

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, BY JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, CAN., AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY

T. T. SHIELDS, *Pastor and Editor.*

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

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

Vol. 4

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 19th, 1925

No. 30

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"WILL BAPTISTS CONSENT TO McMASTER'S THROWING OVER REDEMPTION BY BLOOD?"

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, November 8th, 1925.
 (Stenographically reported.)

"For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by which we draw nigh unto God.

"And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest:

"(For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord swear and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:)

"By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.

"And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death:

"But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

"Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."—Hebrews 7:19-25.



OR the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God. And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest: (for those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord swear and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:) by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament. And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood"—a priesthood that does not pass from one to another. In other words, He is a Priest without a successor, a Priest for ever Himself after the order of Melchisedec; and on that ground, it is argued, "he is able also to save them"—not from the uttermost, though that is true, but "to the uttermost",—it is prospective, it looks into the future, it has in it an element of time—"Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." How is He able to do it? "Seeing he ever liveth"—what for?—"to make intercession for them."

I want to speak to you this evening for a little while about the Priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is a verse in the seventeenth chapter of Leviticus to this effect: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given

it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul."

You will recall the record of the first offerings presented to the Lord by Cain and Abel,—the acceptable offering was an offering of blood; when judgment had been poured out upon the earth, and Noah came out of the ark, he built an altar and he offered sacrifices to God, and the Lord smelled a sweet savor and entered into covenant with the earth and put His bow in the cloud; when Abraham heard the divine call and went out not knowing whither he went, wherever he stopped in his journeyings, wherever he pitched his tent, there he builded an altar unto the Lord; when Israel were delivered out of Egypt and a nation was born in a day, the tabernacle was established in the wilderness "after the pattern of things in the heavens". And the tabernacle consisted mainly of two parts:—there was, of course, the outer court—the holy place, and the holy of holies. The holy of holies contained the ark of the covenant, the unbroken law, the mercyseat, the glorious cherubims overshadowing the mercyseat, Aaron's rod that budded, the golden pot of manna—all these were within the veil; and into that holiest place the high priest entered but once a year, and then, as we read this evening, "not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people". I read to you also this evening how "almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission".

In the tabernacle worship which was established in the wilderness, the office of the priest played a very important part. When the tribes were led into the promised land, no lot was given to the tribe of Levi. That tribe was dedicated to the priesthood, and their inheritance was the Lord Himself; and no one might minister in the priest's office who was not born to it by being a member of the tribe of Levi. And all down through the Old Testament you will find that great importance is attached to the ministry of the priest. In the tabernacle there were no seats: it was not a place for the hearing of music; it was not a place even for the hearing of the law: it was designed to set forth the terms upon which man might come into the presence of a holy God. And when that altar was established, and the sacrifice was put upon the altar, there came down fire from heaven, signifying the divine approval of the sacrifice. When, in a later day, the temple was erected, it was erected after the pattern of the tabernacle, with its holy place and its holiest of all. When it was dedicated, when Solomon had made an end of praying, fire came down from heaven, and the glory of the Lord filled the house.

When our Lord Jesus came. Who came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfill, Who was Himself the Antitype of all that had been prefigured by the types and symbols of the Old dispensation,—for we read this evening they were the figures of better things which were yet to come—when our Lord Jesus came, John records that His great forerunner whose coming had been predicted, and whose ministry was a fulfilment of ancient prophecy, when John the Baptist introduced Jesus he said, "Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." When Jesus Himself drew nigh to the cross He began to tell His disciples that He must go up to Jerusalem to die, and He said, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many"—or, instead of many. I heard the Professor of New Testament Greek at McMaster University, Dr. J. H. Farmer, years ago, quote that text and so interpret it: "He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for—instead of—many".

The epistle to the Hebrews from which I read to you this evening, begins by declaring that all God had spoken in earlier dispensations was now fulfilled in Christ: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." The Lord Jesus is God's last word to the world. The first chapter of Hebrews argues the superiority of Jesus, not only over men but over angels; and the writer quotes the Old Testament Scriptures

in support of his position. He quotes the second, forty-fifth, one hundred and fourth and the one hundred and tenth Psalm—"But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." He declares that the heavens and the earth shall change, and as a vesture they shall be folded up and put away; that the angels are subordinate to Jesus Christ; that they are "all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation". Then he reaches that magnificent climax in the second chapter: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?"

