S LEAVING McMASTER; WHY, INDEED, HE MADE NO EFFORT TO RETAIN HIM? We offer Dr. MacNeill all necessary space in *The Gospel Witness* in which to state why, after having lauded Professor Marshall to the skies as the very embodiment of all that was Baptist, only two years later he consents to Professor Marshall's leaving McMaster University.

Professor Marshall Unchanged.

One thing is absolutely certain: Professor Marshall has not changed. What change, therefore, has necessitated Professor Marshall's leaving? We will go farther, and

CHALLENGE DR. MacNEILL TO EXPLAIN WHY HE ALLOWED HIMSELF TO BE ELECTED TO A POSITION TO WHICH, BY ALL THE RULES OF THE GAME, PROFESSOR MARSHALL OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN PROMOTED?

In explaining his own acceptance of the headship of the Theological Department of McMaster University, Dr. MacNeill declared that the offer had been before him for a year. Obviously, therefore, sentence was passed upon Professor Marshall a year before he was executed.

THE SUMMING UP.

In the quotations we have given in this article, we have shown that Professor Marshall was endorsed by Chancellor Whidden, by Mr. Albert Matthews, by Dr. John MacNeill (and, of course, by Dr. Farmer, to whose many speeches we have made no reference here) and by successive votes of the Convention. We have shown also that Professor Marshall had evidently made up his mind to make Canada his home, and promised that if the controversy lasted for seventeen years, and his life were spared, he would be in it to the end. It is a matter of general knowledge that no statement has been issued by Professor Marshall to indicate any change of view on his part.

WE, THEREFORE, PUT THIS QUESTION TO CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN, MR. ALBERT MATTHEWS, TO DR. JOHN MacNEILL, AS INDIVIDUALS, AND TO THE SENATE AND BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY AS GOVERNING BODIES, IN VIEW OF THE SUPERLATIVELY EXPRESSED SATISFACTION OF ALL CONCERNED, WHY IS PROFESSOR MARSHALL LEAVING McMASTER UNIVERSITY?

What Does Professor Marshall's Leaving Indicate?

Does it mean that those who dictate the policies of McMaster University have changed theologically? have

become more evangelical? and now find themselves out of harmony with Professor Marshall's position? If that were so, Professor Marshall's leaving would be a happy augury. How we should rejoice to publish such good news! But that is impossible. McMaster University is as definitely and determinedly committed to a Modernistic programme as ever. Indeed, in the list of new appointees there is one who is worse than Professor Marshall ever was. Dr. Roy Benson has reached about the end of the Modernistic road. Dr. Benson repudiates the blood atonement, as his address at Parkdale some years ago proved. Let anybody ask Dr. Benson if he believes in a supernatural religion, whether he believes there is any value in prayer. No student will ever be strengthened in his evangelical position by the teaching of Dr. Roy Benson.

Therefore the Senate of McMaster cannot have consented or encouraged Professor Marshall's departure because his theological position was unacceptable to the Governing Bodies, for they immediately appointed another professor who far surpasses Professor Marshall in his Modernism.

Has Dr. Shields Driven Professor Marshall Out?

What, then, is the explanation of the University's attitude? Can it be possible that Dr. Shields has driven this man out of McMaster University? Hear Dr. MacNeill again:

"That man (Marshall) stands foursquare upon those essentials of the gospel of Christ, and what I want to ask you to-day, you who have the final decision, is this: Do you want this gospel driven out of McMaster University? (Cries of No!) Dr. Shields has declared that it is his avowed determination that he will drive this man with his gospel out of McMaster University and he will not cease his agitation until it is done."

And in the same speech Dr. MacNeill said:

"Let me give Dr. Shields the assurance this afternoon that now the issue has been joined we are prepared to fight to the last drop of blood in our veins."

But why is Professor Marshall allowed to leave McMaster? Has Dr. MacNeill's blood turned to water? Or what is the matter with his blood, that he has ceased his fight for Professor Marshall? Surely the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* cannot be blamed for driving Professor Marshall out of McMaster,—and yet he is going! As a matter of fact, he has gone! And is taking Dr. MacNeill's place for two or three Sundays in Walmer Road Church. That was very kind of Dr. MacNeill to arrange for Professor Marshall to take his place for two or three Sundays, seeing he was going to take Professor Marshall's place permanently!

Still we are asking the question, Who has driven Professor Marshall out of McMaster University?

The Question Easily Answered.

The man that wraps the whole Board of Governors around his finger and dictates all its policies, the "sinister"—to use Mr. Albert Matthews' word in respect to another—influence which has been behind this whole movement, the one person more than any and all others combined, responsible for the apostasy of McMaster University, is Dr. Frank Sanderson.

Here we reprint the affidavit of the late Mr. W. F. Hayden, former deacon of Walmer Road Baptist Church:

DOMINION OF CANADA
Province of ONTARIO

To Wit:

IN THE MATTER OF A statement made by Dr. Sanderson.

I, William Foster Hayden of the City of Toronto, in the County of York,

Do solemnly declare that

1. I was for fifteen years a member of The Walmer Road Baptist Church and was elected a Deacon of that Church about the month of February, 1921.
2. Dr. Frank Sanderson was a member of that church at that time and at the time hereinafter referred to.
3. That I was present at the usual weekly prayer meeting in the Walmer Road Baptist Church in the month of June, 1920, and at that meeting Dr. J. H. Farmer, Dean of Theology in McMaster University, addressed or spoke at the meeting and in his remarks he quoted from the Gospel according to John.
4. Dr. Farmer and I walked out of the meeting homewards together and Dr. Farmer then told me that Dr. Sanderson had come to him at the close of the meeting and asked him "If he didn't know better than to quote from John's Gospel, a Book that had been discredited and discarded by everyone that knew anything about it." Dr. Farmer said to me after this statement that he was "amazed" to think that any Christian man would doubt the Gospel of John. I was also greatly astounded to hear this, as Dr. Sanderson was a Deacon of Walmer Road Baptist Church.
5. I recall the occasion most clearly, I have a vivid remembrance of what took place. I remember that Dr. Farmer and I together had walked down Brunswick Avenue and Dr. Farmer reported the language that Dr. Sanderson had used just after Dr. Farmer and I had turned from Brunswick Avenue into Bloor Street. It left so deep an impression on my mind that I could not possibly forget it.
6. In the interests of the denomination and of the cause of truth I informed Dr. T. T. Shields of the same.
7. I fully expected to be present in person at the Convention and state the above facts, but owing to illness I am prevented from doing so and it is because of my illness and the Doctor's prohibition that I am not present to-day in Walmer Road Church. I am suffering from a weak heart.

AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the CANADA EVIDENCE ACT.

(Signed) "W. F. Hayden."

DECLARED before me at the City of Toronto in the County of York this 25th day of October, A.D. 1922.

"John D. Bissett"

A Commissioner and Notary Public.

There is not a shadow of a shade of a ghost of a doubt that Dr. Frank Sanderson said exactly what Professor Farmer reported to Mr. Hayden that he had said. Nor is there the slightest doubt that Professor Farmer reported to Mr. Hayden what Mr. Hayden declares in his affidavit.

Many of our readers will remember that on the floor of the Convention, at Walmer Road in 1922, Professor Farmer contented himself, respecting this matter, merely with saying: "I don't remember."

One Sunday afternoon Mr. Hayden called us by telephone, and summoned us to go over and see him. He had just had a visit from Dr. Farmer. In that visit Dr. Farmer, according to Mr. Hayden's report, spoke to this effect: Brother Hayden, I hope you do not think that I have any disposition to question your veracity. I have tried to recall the conversation which you reported, but have been unable to do so. And I really cannot remember. But I have not the slightest doubt that what you said was true.

The Dr. Sanderson described in the Hayden affidavit is the real Dr. Sanderson, and he is the cause of all the trouble that has come to the Baptist denomination. Once an avowed Evangelical, he became an ardent disciple of Professor I. G. Matthews; and when we came to Toronto more than twenty years ago we were informed by Rev. C. H. Schutt that Dr. Sanderson was losing no opportunity to propagate his Modernistic views.

Following the Walmer Road Convention, this Editor with the late Mr. Hayden and one other, interviewed Dr. Farmer in his home, and on that occasion Dr. Farmer admitted that he had long known Dr. Sanderson to hold views that were "pretty broad". Of course Dr. Sanderson is not now the only one; but while he remains there will be no change in the religious temper of McMaster.

THE REASON.

The reason for Professor Marshall's leaving is this: we became his publicity agent, he said. We advertised him widely,—all of which we admit. He had "wonderful congregations wherever he went". Of course he had—for a while! But we gave Professor Marshall the wrong kind of advertising. A day or two after the First Avenue Convention we stopped at a gas station near the Huntley Street Bridge for some gas, when a man came up whom we did not know, but who addressed us by name. We learned he was a deacon of a Toronto Baptist Church, and he said something to this effect: You must not think you are alone in this matter. The Sunday before the Convention our Pastor announced that Professor Marshall would preach for him morning and evening Convention Sunday. But immediately following the service the Deacons met and informed the Pastor they would not consent to Professor Marshall's occupying that pulpit.

We are inclined to think there are many other pulpits like that. The fact is, *The Gospel Witness* had unmistakably and indelibly stamped Professor Marshall as the out-and-out Modernist he really is; and the Baptist Soviet could not longer use him. They will use Dr. Benson and others so long as the people do not know what they are. But as soon as they are recognized as Modernists, they will dismiss them and get somebody else.

That is how Modernism propagates itself.

THEY ARE LETTING PROFESSOR MARSHALL GO BECAUSE THEY ARE DISCOVERING THAT HIS THEOLOGY IS UNACCEPTABLE TO THE RANK AND FILE OF THE PEOPLE.

We hereby express our profound sympathy for Professor Marshall. He has said much harsher things of us than we have ever said of him. But we have long believed that he was not a man of subtle mind. Though we do not agree with him, we have looked upon him as a rather straightforward, and, to be plain, rather blunt Englishman; or, let us say, fellow-countryman. We tried to save him from "the sorry mess" into which the mistaken zeal of others brought him. We knew the men with whom he was dealing better than he did. We knew that Dr. MacNeill and others would stand by him just as long as it suited their convenience to do so; and that when he had pulled their chestnuts out of the fire they would dispense with him without regret. Professor Marshall knows these men better to-day than he did four and a half years ago.

The fact is, the rank and file of the members of the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec do not want Modernism. They will not pay for Modernism. They will endure it for a while when it comes to them wrapped in an evangelical wrapper, but as soon as they discover its true character they will have none of it.

THE CONVENTION AMENDED ITS CONSTITUTION TO SECURE POWER TO DECLARE JARVIS ST. CHURCH INELIGIBLE TO SEND DELEGATES BECAUSE WE INSISTED THAT PROFESSOR MARSHALL WAS NOT IN HARMONY WITH THE BAPTIST POSITION. NOW McMASTER UNIVERSITY HAS TOLD PROFESSOR MARSHALL THE SAME THING. WE WERE EXCOMMUNICATED FOR TELLING WHAT McMASTER NOW ACKNOWLEDGES—PRIVATELY OF COURSE, TO BE TRUE.

Modernism a Cuckoo.

Modernism does not support Home Missions. Modernism does not support Foreign Missions. Modernism supports nothing but rationalistic heresies. Modernism is a cuckoo that lays its eggs in the nests of other birds. Modernism is a parasite that feeds upon pre-existing organisms. Modernism makes poor, but does not enrich. Modernism cannot give life: it only takes life away. Already many of the churches of the Ontario and Quebec Convention are living at a poor dying rate. In many instances the salt has been withdrawn, and that which remains is rapidly deteriorating.

Modernism does not grow to maturity in a month or a year: it takes a few years to run its course and to produce its fruit. Its leaves are pleasant to the eye, and its fruit, while it is yet green, is apparently to be desired to make one wise; but the harvest of Modernism is everywhere beginning, and soon its bitter and poisonous fruits must be reaped. If the Lord should tarry, Modernism will die out, because it will destroy itself. "None but Jesus can do helpless sinners good." We must have authority outside of ourselves: we can find it nowhere but in an infallible Bible. We must have a Saviour outside of ourselves: we can find such a Saviour nowhere but in a divinely-begotten, virgin-born Saviour, Who is God manifest in the flesh. There can be no peace of conscience, no day of grace, without such a Days-man betwixt us and God as Jesus Christ the righteous has proved to be. There could be no hope for the individual, or for the world, apart from the promise of the personal return of our glorious Redeemer, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. And should He tarry, men will turn from the brackish springs of earth, and from their self-made cisterns that can hold no water, and will take the ancient words from Peter's lips and make them their own: "To whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life." May God speed the day!

OLIVE LUCILLE CLARK, Ph.D.

Toronto Baptist Seminary feels the intensest gratification in the splendid scholastic record of the one lady member of its regular Faculty, Miss Olive Lucille Clark. On the fifth day of this month Miss Clark received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classics at the University of Toronto.

While a good number have begun this difficult course, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classics has never been conferred by Toronto University until this year. Two obtained the degree this year, and Miss Clark's name being the first on the list, she had the honour of leading the procession and being the first person, man or woman, to receive that high degree in Classics from our great Provincial University.

It will interest our readers if we give herewith Miss Clark's scholastic record. At her first year in the Central Collegiate Institute, Hamilton, Ontario, she won the medal for attendance, application, and conduct. In 1914 she passed honour matriculation, winning the Edgar Levy gold medal for general proficiency, and the John Buchan gold medal for proficiency in Classics, and First Carter Scholarship (highest standing in the county). At this examination Miss Clark ranked first for thirteen University of Toronto scholarships, awarded for proficiency in various departments—Classics, Moderns, English, History, and Mathematics.

Only one of these scholarships, however, might be held, and this one was cancelled to accept the Thomson Scholarship, tenable at McMaster University. Miss Clark entered second year at McMaster University in the Arts Course, taking Special Classics. In her second year at McMaster she won the Governor-General's medal for general proficiency, a prize in Latin, and a prize in Greek. The third year she won a prize in Latin; and the fourth year, graduated with first class honours (1917), with the degree of B.A. In 1921 she obtained from McMaster the Master's Degree in Latin.

Following this, she attended Faculty of Education at Kingston, winning the Governor-General's medal for highest standing. She was for a while a tutor at Queen's University. She has also taught at Ingersoll Collegiate and Brockville Collegiate, five years altogether; and while pursuing graduate studies at the University of Toronto was tutor at Victoria College. She later became assistant in the Latin Department at McMaster University.

Ultra loyal to her Alma Mater, it was difficult for Miss Clark to believe that McMaster University could take the course she was taking. Without being approached by any man or woman she heard for herself what McMaster had done, and faced the question between herself and Christ as to who was to be first. Heartily and joyously she accorded first place to her Lord, and forthwith resigned her position in McMaster University. It was not until some months after this that we had the privilege of meeting Miss Clark. We soon recognized that events had been providentially ordered for her to join the Faculty of Toronto Baptist Seminary, which she did in the fall of 1928. The Faculty and Trustees of Toronto Baptist Seminary, and multitudes of friends, both in Toronto and Hamilton, heartily congratulate Dr. Clark on her magnificent achievement. Toronto Baptist Seminary considers itself extremely fortunate to have this devoted Christian scholar on its staff.

WEEK-END IN JARVIS STREET.

Sunday was a good day in Jarvis Street, though a very warm one. The attendance at the morning school was 1,390. In the evening six were baptized, and the Pastor preached the sermon appearing in this issue.

A UNION OF CHURCHES TO REPLACE THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION

The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union of North America was held in the Wealthy Street Church, Grand Rapids, Mich., June eleventh and twelfth, nineteen hundred and thirty.

Rev. C. R. Peterson of St. Louis, Mich., was appointed Secretary pro tem. Members were present from Illinois, Ohio, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Canada; while letters were received from members in nearly every other state in the Union, expressing regret at their inability to be present on account of distance; and expressing also their earnest hope that some organization of churches would grow out of the meeting.

Addresses were delivered by Rev. R. T. Ketcham, of Ohio, Rev. Gerard Knoll, Michigan, Rev. H. G. Hamilton, Minnesota, Mr. P. W. Decker, of Grand Rapids, Rev. William Headley, of Grand Rapids, Rev. H. C. Fulton, of Buffalo, Rev. Earl Griffith, of Toledo.

The principal matter before the meeting was the question as to whether, and how the Baptist Bible Union could be merged into a Union of Churches. A committee was appointed to consider the question; and on the morning of Thursday, the twelfth, submitted the following resolution which was unanimously adopted:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., JUNE 12, 1930.