The writer proceeds, following that, to discuss the Priesthood of our Lord Jesus in contrast with the changing, transient, priesthood of the law. He points out that the priests came of the tribe of Levi; but that our Lord came of the tribe of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood. Our Lord Jesus was not of the tribe of Levi: He was of the royal tribe of Judah, the Lion of the tribe of Judah as well as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; He was both a King and a Priest. And in proof of that he continues: "For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." We have it on record both in the Old Testament, and brought forward into the New—spoken, according to His own claim, by the Holy Ghost—that the Lord God of heaven hath sworn that Jesus Christ will never have done with His Priesthood, but that He is a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. He speaks of the passing away of many priests, who "were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood"—He has no successor, He abides a Priest for ever. And because of that "he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

This epistle from which I read to you this evening declares that all the types and symbols of that elaborate ritual of the law found their fulfilment in Christ; and that He was Himself the Tabernacle, He was Himself the Altar, He was Himself the Sacrifice, He was Himself the Priest; and He entered into the holiest of all, not with the blood of others, but with His own blood. What for? There "to appear in the presence of God for us." O blessed be His name! He was not only our Representative on the cross, in the grave, and in the resurrection; but He is our Representative before the throne, appearing for us, the guarantee that some day poor sinners, redeemed by His blood, shall also appear in the presence of the Holy One without fault before the throne of God. But He appears there for us. On what ground? With His own blood, just pleading the merits of His own blood, ever exercising the office of a priest. He presented His perfect sacrifice, and satisfied all the claims of a holy God: reconciled to God by the death of His Son, we are saved through our glorious Representative, Who ever liveth to make intercession for us. ("Hallelujah!" "Praise the Lord!"). "Don't you think that is a fine gospel? Don't you think that is satisfying to the heart and conscience, to every element of our nature, to have a second Adam thus interceding for us?"

"O loving wisdom of our God!
When all was sin and shame,
A second Adam to the fight,
And to the rescue came.

"O wisest love! that flesh and blood,
Which did in Adam fail,
Should strive afresh against the foe,
Should strive and should prevail."

Now, the proposition I submit to you is this: that any gospel—any gospel so-called—which ignores the eternal Priesthood of Jesus Christ is not *the* gospel: it is "another gospel," it has no relation to the gospel revealed in God's holy Word.

We had a discussion in the Convention and Senate of McMaster, about the Driver view. Someone said to me this morning, "What do the rank and file know about Dr. Driver? They do not know whether he was an explorer who did not find the pole, or what he is!" Of course, they don't. Some have read him. But I think I can tell you what the Driver view is in a word or two. He represents a certain school of Biblical criticism. And when it was said the other day at our Convention, that Prof. Marshall held Driver's view, someone said, "O yes! But remember, only in respect to authorship and dates of the Old Testament Scriptures." Of course! But does that not matter? Well, I will show you how it matters. That philosophy with which Dr. Driver's name is quite prominently associated—I will admit that he is not the most extreme type of modernist, but he is extreme enough; and altogether too extreme for Canadian Baptists. I hope he is for you—but that whole philosophy is based upon the assumption that the first five books of the Old Testament, the Pentateuch, were not written by Moses—he had some little part in it—but by a process of literary analysis, they, the critics, profess to have discovered that ever so many documents were woven together, but that there were three chief elements. There were, of course, more than three. There are now so many subdivisions that it is difficult to keep up with them, but there are three main divisions: one is the "J" writer. That is, the writer who uses the word Jehovah for God; another is the "E" writer, the one who uses the word Elohim for God; and the third is the priestly writer, "P", who is mainly responsible for the portions of the Pentateuch containing the priestly conception.

And Dr. Driver's position relates only to authorship and dates! I read to you to-night what the writer to the Hebrews said about the significance of Exodus and Leviticus. He said, "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest"; and in proof of that he quotes: "When Moses"—now listen—"had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took"—Moses took—"the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." What does the Driver philosophy do? It labels such portions of Scripture as part of the "Priestly Code," then it takes it out of the first five books of Moses, and dates it after the Babylonian exile, the greater part of it. Then they tell us the ritual of the Jewish worship did not come down from heaven.—but that the priests copied it from Babylon! In their view it is part of the evolutionary process, and could not possibly belong back there in the Pentateuch. It must have come later, because they did not get it from heaven: they got it from Babylon. What does it do? It simply takes the whole conception of the priesthood out of the Old Testament as a divine revelation, and makes it a piece of literary forgery, perpetrated by the priests of post-exile times to credential themselves and their office.