Members of the Baptist Bible Union of North America in annual meeting assembled in Grand Rapids, Mich., resolve as follows:—

1. That the Baptist Bible Union organized to conserve the faith once for all delivered unto the saints as distinctively interpreted and propagated by Baptists, having protested against the subversion of Baptist institutions and organizations by Modernism, and the prostitution of their resources and potentialities to the propagation of modernistic principles, believe that the said Union has exercised a useful ministry by awakening thousands of Baptists to the perils of the day; and that by the antagonism it has aroused on the part of modernists, it has served the further useful purpose of revealing the anti-Christian character of modernism; and that the protest of the Union has had the effect of demonstrating the impossibility of accomplishing the purging or reformation of certain so-called Baptist conventions; and that the Baptist Bible Union, determined to abide by the historic faith of Baptists as expressed in the New Hampshire Confession and other historic statements of faith, and convinced that such faith can be conserved and propagated only as Baptist churches are free to exercise their own ministry at home and to preach the gospel abroad independently of the interference or control of any association; and, affirming the conviction that the historic Baptist position, theologically and ecclesiologically, represents an historic outworking of pure New Testament Christianity, the Baptist Bible Union emphatically denies that it has departed at any point from the historic Baptist faith, or that it has any intention of or desire to do so, or to advance any new doctrine; but, that the faith once delivered may be preserved and perpetuated only in the New Testament way by the establishment and through the agency of New Testament churches; and that therefore the Baptist Bible Union recognizes that this union of individuals, known as the Baptist Bible Union, has fulfilled its mission, and should now give place to a Union of Baptist churches, associated in such a way as will conserve the principles of the historic Baptist position, and will in no particular infringe thereon, and that this change in form of fellowship shall be effected in harmony with principles hereinafter set forth;

2. That the Baptist Bible Union be continued until its successor, herein proposed shall be formed;

3. That such fellowship shall be called "THE MISSIONARY UNION OF BAPTIST CHURCHES OF NORTH AMERICA", and its purpose shall be to provide the churches composing it

a. A means of co-operating in the spread of the gospel in foreign lands, and in such places on this continent as are not served by a Baptist agency in fellowship with this Union.

b. A fellowship of churches holding the historic Baptist faith among which exchanges of pastors may from time to time be possible.

c. A channel for the execution of such other forms of Christian service as experience and circumstances may show to be wise.

4. That a committee of five members be now appointed to give effect to the foregoing proposals as follows:—

a. To formulate a tentative constitution for the Missionary Union herein proposed, such constitution to be framed

(1) In harmony with the recognized historic Baptist principle of the complete autonomy of the local church.

(2) To avoid the jeopardizing of property rights, and as far as possible, any likelihood of litigation in respect thereto,

(3) To provide for the direct control of the Union's affairs by the churches through regularly appointed messengers,

(4) In recognition of the existence, actual or prospective, of state, provincial, or regional Baptist agencies true to the historic Baptist faith and the care by such agencies of all extra-church local Baptist interests.

(5) To provide a minimum of overhead expense,

(6) To provide for such officers, boards or committees as may be necessary,

(7) And specifically to safeguard our common historic Baptist faith by a provision that the right to send messengers to the Union, and to hold office in the Union, shall be restricted to those who are in harmony with the historic Baptist faith and practice as expressed in such brief but comprehensive statement of faith and principles as shall be made part of the constitution.

b. To appoint a time and place within a year from now and as soon as may be expedient at which to call a convention of messengers of Baptist churches to effect the organization of the Union.

c. To take such steps as may be necessary to inform the churches of this proposal and to secure the attendance of such messengers.

d. That the committee be authorized to solicit funds from all Baptist Bible Union members and other interested Baptists to meet the expense of this work of preparation.

e. That the committee be authorized to employ a field representative to lead in giving effect to the foregoing proposals, to select a general headquarters for the Union and to employ such clerical help as may be necessary.

A Committee on Constitution.

A committee of five, to draw up a constitution for the proposed missionary union of Baptist Churches, was appointed, and consists of: H. C. Fulton, Buffalo; Max Schimpf, New York City; R. T. Ketcham, Elyria, Ohio; D. R. Walkinshaw, Greensburg, Pa.; and T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada.

On motion of the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, Rev. H. C. Fulton, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Buffalo, was elected President of the Baptist Bible Union, to carry forward the work till the new organization is effected. Regional Vice-Presidents of the Union were elected as follows: Mr. Max Schimpf, New York City; Dr. G. Rector Dye, San Diego, Calif.; Rev. Charles F. Fredman, La Salle, Ill.; Rev. H. G. Hamilton, Austin, Minn.; Rev. Earl Griffith, Toledo,

Ohio; Dr. Oliver W. Van Osdel, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Rev. J. J. Van Gorder, Butler, Pa.; Rev. Andrew Grieve, Vancouver, B.C.; Rev. T. T. Shields, Toronto, Canada.

The Editor of *The Gospel Witness* spoke at the public service Wednesday evening, and Rev. Earl Griffith, of Toledo, Thursday evening.

One of the chief delights of the service was the fellowship with the great Dr. Oliver W. Van Osdel, and his magnificent church. The spirit of the people was delightful; and their hospitality most generous. We can think of no place in America where such a movement as was there proposed could more appropriately be projected than in the Wealthy Street Church, of which Dr. Oliver W. Van Osdel is the Pastor. While in the truest sense a father in Israel, Dr. Van Osdel is a brother beloved by all who know him.

The Committee on Constitution may be expected to do their work with expedition, and to call a convention for the formation of such a missionary union as the resolution proposes at the earliest possible date. It seemed to be the consensus of opinion that such a meeting might more usefully be held in the autumn than in the spring. This writer does not speak officially, but expresses the hope that this new movement will be fully launched before the end of the present year.

Miss Edith M. Rebman Goes to China.

Miss Edith M. Rebman, who had been the Secretary-Treasurer of the Baptist Bible Union from its inception, sailed from Vancouver for China, June twelfth, to become associated with Mrs. W. S. Sweet, at Hangchow, Chekiang Province. In view of this a telegram was sent to Miss Rebman, as follows:

"Miss Edith M. Rebman,
c/o Canadian Pacific Steamship 'Empress of Canada,'
Vancouver, B.C.

"The Baptist Bible Union, in annual session at Grand Rapids, Mich., desires to express its deep gratitude for faithful and untiring service. Rest assured of our solicitude for your personal welfare, and of our best wishes in your new field to which the Lord has called you. Our prayers go with you across the seas.

Baptist Bible Union,
E. G. Griffith, pro tem."
Resolutions.

The following resolutions were presented to the assembly by the committee:

"Resolution of appreciation to Miss Edith M. Rebman.

"From its infancy Miss Edith Rebman has been the faithful, untiring, Secretary-Treasurer of the Baptist Bible Union. We gladly acknowledge our great indebtedness to her and record our profound gratitude for the years of unexcelled service she has rendered. Whatever the Union has achieved, has been appreciably due to her willing devotion to its highest interests.

"On this day, marked by the coincidence of her sailing to a new field of labour in China, and the Bible Union's launching forth to a larger gospel venture, we assure Miss Rebman of our sustained regard and prayerful interest which will journey with her across the seas.

Sincerely,
Baptist Bible Union of N. Amer."

"Resolution of appreciation to Dr. T. T. Shields.

"With due regard for the virtue of modesty, we risk the affirmation that the most effective instrumentality in the hand of God for the preservation and proclamation of historic Baptist principles in recent years has been the Baptist Bible Union of North America.

"Dr. T. T. Shields has been the President up to the present and as he hands the leadership to his successor, we wish to record our heartfelt appreciation of his service. Words are poor compensation, however. We are constrained like Paul to say, 'We thank God upon every remembrance of you.' In perplexity Dr. Shields has been a wise counsellor; in trial a true friend; in conflict a gracious though militant leader.

"For such a time as this God brought him to the Kingdom. Many soldiers of the Cross have 'done valiantly, but thou excellest them all.' Our prayer is that he may be spared many years to continue his labour of love, and that he may continue to have Heaven's highest favour."

These resolutions were unanimously carried.

C. R. PETERSON, Secretary, pro tem.

"ACCEPTED IN THE BELOVED."

(Continued from last week's issue.)

By Rev. T. I. Stockley, D.D., Dean of Toronto Baptist Seminary.

In our meditation last week we spoke of the great truth of Justification from two different aspects—as an act of God and as a gift of God. The privilege of justifying righteousness is sometimes called the righteousness of God—which, of course, cannot mean God's own attribute of righteousness. He cannot give that away. That is essential to His very nature. But justifying righteousness is called the righteousness of God because it is planned by God, provided by God, and given as a free gift by God. To whom is it given? Who are the favoured souls who receive this amazing boon? There is a remarkable passage in Romans, chapter four, verse five. In this scripture we are told that God justifies the "ungodly". That is an extraordinary statement. The word which the apostle uses is a strong one. It means an "impious" man, describing an open sinner and an extreme case; it is one who stands in direct opposition to a righteous man. This is probably intended, and is designed to teach us that the very worst of men may become justified men. No man need to exclude himself if God justifies the "impious". What a marvel of grace that such souls should be blessed thus! Is my reader one such? Why should he not attain unto this righteousness? Wonders of grace are miracles in which God delights. Why should he not work such wonders in us?

From the nature of the case it must be the "ungodly" who receive this gift of righteousness. The "righteous" do not need justification. "The whole need not a physician." "I came not to call the righteous but sinners", Jesus says. It is the ungodly whom God justifies because He "justifies freely", that is, without a cause. In John, chapter fifteen, verse twenty-five, Jesus uses the same word when He says, "They hated me without a cause". Just as there was no cause in Jesus why men should hate Him, so there is no cause in men why God should justify them. This fact makes the grace of God shine out in all its lustre in the divine method of justification. Of course, the ungodly become godly after they are justified; but the point of the inspired word here is that full acceptance in the presence of God is within the reach of the very worst of men.

A Puritan writer says, "The devil takes his scissors and cuts off the letters "un" in the word ungodly, and says to the sinner, 'God justifies the godly; you are not godly, therefore He will not justify you'". That, of course, is the devil's lie. The truth is that God justifies the ungodly, the impious.

The same scripture (Romans, chapter four, verse five) says that "him that worketh not" God justifies. This word seems to be as amazing as the other. However, the phrase must not be misunderstood. It teaches the same truth as the words, "justified . . . without the deeds of the law" (Romans, chapter three, verse twenty-eight); or "righteousness without works" (Romans, chapter four, verse six). This means that the man whom God justifies is the one who has given up the struggle to justify himself by his own efforts. Does some one say, "Surely the man must do his best, for God helps those who help themselves"? No! In the matter of justification, God helps those who cannot help themselves, and have given up all attempts to do so. While a drowning man is struggling, and plunging, and splashing, his rescuer holds aloof from him. He waits till the struggles have ended in utter helplessness, and then he lays hold and saves from death. Human attempts at self-justification are a positive hindrance instead of help. The man who wants to work for his own justification will be left to himself, because the robe of righteousness in which a soul is accepted is not a patchwork garment. It must be all of God if it be of God at all. Besides, it is fruitless to attempt to work for one's own acceptance when all the work which secures justification is already finished. Our Lord's triumphant word upon the Cross, "It is finished", declares a perfect righteousness. And who will dare attempt to add to the finished work of Christ? Works with a view to acceptance with God are an impertinent rivalry of the all-glorious work of Christ. And remember—

"Grace, triumphant on the throne,
Scorns a rival, reigns alone;
Come and bow beneath her sway,
Cast your idol work away.
Works of man when made his plea
Never shall accepted be."

Thus we see that God justifies sinful men who are not trying to sew together a garment by their own efforts, or to weave the material for it out of their own heart. God "justifies the ungodly", and "him that worketh not".

But there is a third word in Romans, chapter four, verse five, which is of supreme importance. "To him that worketh not *but believeth*"—that is the man whom God justifies. And this believing or trusting in the God who is revealed in the Lord Jesus cannot be omitted. It is imperative. The unbeliever remains under condemnation whether he works or does not work. It is only the believing man who is justified. Not until the Israelites looked to the brazen serpent were any of them healed. Not till the manslayer was within the gates of the City of Refuge was he safe. Not until the thirsty man drinks of the Water of Life will his thirst be quenched. The man who says,

"Nothing in my hands I bring,"

must also say,

"Simply to Thy Cross I cling"—

else he will not know the shelter and safety which he needs.

This faith which places the soul in union with Christ and so with this perfect righteousness is not the ground of acceptance, but rather the instrument of it. It is not our faith as such, but the Christ Whom faith receives. Who is "made unto us righteousness". By faith we run to the shelter of the Rock of Ages, but it is not our running but the Rock which shelters us. By faith we drink of the fountain of living waters, but it is not our act of drinking but the Water itself which gives the life. By faith we put on the robe of righteousness, but it is not the act of dressing but the robe itself which covers us with beauty. So faith appropriates the Lord Jesus, and as an instrument it justifies.

And it is faith alone. No other instrument is of any use. The righteousness of God is revealed to faith: it is "upon all them that believe". Faith is the ear that hears the Saviour's voice, the eye that sees the Saviour's sufficiency, and the hand that grasps Him and makes Him ours. Nothing else is asked—the empty, open hand that receives the gift divine. How blessed it would be if every reader of these lines would now receive the Lord Jesus as his or her Righteousness, and then go on to know Him as Sanctification, and Redemption too!

Shall we now say,—

"Hallelujah! I believe!

Now no longer on my soul

All the debt of sin is lying:

One great Friend has paid the whole!"

TO OUR RADIO FRIENDS.

Letters of appreciation of the Jarvis Street Radio ministry continue to reach us. We here record our hearty thanks to all who write us, and express the hope that all who receive a copy of this paper for the first time will become regular subscribers.

Books by Dr. Shields

"THE ADVENTURES OF A MODERN YOUNG MAN."

A series of sermons on the parable of the prodigal and his brother.

"CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT."

A series of Thursday evening Bible Lectures from Genesis to II. Samuel.

"THE MOST FAMOUS TRIAL OF HISTORY."

A series of sermons preached in Jarvis St. Church on "The Trial of Jesus."

Price Fifty cents a volume postpaid.
Order from The Gospel Witness, 130
Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Canada.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"OTHER LITTLE SHIPS".

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Canada, Sunday Evening, June 15th, 1930.

Broadcast CKGW 690 k.c. 434.8 metres.

(Stenographically reported)

"And there were also with him other little ships."—Mark 4:36.

Prayer before the Sermon.

We draw near to Thee, O Lord, this evening with but one name upon our lips and with one ground of confidence in our thought: we remember that Christ 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 rejoice that when He had shown Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of His disciples forty days, He ascended again to Thy right hand, entering into heaven itself with His own blood, there to appear in the presence of God for us. Though we have all sinned and come short of Thy glory; though we have proved the truth of Thy Word in our experience, that there is none that doeth good, no not one; though we have explored the utmost bounds of the far country, and have been reduced to an attempt to nourish our souls upon the husks of that alien land, we rejoice that there is a way home for all poor sinners, and that we can come to Thee pleading the promise Thou hast made to us, that if we confess our sins, Thou art faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

O Lord, help us all thus to pray this evening. We would come into Thy holy presence with deep contrition of heart. We pray for ourselves, and for one another, and we would pray too for those who do not pray for themselves. May the Holy Spirit touch every heart that shares in this service this evening.

It may be there are many prodigals who will hear Thy word, for whom many prayers have ascended,—prodigal sons and prodigal husbands, prodigal fathers, and mayhap prodigal wives and daughters; many who have turned their back upon Thee. Call them to-night, O Spirit of God, and bring them from strangerhood to a place in the divine family, from the want and penury of the far country, into the wealth and plenty and fellowship of the Father's house. May this be a night of salvation to a great multitude of people!

O Lord, we would very tenderly bring to Thee this evening Thy children who suffer. We thank Thee for the privilege of speaking a word to those who lie upon beds of pain, who cannot come where Thy people are gathered in Thy name. Be gracious to them where they are this evening. Soften their pillows, we pray Thee; minister to them as only the wounded hand of the sympathetic Saviour can minister. Take the pain from their bodies if it please Thee; but above all things, give them rest in their spirits.

There are not a few who share the service with us this evening who are aged and infirm, whose faces are toward the west where the sun is rapidly sinking. We pray that Thine angels may be very near to them, and as Jacob in the eventime saw that all things had worked together for good to him, so grant, we pray Thee, that Thine aged saints may be filled with joy as they contemplate the setting forth from this land and reaching the country where night shall never come.

Bless, we pray Thee, all lonely hearts this evening, and those who are widely separated from their friends. Wherever Thy word shall reach as it is now proclaimed, may the power of the Holy Ghost accompany it! May it result in renewed consecration on the part of Thy people, and in a simple trust on the part of the prodigal! O God, may it have the effect of bringing many broken-hearted sinners to the feet of Jesus Christ.