And the man who takes that view, cannot believe in the Priesthood of Christ. That view makes the five books of Moses a pious fraud—and not very pious either—and the most gigantic forgery that was ever foisted upon the human mind. And then when they take that view, changing the authorship, changing the dates, with utter disregard to the teaching of the New Testament, they come to us and say that it is only a matter of authorship and dates! But when you consider what that means, you discover that they have taken away the foundation of the New Testament. The New Testament has its roots in the Old, the great central fact of the whole Christian revelation is the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. It begins back there in Eden: the blood is shed; the coats of skin are made; and all the way through there runs that scarlet line that binds all the Book together, until we come to the last book which tells us of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. It is not confined to the book of Hebrews: we find it in all Paul's writings. The Acts of the Apostles is full of it, and in every epistle Paul wrote we are taught that we are made nigh by the blood. Paul does not confine himself to the death of Christ: it is the blood of Christ. What is the significance? "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have

given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." What is the blood? It is the life in solution. That is what it is. That is scientifically accurate: men of science will tell you to-day that the life of the flesh is in the blood. And it is the blood, which represents the whole life, that was shed and that made an atonement—the Just for the unjust to bring us to God. It is the substitutionary fact that is the foundation of the gospel: He died instead of us, the Just for the unjust; He was made sin for us though He knew no sin "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

We are living in a day when men speak in such a fashion that they would deceive the very elect. I will read you something—I have read it to you before, but I think I will read it again. You hear "Jesus Christ, and him crucified" preached, and someone comes to you and says, "Why, the man preaches Christ!" Yes, he preaches Christ, and talks about coming to Christ. He preaches Christ! "I tell you, sir, he magnified the Cross; he led us right to the Cross; and he preached the death of Christ, too." Yes! but what does the death of Christ mean in such a man's philosophy?—I am not speaking of any particular man for the moment. This is just a hypothetical case, although I have many in mind who preach after that fashion—what does the death of Christ mean in such a case? It means the climax of a righteous life; it means the consummation of a sublime, a supreme Example; it teaches me that I ought to be so devoted to truth, to righteousness, to right living, and right doing, that I would rather die than do wrong. That is what Christ did: I ought to do it too. But that is not all the gospel, that is only half the gospel. That is all right for the man who is once saved. Christ is his Example. But, my brethren, without the blood of expiation, without the blood that cleanses from sin, there is no salvation.

Of course, if we are astray in our conception of sin itself, if it is but the residue of some earlier stage, we need no atoning Sacrifice. Christ is often thus preached; and the undiscerning accept it. When our dear friend whom I have had occasion to criticize made his statement of faith the other day, he said that he believed—let me read you exactly what he said: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; I believe in the Deity of Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord; I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and the final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour"—You see He is not authoritative or infallible in all realms. Dr. Driver says that He did not necessarily know anything about the authorship of the Old Testament, that the question was never submitted to Him at all, and therefore in attributing certain Scriptures to Moses and certain to David, we are not to accept Christ's word for it at all.—A great many people sat in the Convention and said, "Oh, that is great. He believes that on questions of morality and religion, the absolute and the final word is with Jesus Christ." If Christ made a mistake about Jonah, if He made a mistake about the authorship of the Old Testament Scriptures, if when He said, "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?"—if He made so many mistakes as some of the critics tell us He did, then He is not infallible for me. I cannot understand how a Man Who is so faulty should be an infallible Guide for us at all. If He had not the wisdom, and omniscience, and sure knowledge of God, how can we follow Him unfalteringly in every word He utters?

And then Dr. Marshall said: "I believe in the virgin birth; I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God; I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave"—"Why", someone nudged me and said, "did you hear that? Did you hear him say that he believed in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God? What more do you want than that?" Our new Professor's great sponsor tells us that when John said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world", he said something that was historically true, that under the inspiration and example of Jesus Christ a great many sins that used to be in the world are gone—that when John said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," he stated a fact which has been historically demonstrated, because the world is getting better every day. That is the most subtle kind of deception.

That is not what this Scripture means: it means that between this soul of mine and God there was sin which a holy God could not pardon; and that Jesus came and died, and offered an equivalent before God for my poor life; and cast my sins behind His back. It is an objective Christ Who did something for me, in order that He might do something in me. That is the gospel. Our Professor of Practical Theology seems to know nothing at all about an objective Christ suffering the Just for the unjust—"vicarious" on his lips is one of the "weasel words."