Lord, bless us. Open our hearts to receive Thy word, and open the treasures of Thy Word to our wondering view. May we all be enriched with such wealth as shall last through time and through all eternity. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

Our evening text will be found in the fourth chapter of the gospel by Mark. I shall read from the thirty-fifth verse: "The same day, when the even was come, he saith unto them, Let us pass over unto the other side. And when they had sent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ship. And there were also with him other little ships. And there arose a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the ship, so that it was now full. And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow: and they awake him, and say unto him, Master, carest thou not that we perish? And he arose, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm. And he said unto them, Why are ye so fearful? how is it that ye have no faith? And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, What manner of man is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?"

"And there were also with him other little ships." I suppose it is quite natural, when reading this story of the miraculous stilling of the tempest, that our attention should be chiefly given to the ship in which Jesus Christ sailed. But the record I have read this evening tells us that, although the disciples who sailed in the ship with Jesus enjoyed the special advantage of His presence, and the privilege of calling upon Him in their time of danger, yet on that stormy night, sailing that troubled sea, there were "also with him other little ships".

I.

First of all, will you turn over in your mind the very simple observation, that THERE ARE ALWAYS MANY SHIPS AT SEA, AND THAT THE STORM THAT BREAKS UPON ONE SHIP, BREAKS UPON THE OTHERS.

That is true of *those who are exposed to the winds of adversity*. However troubled you may be by circumstances which you imagine are peculiar to you, out on the storm-swept sea there are also "other little ships". The storm of adversity does not break upon you alone. You are probably having, some of you, rather a hard time these days, for these are not days of general prosperity. There are some here this evening, very probably, who are finding it difficult to make ends meet, who are subject to many limitations because of the straitness of their temporal circumstances. And there are some, perhaps, who are disposed to imagine that they are rather hardly treated, that their situation is peculiarly difficult, that somehow or another something has gone awry with the government of things. I would remind you, my friends, that you are not alone in your adversity. There are "other little ships",

and you must not groan and grumble too much. We are having not very easy times in Canada just now, but I read in last evening's paper that there are perhaps a hundred thousand unemployed in Detroit—in the land of plenty and of wealth to the south of us. When I read it I said to myself, The storm is sweeping that sea as well as ours. We have no monopoly of the present-day difficulties on this troubled surface; there are still "other little ships".

I know some will say that that furnishes but small comfort, but I think there is great advantage in our recognizing that no strange thing has happened unto us. The worst thing that can come to any man is for him to imagine that all the fates are against him.

I know of one poor fellow who used to attend this church, who got it into his head that everybody was his enemy. He came here one day with samples of bread, and cake, and I know not what—food he had brought from different restaurants. He wanted us to have it analyzed, because he was quite sure that wherever he went somebody was putting poison in his food. He was a good fellow at heart, but his head was wrong, and he had to be taken care of.

There are many people who are not in asylums who open their hearts to that fallacy; they think they are having a hard time, hence they become cynical and hard and bitter. I would remind you that trouble is the common lot of life; when the storm breaks, the whole sea is troubled, and you have no monopoly of the tempest—there are with you "other little ships".

That is true too of *physical affliction*. I do not know how often in the course of my ministry as a pastor people have said to me, "Why should I be especially afflicted? What have I done to deserve such chastisement? Why should all this trouble come upon me?" Your difficulty is that you are so sea-sick you cannot get on deck to see the other little ships. When affliction comes to us we are disposed to think that we are the only one who has such sore trouble; and yet if we go up on deck a while and look out upon the rolling billows, we shall discover that there are other ships at sea. You are not the only one who has sickness in your home. You are not the only one who bears burdens. Many ships are ploughing their way through the storm this drab and dreary day.

I recall the case of a woman who was troubled with rheumatism, which is one of the worst of isms. She used to spend most of her time in a wheel-chair. In this particular case the rheumatism seemed to have found its way into her spirit as well as into her joints, for she was about as rheumatic spiritually as physically. She was all pains and groans; and when I went to see her—she always called her husband by his surname—to be as impersonal as possible I will call him Smith, and she used to say, "Smith does not understand me." She had two of the most devoted daughters I have ever known, who waited on their mother hand and foot; but she insisted that they had no sympathy either, nobody cared; her timbers were the only ones that creaked in the storm, her ship was the only one exposed to the violence of the waves. And I used to tell her of another little ship, of another woman who was troubled just as she was; but she was like Dickens' Mrs. Gummidge who used to suffer from the east wind, and when informed that the east wind

touched other people as well, insisted that nobody felt it as she did; that the east wind went through her shawl as it got through nobody else's shawl. Her constant complaint was, "I'm a lone lorn creetur myself, and everythink that reminds me of creeturs that ain't lone and lorn, goes contrary with me." To "Dan!" she insisted, "If I felt less, I could do more. You don't feel like me, Dan!; thinks don't go contrary with you, nor you with them."

And there are many like her, who are never so happy as when they are miserable. They take a melancholy delight in magnifying all their ills, and in persuading themselves that all the trouble in the world is theirs. Nothing could be farther from the truth, my friends. We sympathize with those who are in trouble—as we ought, for we cannot escape it ourselves; but I remind you that when the storm breaks and the waves are rolling mountains high, yours is not the only ship at sea. There are also with you "other little ships", equally exposed to the violence of the waves.

I heard from one dear soul last week who said, "I heard your message last Sunday. I have been a year and a half on my back in a sanitarium, and I was so happy to be able to join in your service." I cannot help thinking of scores of others to my certain knowledge who are similarly circumstanced. We send you, dear friends, through the air, our loving sympathy, and pray that God may lighten your affliction. "O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted", hear this word from the Lord: "The mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, said the Lord that hath mercy on thee." It may comfort you somewhat to know that there are others battling their way through the storm, plowing the waves; and yet receiving grace, like Paul on the sea whipped into fury by the wind called Euroclydon, to call upon their fellow-voyagers to "Be of good cheer."

Last Sunday night before I left the church I found a telephone number awaiting me. I called, and a voice that was full of pain, and yet of cheerful gratitude, said, "Is that you, Doctor?" I said, "Yes"—I will call him by name. Perhaps he is listening in; I believe he is,—I said, "Is that you, Brother Wright?" He replied, "Yes; and I just wanted to tell you I had a good time with you to-night." He is a soldier who was terribly injured in the Great War. He used to come here for a while, wearing a steel case of some sort, but it is impossible for him to get out to the house of God now. When I asked him how he was he said, "I am pretty well. I cannot get out now, but I have much to be thankful for. I have more to be thankful for than some have." He had managed to get to the deck of his ship, and looking out through the mist of the storm he had seen "other little ships", and was comforted by their perhaps unconscious comradeship.

And that is true, too, of those who are exposed to *peculiar sorrows*. One says, "Mere stress of circumstances, and even bodily affliction are as featherweights compared with sorrow at heart; and it is from this last I suffer." "The heart knoweth his own bitterness; and a stranger doth not intermeddle with his

joy." Yet we are tempted to think that we have a heavier burden of sorrow than anybody else; that we are going to be altogether overwhelmed. We thought that grave-digging was a new business the first time our spade was made to turn the sod, and we could hardly see through our tears that the path to the cemetery was worn by many feet. Others had been there before us, and as we came away we met others coming to the same place to bury their hearts. Notwithstanding, sometimes we felt that we were not travelling a road—it was a wild and furious storm-swept sea we were riding! Yes, but battling with the boisterous billows of the sea of sorrow there are also "other little ships." This is a troubled world. Long ago a keen observer said, "Man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward." It is as natural for us to come into trouble as it is for the sparks to fly upward. You say it is poor comfort to be reminded that other people are passing through the same experience. You remember Tennyson?—

"One writes, that 'Other friends remain,
That 'Loss is common to the race'—
And common is the commonplace,
And vacant chaff well meant for grain."

That does not help us? O but it does, sometimes! A mother was standing dumb with grief beside a little coffin in which her only child lay cold in death. Her friends came in and they brought flowers and piled them around the casket in a well-meant effort to disguise death. But it was still death! I remember myself standing, in a similar case, beside the form of a little boy. His mother stood with me—and I expect she is listening in as I speak this evening,—and as she laid her hand upon his cold little hand, she said, "Pastor, that is death." I had nothing to say. So these friends came in, and they brought their flowers. Others came and told her she should not weep; that after all God had taken her darling child home; and that she must be resigned. She listened to it all, but made no response, and was un comforted. Then a little woman came in and stood with her for a long time in silence. Presently she put her arms gently and lovingly around the stricken mother—she was an intimate friend—and she said, "Mary, in a drawer at home I have two pairs of little shoes, and the little feet that used to wear them are walking the golden streets to-day." That was all! But the stricken mother seemed to shade her eyes with her hand as she looked out over the raging waters, until she saw that there were other little ships at sea. There was a bond of sympathy between her and another suffering soul, and she was comforted.

It may be there are some here this evening who say, "Well, I could endure even that; I could bear physical pain; I could live on dry bread; I should be content to live in one room; but it is the moral aspect of things that troubles me. It is so hard in my business to steer a straight course; it is so difficult to live as a Christian should live; the temptations of life are multiplying, and the storms are so severe." I was talking with a theological professor one day some years ago regarding his attitude, and the attitude of the Christian Church in general, toward the Bible; and he said, "Well, what are you going to do? We are facing a world condition." His policy was simply to drift, drift,

drift. The winds are blowing, and the seas are rolling mountains high—what can one do but drift with the storm? Ah, blessed be God; if our eyes are opened, though we may not see them at once, they may disappear in the trough of the sea for a moment, but if you look long enough you will see some other little ship bravely riding out the storm, steering a straight course, because commanded by one Captain Who is Sovereign of the sea.

We perhaps have thought that the storm of anti-supernaturalism which has been sweeping over Christendom has swept all orthodox ships from the sea except ours! We are in danger of supposing ours is the only ship at sea using the divine chart. We admit we have observed no "traffic jam"; but though they may be hidden in the trough of the sea, or obscured by the fog, there are other little ships at sea. "I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts: because the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left. I am the only ship at sea." "O no, Elijah," said the Lord, "you are wrong. Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him. I have seven thousand other little ships, and they are all steering a straight course. Cheer up, Elijah! You are not alone." It is a dark day, my brother. The storm is on; and it is true that men are "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," and that "they will not endure sound doctrine," but turn away their ears unto fables; and yet, I verily believe that there never was a day since Peter stood up with the eleven that the Lord had more faithful souls than He has to-day. There are still other little ships.

I recall an experience I had a few years ago, before the days of motor cars. But please remember that is not so very long ago, for I am not speaking as an otogenarian. It was in the days when bicycling was fashionable, and I was in the fashion—I had a wheel. I had been away to a meeting which continued until late. I was the last speaker, and it was later still when I got through, as you would expect! I had to be home the next morning at eight o'clock, and there was no train; in fact, it was a country place, and there was no way of getting home but going on my bicycle. The road was strange, and I was directed to take a road that I had never taken before. I started out from the church in the country about midnight, and I wheeled along for a few miles until I came upon a sandy road, with a deep ditch on either side. I had to dismount, and I trudged along and pushed my wheel through the dark. After tramping for several miles further I came into the midst of a thick bush, and it was as black as Egypt. The sky was cloudy, there was not a star anywhere to be seen. It was hard enough walking without pushing a bicycle; and I could not get off the sand without getting into the ditch. There were a few fireflies here and there—it was in the summer time—and I remember that I felt as though I were the only one in all the world that was awake. I felt as though there was no human creature anywhere within a thousand miles of me. I was very, very lonely.

Then I felt a few big drops of rain, and presently I heard the thunder, and a summer thunder-shower came

on. The only redeeming feature about it was that the lightning lightened my path a little occasionally. I got a little wet and lonelier still, and I said to myself, "Was there ever such a plight as I am to-night?" I did not know where I was, nor whither I was going, and there was no one to tell me. At last I came to a railway track, and a little way-station. I climbed up on the fence and tried to read the sign, to discover where I was; but there was not light enough. Then I put up my hand like a blind man to see if I could read it with my fingers, if the paint would give me any help; but all to no purpose; so I resumed my journey. Presently I heard the sound of wheels, and as the vehicle approached, I hailed the driver. But he evidently feared I was a highwayman. He applied his whip and galloped away, and as the sound of the wheels died away in the distance, I was left alone again, the only one out in that storm.

After a few more miles I came at last into a village street, and I thought, "I shall surely find company here," but it seemed lonelier than the road through the bush, because everybody was fast asleep. There were no electric lights, everything was in darkness; until, getting to the end of the street, I saw just a glimmer of light. I shall never forget the feeling that came over me, and I said, "Well, there is somebody else awake in the world." As I reached the place I saw the light came from a dim lamp, shining out through a screen door. I stood on the street and looked through the screen door, and there were two women sitting beside the bed of a man, who was apparently very ill. I went up, and so as not to alarm them, gently knocked on the door. They were startled, but one of them came to the door, and as I began to tell her that I was lost, she said, "Will you come in, Mr. Shields?" And I said, "How do you know me?" She said, "My sister's husband is dying, and she sent for me two weeks ago. While on my way I saw you on the train, and I overheard somebody mention your name, and that is how I knew you." I went in, and went up to the couch of the sufferer. This good lady yielded me her chair, and I sat down beside his wife. He was dying. I took his hand and I talked to him about the Lord Jesus. I did not know whether he was a professing Christian, but he seemed to open his heart, or the Spirit of the Lord opened his heart, to the truth, and he was greatly comforted. Then we knelt in prayer, his wife, and her sister and I, and commended him to the One Who goes through the valley of the shadow with those who put their trust in Him. Presently he lapsed into a peaceful slumber. Then these good women said, "You had better not go on." "Well," I said, "I do not know where to go. Perhaps you can tell me where I am. I have not the remotest idea." They told me the name of the village, and I said, "I will wait until daybreak, but I have to go a long way, and must be home early in the morning." So I waited until the birds began to herald the morning. I could have said,

"I wait and watch: before mine eyes
Methinks the night grows thin and gray;
I wait and watch the eastern skies
To see the golden spears arise
Beneath the oriflame of day!"

—and then amid the beauty, and to the accompaniment of the awakening voices of the opening day, I mounted my wheel and quietly slipped away.

A year or so after that I was preaching in a certain place, when at the close of the service a woman in a widow's garb came up, and gripped my hand very heartily, as she said, "Do you remember me?" I said, "No, I do not." "Do you not remember being lost," she said, "one night some years ago, and finding your way to the side of a dying man at three o'clock in the morning?" I said, "Yes." She said, "I shall never be able to tell you what a comfort your visit was to my husband. He has gone home, but he witnessed a good confession before he went."

There is always a reason for your being out in the storm, my friend. There are "other little ships," and it is your privilege to share the trouble of the night with them.

II.

These little ships SAILED IN THE WAKE OF THE SHIP IN WHICH JESUS SAILED. He was not in their ship, but they put to sea because He put to sea. "And there were also with him other little ships." It would be interesting to know the story of their passengers, and their crews, and their cargoes. I wonder what they carried? I wonder whither they went, those little ships that were on the stormy sea that night, because He was there? One of them may have carried a doctor, another may have carried a teacher, another may have carried a philanthropist upon some errand of mercy bent. But whoever they were, whatever they proposed to do, they were there because He was there, although they were not actually in the ship with Him. When Jesus puts to sea He never sails alone.

There is an indirect influence of the Gospel which is not to be under-estimated. Many beneficial influences are set in operation by the preaching of the Gospel, for which the Gospel gets no credit at all. There are always with Him "other little ships." There are some people who deny to the Church of Christ credit for accomplishing anything in this troubled world. It is popular to boast of the various forms of social service in which clubs, and fraternal organizations, and other institutions engage, to the disparagement of the church. Ah, yes, but your hospitals are the ships with doctors; your educational institutions are the ships with teachers; and all your philanthropic endeavours are ships that carry well-intentioned men who put to sea only because Jesus first shows the way.

I heard Professor George Jackson deliver an address before the Ministerial Association. I am not sure of the exact wording of the title of his address, but I think it was "John Morley, The Priest of The Outer Court." He extolled John Morley, the biographer of Gladstone; he described his blameless character, his wonderfully serviceable life, his amiable disposition, and held him up as a kind of superman; being careful to point out that in the production of this character religion had no part; for John Morley was an agnostic. I happened to be living in the same direction and walked up the street with Dr. Jackson, after the meeting, and I said, "Doctor, has it ever occurred to you that Morleyism never yet produced a John Morley; that you cannot find a John Morley where Christ is

not preached, and His principles are unknown?" I said, "All the influences which made him what he was had their origin in the very religion which he refuses to acknowledge." "There were also with him other little ships;" and everything that is good in what we have been pleased to call our Christian civilization is there because Jesus sails the sea.