I had a letter last week from a great editor in the United States—I am publishing an extract from it in this week's issue of *The Gospel Witness*—in which he speaks of having read the new Professor's sermon, and characterizes it as being made up of "weasel-word chicanery." Do you know what a weasel-word is? I believe Theodore Roosevelt coined that word. Do you know what a weasel does? It takes an egg, pierces it, and sucks all the egg out of it, and leaves you a perfectly good egg—except that there is nothing in it. What is a weasel-word? It is the word "vicarious" with all the evangelical content taken out of it. That is what Modernism does,—sucks the blood out of the terminology of orthodoxy, and then comes to us with the very words of orthodoxy, making them mean the very opposite from what they have always meant. It is the very worst kind of deception.

The Professor then reached this climax: "I believe that Jesus ever liveth"—when I heard that I thought, just for the fraction of a second, surely I must have been wrong, I must have been misjudging—"who ever liveth"—what for? To appear before God to make intercession for me with His own blood? No!—"who ever liveth to be the inspiration of His followers"! Do you see it? My brethren, it is an absolutely bloodless gospel—an absolutely bloodless gospel: the death of Christ, but no expiation; the living Christ, but no intercession; an Example, but no dynamic to enable me to attain to it. That is the kind of thing we have in our day.

But oh, how blessed to get back to the Word of God, and to remember that our Lord is there, having carried our human nature, in His glorified body, into the presence of God,—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and, fulfilling the ancient prophecy, the Mediator before God, saying, "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom"! And people who have been saved by the blood, who have been redeemed at such tremendous cost, will come clearly to see that there is no blood in this Professor's gospel, no blood of atonement—coming to Christ! Coming to Christ! Coming, saying, "Nothing in my hand I bring; simply to Thy cross I cling"? No! The way to come to Christ is to pay your debts, to live as a decent citizen; the way to come to Christ is to live a self-sacrificing life, to avoid snobishness—and when you live a self-sacrificing life you come to Christ; and when you do not live a self-sacrificing life, you do not belong to Christ! We all ought to live self-sacrificing lives, we ought to deny ourselves and take up our cross and follow Him. But that is not the gospel: that is planting the tree upsidown, with its roots in the air; that is confounding cause and effect, putting the effect before the cause. The great thing is that we should know our sins are atoned for, that they are washed away. The poor, bankrupt, hell-deserving, empty-handed sinner comes to the Cross, and finds full and free forgiveness for all his sins; and then says, like Saul of Tarsus, first, "Who art thou, Lord?"; and the answer comes, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." And then, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" He ought to be our Lord; we ought to do His commandments: we ought to feed the hungry, and clothe the naked, and educate the ignorant, and visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and keep ourselves unspotted from the world—we ought to do all these things. But the great matter is that, first of all, we should be right with God. Made nigh—made nigh! How can you be made nigh? Only by the cleansing of the precious blood of Christ.

I wonder if there is someone here this evening who needs a Saviour like that? If I were to talk to you to-night about following Christ as a great Example, you would say, "It is all very lovely, sir. I have never read of Him without admiring Him. I should like to walk in His steps, and go down to the office to-morrow and do exactly as He would. I should like to do all that, but I am afraid to begin because I should get into endless trouble. I have no strength, no goodness of my own." Well, I am not going to ask you to follow

the example of Jesus Christ to begin with: I am asking you to come as one who has nothing at all, who pleads bankruptcy, utter moral and spiritual ruin, with nothing at all to bring to God; and therefore with empty hands to receive everything from God. Then you will have "Someone to go to the office with you, to your home, to the shop, everywhere.

You young people—young to-day, you will be older by and by—but if you live to be as old as Methuselah, and the Lord should tarry, there is a great High Priest yonder in Heaven pleading every day, He is there as a freshly killed Sacrifice; and He is pleading every day, "Lord, save that man; help that woman." And every time we take the name of Jesus upon our lips and pray to Him, Jesus takes our prayer and presents it to the Father. I do not know whether I have told you, but when I was in Hamilton years ago, I was going down the street one day, and I saw in the distance a little girl trying to post a letter. She was trying to get it into a pillar box, but she could not quite reach it. Then she got hold of the box with one hand, and tried to jump; but she could not hold the lid of the box open, and jump at the same time. She could not get the letter in, though she tried ever so many times. And just as I was approaching, she hung her hands down, and looked up and down the street as though looking for help. Presently she saw me, and came running to me and looking up as though she thought I could reach anything said, "Please, sir, will you post my letter?" I took the letter and examined it. I saw that it was addressed and stamped, put it in the box, and it went on its way carried by His Majesty's mail to its destination.

No matter what stilts you may get, no matter how you stand on tip-toe morally and spiritually and try to present a request of yours before the Throne, you cannot reach, you cannot attain to the height of the Divine holiness, you cannot measure up to His perfect righteousness, by the utmost reach of your moral stature. We are moral dwarfs, we have come short of the glory of God; but our High Priest will stoop, and with His humanity He will take your poor prayer, and with His Deity He will lift it up to the highest heights of divine holiness. He will present your poor prayer, stamped with His name, certified with His imprimatur, made effective by His intercession, and for His sake the answer will come. What a blessed thing it is to be assured that we have such an Intercessor as that! Will you send a letter to Heaven? Will you send it to-night in the Name of the Lord Jesus? Will you send this letter, "God be merciful to me a sinner"? "But will He hear me?" No; but He will hear Christ; and when you pray in His name and for His sake, He will blot out all your sins, and you will be His for ever: "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

No one is more welcome to Jarvis Street Pulpit, than the great preacher and Bible teacher, Dr. R. E. Neighbour, of Chicago. Dr. Neighbour taught the Pastor's Bible Class at 10.00 Sunday morning, and in spite of the heavy storm, three hundred and fifty were present, with nine hundred and sixty throughout the School. At the 11.00 o'clock service, Dr. Neighbour preached a strong sermon from Psalm 126: 6. At this service, Mr. R. E. Neighbour, Jr., violinist, who has studied under world-famous masters, and who has consecrated his talent absolutely to the Lord and His work, gave two much appreciated violin selections. In the evening, Dr. Neighbour preached to a capacity congregation, when several confessed Christ.

A few weeks ago the people of Jarvis Street were privileged in hearing Pastor James McGinlay, the young Alton revivalist, when God was pleased to use his ministry to the salvation of many souls. During the Pastor's absence next Sunday, Mr. McGinlay will teach the Pastor's Class at 10.00, and preach both morning and evening. Let us be much in prayer that God will show His hand in our midst.

The Pastor left last Friday evening, November 13th, for Lexington, Ky., where he will conduct evangelistic services in the First Baptist Church until November 27th. Mr. W. J. Hutchinson, our Sunday School Superintendent and Choir Leader, accompanied Dr. Shields. He will lead the singing at all services, and conduct Junior Gospel Services every day at 4.30. Pastor and officers of First Church, Lexington, earnestly solicit the prayers of our readers for this evangelistic mission.

The publication of this paper as a missionary enterprise is made possible by the gifts of members of Jarvis Street Church and others, and is sent to subscribers by mail for \$2.00 (under cost) per year. If any of the Lord's stewards who read this have received blessing, we shall be grateful for any thank-offering you may be able to send to The Witness Fund at any time; and especially for your prayers that the message of The Witness may be used by the Holy Spirit for the defence of the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the exaltation of Christ. As our funds make it possible, we hope to add to our free list, from time to time, the names of ministers at home and missionaries abroad.

EDITORIAL

WHAT PROF. L. H. MARSHALL TAUGHT IN ENGLAND.

We publish below a sermon by the Rev. L. H. Marshall, B.A., B.D., recently appointed Professor at McMaster University. A copy of the printed sermon has just reached us from England. On the outside cover the sermon is entitled, "What Baptists Stand For," while on the front page within, the sermon is entitled, "Our Baptist Witness." We draw particular attention to the lines printed in bold type in the sermon which follows, but we want our readers to understand that this emphasis is not Mr. Marshall's, but ours. These lines are not emphasized at all in the printed sermon before us, but we have printed them in bold type in order that we may call our readers' attention to their teaching. The date of the sermon is placed, approximately, by the fact that Mr. Harding was at the time President of the United States, and that the sermon was preached some time since the Baptist World's Conference at Stockholm. It is therefore of comparatively recent date.

The title of the sermon, "What Baptists Stand For," would surely lead us to expect to find in this sermon a statement of Baptist fundamentals. To omit essential matters from a sermon designed to show what Baptists stand for, one might suppose all would agree, would be inexcusable.

We have numbered the parts of the sermon printed in bold type for convenience of reference. Again, we desire it to be understood that the numbers also are ours, not Mr. Marshall's. We state it again to avoid all possibility of misrepresentation: the numbers enclosed in parentheses do not appear in Mr. Marshall's sermon, and we print them for the sake of reference.