III.

But let no one make any mistake: **THERE ARE SPECIAL ADVANTAGES TO THOSE WHO SAIL IN THE SHIP WITH JESUS.** I would rather sail in the ship with Him than be in either of the other ships, wouldn't you? What was the difference? In the first place, *those who sailed in the ship with Jesus were conscious of His presence as the others were not.* The others shared the miracle, the others reaped the benefit of His stilling the tempest, although perhaps they never knew, and never acknowledged what they owed to Jesus. Multitudes of people sail a calmer sea, and live an easier life, because Jesus shares the sea with them; but they are in one of the "other little ships," and they do not know how much they owe Him. But they who were in the ship with Him knew that it was the presence of Jesus in the storm which brought deliverance to them, and to the other little ships.

It may be there is someone here this evening who is not a Christian, and who says, "I have seen Christian people just as much troubled as I." Yes, they sail the same sea with you, my friend. "But they are just as fearful in the storm as I am." Yes, they seem to be so. They may even talk of perishing sometimes, as David did when he got into a fit of the doldrums. He said, "I shall now perish one day by the hand of Saul. He will be too much for me some day. I fear I shall be overwhelmed at last." Yet, he really knew better; and so did these disciples. Although they were filled with fear, there was a subconscious realization through it all that there was Someone in the ship with them Who had command of the winds and the waves. You will remember how they awakened Him at last, and said, "Carest thou not that we perish?" The Lord does not command the storm at the first gust of wind. He lets the wind blow awhile for us; and some of us have to have a time of real seasickness before we get out of our difficulties, and perhaps that will do us good. They say seasickness is very beneficial! But He is there; and in due time He awakes and rebukes the wind and the waves, and there is a great calm; and the ship in which Jesus sails always outrides the storm.

It is a high privilege to sail in the ship with Him. I exhort you to be sure you get in the right ship. May our lives be such that we may be conscious always of the immediate presence of Jesus with us in the storm. See that you put to sea in a ship that is equipped with wireless so that you will never get out of communication with Him.

"Begone, unbelief; my Saviour is near,
And for my relief will surely appear;
By prayer let me wrestle, and He will perform;
With Christ in the vessel, I smile at the storm."

IV.

Let me now remind you of **THE GREAT PRIVILEGE OF STILLING THE STORM FOR OTHER PEOPLE.** What did these men do when they arose and said to Jesus, "Carest thou not that we perish?" They prayed, and said, "Lord, save us, we perish." He answered their prayer; and in the hour in which He answered their prayer, they brought deliverance to "other little ships" beside themselves. There are "other little ships" watching your course, my friend. I was at a funeral service a few years ago with a minister of another denomination. I had never met him before. We drove to the cemetery together, and he said, "I have long wanted to meet you." And I said, "I am glad to meet you, sir." He said, "You know a lot of us have been watching the course of Jarvis Street Church, and you would, perhaps, be surprised to discover that many ministers are fighting the same battle that you have been fighting, in greater or lesser degree, and," he said, "I know of at least two ministers who have found deliverance through the victory God gave you in Jarvis Street Church." I said, "That is another view of things." Do you not see, there were also with us "other little ships?" I am hearing it everywhere. Brethren, what are our many weekly prayer-meetings for? Why do we meet so frequently, week after week, now over nine years? Somebody says, "Your great revival has not come yet, has it?" No, not in the measure in which we hope to see it. We have seen souls saved; but then, do you not see we are not praying for ourselves alone? We are praying for "other little ships," and who knows what blessing even one church may be privileged to bring to other churches, and to other ministers, and to other hard-pressed mariners on the mighty deep? Let us see to it that we use our privileges aright, for the sake of the "other little ships." How truly there are "other little ships" following us; how necessary that parents should be in the ship with Jesus for the sake of the "other little ships"; how important that every man and every woman should live in such relationship to Christ that their influence may tell upon other lives, and calm the sea for other ships!

V.

Just this last word: **THERE IS A VOYAGE WHICH ONLY ONE SHIP CAN TAKE.** When the storm breaks upon that sea, there will be only one ship that can survive; there will be with it no "other little ships".

This was but a temporal salvation that I have been speaking of, saving them from physical death and physical discomfort. Their little ships on that inland sea were tossed about, but had they dared to brave the wide expanse of the Atlantic they would have been beaten to pieces. I read in the Book of a storm when there was one great ship built according to the divine pattern; and at God's call Noah and his family went into the ark, and God shut them in. When the windows of heaven were opened and the fountains of the great deep were broken up, that ship was made for a stormy day and for a rough sea. When the storm of divine wrath broke upon a sinful world, and the waters rose until the tops of the highest hills were covered, "all in whose nostrils was the breath of life,

of all that was in the dry land, died", save only those whom God had shut in with Noah. When Noah looked out upon that boundless sea of judgment, looking to the horizon in every direction, no where could he discover even so much as one other little ship.

There was One Who set sail alone: "I have trodden the winepress alone"; said He, "and of the people there was none with me." He made the voyage alone. He explored a world that men have never known. He tasted death for every man. And some day the earth and the heaven will flee away. He will be seated upon His great white throne, and salvation will be in Jesus Christ, and in Jesus Christ alone. There will be no other little ships: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." He is the Ark of our salvation.

We cannot be saved in the sense of being delivered from the guilt and power of sin, and brought to everlasting felicity in the presence of God, by the indirect influences of the gospel. Beneficial as such influences may be in this present life, it is only as we are found in the ship with Jesus Himself, as we are in Christ, that we can safely make that last great journey to the land where there is reared "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God". Christ in you is the only hope of glory. Only as you are in Him, and He in you, can you be brought to the desired haven.

Let us pray together. Will not those who hear us

over the air—indeed, all to whom God calls to-night—just where you are, join us in this prayer:

"Jesus, Saviour, pilot me
Over life's tempestuous sea;
Unknown waves before me roll,
Hiding rock and treacherous shoal;
Chart and compass come from Thee:
Jesus, Saviour, pilot me.

"As a mother stills her child,
Thou canst hush the ocean wild;
Boisterous waves obey Thy will
When Thou sayst to them, 'Be still!
Wondrous Sovereign of the sea,
Jesus, Saviour, pilot me.

"When at last I near the shore
And the fearful breakers roar
'Twixt me and the peaceful rest,
Then, while leaning on Thy breast,
May I hear Thee say to me,
Fear not, I will pilot thee!"

DR. SHIELDS GOES WEST FOR A WEEK.

The Editor of *The Witness* will leave Toronto Sunday night on the Trans-Canada for Winnipeg, where he will speak in the church of which Brother Dempster is pastor, on Tuesday evening; he will preach in Kenora, Ontario, Wednesday evening; and in Fundamental Baptist Church, Fort William, of which Mr. Leander Roblin is pastor, Thursday evening, returning to Toronto on Saturday.

The Union Baptist Witness

This page is the official organ of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches in Ontario and Quebec.
337 Jarvis Street, Toronto, Canada.

W. GORDON BROWN, Editor.

GROWING OAKS.

Great oaks from little acorns grow, and in seeking to produce something of the sturdiness of the oak, as well as of its beauty, we must remember not only its small beginning, but also the steady and prolonged period of its development. The work of our Union had a small beginning, and now we believe it is growing from more to more.

* * * *

Brownsville.

We reported last week what seemed to be the beginning of a real revival in the Brownsville Baptist Church. We are glad to add that, when our Secretary, Rev. W. E. Atkinson preached on Monday, June 9th, two professed conversions. The next day the district Pastors' and People's Conference met in Brownsville. One feature of the day was the messages from our missionaries elect, Rev. and Mrs. E. Hancox. In the evening there were showers outside, but, thank God, showers inside too, when four, we believe, received Christ, following a powerful message by former-pastor W. J. H. Brown, who remained the rest of the week, others being converted. Beginning last Monday, Pastor James McGinlay is holding special meetings. Old times will be new times in this historic church.

Annette.

Pastor Brown rejoiced to have our missionaries-elect at Annette Street, last Sunday morning. Following their strong messages several young people expressed their willingness to be used by God in His harvest field at home or abroad.

* * * *

South Zorra.

The first day of June, Pastor W. F. Mesley had the joy of baptizing three young men in the South Zorra Church. "We rejoice in the ones and twos being saved. We have a full church at every service, new faces every Sunday—a unique experience for a country church." Two series of special sermons, one on Life's Greatest Questions, and another on Things Future, have been drawing special attention.

* * * *

Mitchell Square.

Over at Mitchell Square Pastor A. T. Finlayson is seeing some reaping from faithful sowing, in the special meetings going on with Mr. T. McClure as preacher. Last Sunday two young people followed their Lord in baptism, and other candidates are expected.

Edmonton.

Elsewhere we have recounted the organization of a Regular Baptist Missionary Society in Alberta. Its president, Pastor Morley R. Hall, has been spending several days in Edmonton, where, as he reports, modernism has worked havoc in the Baptist ranks, so that their testimony for the Gospel is weak indeed, if not entirely paralyzed. As ever, there are some of the seven thousand who will not bow the knee to Baal, in Edmonton, and a work on Fundamental lines is being organized. "When I visited the field here in April, we had a cottage meeting of about two dozen. Sunday morning, June 8th, we had about thirty, and in the evening we had sixty-five. At our meetings so far this week we are having between fifty and sixty present, and these nearly all are those ready to stand behind a Regular Baptist cause. We are looking for Brother Gordon Searle here this week to go right ahead with this work, and I believe there are great things in store for the work here. I will be remaining here another Sunday and then return to my work in Calgary. This is a city of over 80,000, and very little evangelical work being done."

Baptist Bible Union Lesson Leaf

Vol. 5

No. 3

REV. ALEX. THOMSON, EDITOR.

Lesson 27

July 6th, 1930.

Third Quarter.

CREATION, CHAOS, AND NEW ORDER.

Lesson Text: Genesis, chapter 1.

Golden Text: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Gen. 1:27.

I. INTRODUCTION.

Having concluded the study of the book of Revelation the lessons are now to be found in the book of Genesis. From the study of the new creation we come to the consideration of the old creation, and from the study of the end of things, to that of their commencement. Let us consider this portion of God's Word just as carefully, prayerfully, and open-mindedly, as we did the other, and we shall receive distinct benefit therefrom.

The authorship of the book has caused considerable discussion, and various ideas have been expressed concerning the same, denying the Mosaic authorship and supporting a documentary basis for the writing. Such hypotheses are not satisfactory, however, and are more difficult of acceptance than the orthodox view. That Moses was the author may be ascertained by a study of the Scriptural evidence, noting the manner in which the first five books are referred to in the epistles, Acts, gospels, and Old Testament books; the internal testimony of the Pentateuch, wherein by distinct statement and implication the authorship of Moses is set forth; and the testimony of our Lord who assumed such authorship.

The record of Genesis is historical from beginning to end, and is one of the most interesting books of the divine library. It is a book of beginnings wherein among other things we note the origin of the heavens and the earth, of the human race, of marriage, and of the sabbath, etc. It is the seedbed of that fruition which is seen in the later books. Its contents may be divided into two main divisions; the first eleven chapters dealing with the whole human race, setting forth the record of the creation, the fall of man, the deluge, and the dispersion of the human family after the confusion of tongues at Babel. From chapter twelve to the end of the book the history of the select family is given, the record containing information concerning such persons as Abraham, Esau, Jacob, and Joseph. It is significant to note that the book begins with the statement, "In the beginning God", etc., and ends with "in a coffin in Egypt", giving us a sad commentary on the effect of man's sin.

II. THE STATEMENT OF CREATION, (v. 1).

This is a very brief statement, yet sufficient to our understanding of this great transaction. God is a sufficient cause for the whole. Two words are used in these early chapters in naming Him: the one in this verse, Elohim being the more general term; the other,

"Jehovah", implying the Self-existing One, the designation used in His covenant relationship with man. In this statement of creation certain things may be noted, and certain errors refuted. First God created the heavens and the earth; therefore matter is not eternal, and Atheism is refuted. Second, the creation is distinct from the Creator; therefore Pantheism is refuted. And third, God is One God; and Polytheism is refuted. The idea is propounded, and is worthy at least of consideration, that in this verse we have the only account of the original creation, the second verse giving the result of a great catastrophe, the remaining verses dealing with a re-making. There is no statement to this effect, but certain Scriptures are referred to as bearing out this meaning; the Hebrew word, "bara", translated, "creation", and meaning to call into being without the aid of preexisting material, is used only three times in this first chapter,—in reference to the heavens and the earth, (v. 1); to every living creature that moveth, (v. 21); and to man, (v. 27). Two other words are used concerning the other matters,—one signifying to make, fashion, or prepare, out of existing material, (v. 7); and the other to shape or mould, as a potter the clay, (2:7). Note Isaiah 45:18 for a statement relating to creation, and Isaiah 34:11, and Jer. 4:23-27 for significance of words used in v. 2 relating to the chaotic condition.

III: THE CONDITION OF CHAOS, (v. 2).

Two statements are contained in this verse, the one relating to the chaotic condition of the world; the other to the action of the Holy Spirit. "And the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep". Whether such a scene of desolation was brought about through the sin of a pre-Adamic race, on account of the fall of Satan, or was merely a stage in God's great work, it is a most striking type of man's condition by nature, due to sin. He dwelleth in darkness, and his whole being is desolate and chaotic. Concerning the Holy Spirit we are informed He "moved upon the face of the waters". This was prior to the coming of light, and is typical of the Holy Spirit's work in man at conversion, for without Him there is no regeneration, (John 16:7-11; 3:5).

IV. ORDER IN CREATION, (vs. 3-31).

It is well to note the presence of order in God's creative activity. He is a God of order, not of confusion, (1 Cor. 14:33). In this account we note progression from inorganic matter to organic, and from lower to higher forms of life; not the evolving of one species from another, but the distinct creation of each order. The work of God is divided into certain periods, designated as days. Various interpretations have been given of these days, but there is no reason to depart from the twenty-four-hour-period conception of each day. The numeral before each one signifies the ordinary meaning of the term, the fact of there being evening and morning would imply this, and there would be difficulty in understanding how plants would be kept alive through successive periods of dark-

ness if such were of long duration, as we are informed they were brought forth on the third day. The fourth commandment would imply the same interpretation. The first day. (vs. 3-5). Light. Note first that light came at the command of God; second that it was good; third that God divided the light from the darkness; fourth that he called the light Day, and the darkness Night; and fifth that the evening and the morning were the first day. We conclude from this that there was light before the sun appeared—sometimes termed elementary light—and that the day was reckoned from evening to morning. Note the power of God's word.

The second day, (vs. 6-8). Firmament. God made the firmament. He divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament. And He called the firmament Heaven. The term firmament means to stretch, spread out, then beat or tread out, an expanse. It is described as like a curtain: (Psalm 104:2; Isaiah 40:22), as a work of sapphire, (Ex. 24:10); and as with a molten looking glass, (Job 37:18). It means the spreading "out of the air which surrounded the earth as an atmosphere"; but does not imply a solid mass.

The third day, (vs. 9-13). Dry Land. On this day we have the gathering together of the waters into one place, the appearance of the earth, and the coming forth of grass and tree. The grass referred to is the tender grass which shoots up after rain, and covers the meadows. Herb yielding seed is used as a generic term for all herbaceous plants, and tree yielding fruit includes all trees. These three classes embrace all the productions of the vegetable kingdom.

The fourth day, (vs. 14-19). Light bearers. After clothing the earth with vegetation, and making it fit for man's habitation God made the sun, moon, and stars, in which the elementary light was concentrated. They were to be for signs, (Matt. 2:2; 24:29; Luke 21:25), for seasons, for days and for years. They were to be for lights, and they were to rule the day and the night.

The fifth day, (vs. 20-23). Fish and fowl. The command is given to let the water swarm with living beings. The inference is that many were created, and the further command is given concerning their fruitfulness and multiplication.

The sixth day, (vs. 24-31). Animals and man. Note first the creation of the animals, "Cattle", the larger "animals", creeping things, the smaller animals, reptiles, insects, etc., and "beast", the wild animals. And second, note the creation of man, God's highest creation. Several things are stated in relation thereto, as, the communing of God with Himself, the dominion of man over all creation, the creation of man in God's image, the blessing of man by God, the command concerning fruitfulness and multiplication, and the statement concerning the food which man should eat. This proclaims man's preeminence over all other creatures. As made in the image of God he was like Him in a spiritual sense if not also in other ways as well, but through the fall he has been affected both physically and spiritually.