When we read this sermon and came upon the question of baptism, and observed Mr. Marshall's insistence upon immersion, we thought that here at least we should get some indication of Mr. Marshall's view of the death of Christ; for we have never heard any sound Baptist discuss the question of baptism without emphasizing its symbolic significance as setting forth in symbol the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Therefore we expected that when Mr. Marshall touched upon the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, there would be some reference to the substitutionary work of Christ, or, at least, to the death of Christ; but in discussing the "mode" of baptism here is what Mr. Marshall says (1):

"This question is not unimportant, for clearly the whole spiritual significance and symbolism of baptism are destroyed when sprinkling is substituted for immersion. Baptism is essentially a symbolic act setting forth the cleansing of the whole being from evil and the dedication of the whole being to God."

There is not a word to suggest that baptism has any relation to the death of Christ, or to His resurrection; but, on the contrary, "baptism is essentially a symbolic act setting forth the cleansing of the whole being from evil and the dedication of the whole being to God."

Once again: Mr. Marshall says that "very near to us are the Congregationalists and the Quakers. But the former have adopted infant baptism—an institution entirely foreign to the spirit of the Early Church; and the latter have abolished both baptism and the Communion service." And then he adds (2): "And however justifiable Quaker practice may be in this regard, it is clearly at variance with the practice of the Apostolic Church." In the name

of reason, we ask why Mr. Marshall should imply that the Quaker practice of doing away with both ordinances may be justifiable? Surely no other inference is possible but that there is something to be said in justification of the Quaker position in respect to the ordinances. Of course, Mr. Marshall points out that "it is clearly at variance with the practice of the Apostolic Church"; but his words imply that such variance might possibly be "justifiable."

Mr. Marshall speaks of the church meeting "for the breaking of bread." But again, there is absolute silence as to the significance of that solemn ordinance.

With what Mr. Marshall says in section one of his sermon about the privilege of direct access to God, and the equality of all believers before God, all Baptists will be in hearty agreement. But even here Mr. Marshall shows the bent of his mind when he says (3): "We should have no difficulty in finding a Miss Maude Royden both a pulpit and a Church." We express only our personal view when we say that the Scriptures are very clear on the matter of women as pastors of any sort; but this particular Miss Maude Royden, we should hope, would not be at home in any Baptist church in Canada, for she has not very long since denied both the virgin birth and physical resurrection of Christ. Mr. Marshall, however, thinks there should be no difficulty in finding such an one both a pulpit and a church in the Baptist denomination.

We come now to the terms of church membership as laid down by Mr. Marshall (4):

"Anyone who shows a sincere desire to lead a Christian life, be he twelve years old or fifty, may join the Church of Christ and confess his allegiance in the historic way by immersion."

Baptists used to talk about a regenerate church membership, about having a real experience of the new birth; but the condition of membership according to Mr. Marshall—and for believer's baptism, too,—is that one should "show a sincere desire to lead a Christian life," and baptism is declared to be "the mode by which they publicly declare their sincere desire to be followers of the Lord Jesus Christ." Do Canadian Baptists really hold any such thing, that a mere desire to become a follower of Christ is sufficient reason for admission to a Baptist Church? Do Baptists hold that baptism is nothing more than an expression of that desire? Why should there be, in this connection, not a word to suggest the necessity of the new birth, not a word to suggest the relation of that experience to the death of Christ, not a word to suggest that the ordinance of baptism has this spiritual significance? But everything is summed up in a "desire to lead a Christian life."

Again (5), the special advantage of baptism is that "a young person who is publicly baptized at his own choice is bound to think far more seriously of what Church membership involves than one who, having been baptized in infancy, later on simply receives the right hand of fellowship at a Communion service."

Has baptism no fuller and richer ministry than that? Is the ordinance reserved for such as may be "publicly baptized at his own choice," because it is bound to have the effect of making such an one "think far more seriously of what Church membership involves"? Nowhere, so far in the sermon, is there the remotest suggestion that there is an Holy Spirit of God by Whose power souls dead in trespasses and sins are made alive; nor is there anything here to suggest that if any man be in Christ he is a new creation. According to Mr. Marshall, the church is made up of people who desire to lead a Christian life; baptism signifies the dedication of the whole man to God; the special advantage of baptism for those who submit to it, is that they are bound to think far more seriously!

We observe further that Mr. Marshall does not go as far as some and say that it does not matter what a man believes; but, on the contrary, he says that what a man believes is a vitally important matter. But certainly he reduces what we ought to believe to a minimum: (6) "All that we insist on is personal loyalty to Jesus Christ." Is that all? Many Unitarians claim to be loyal to Jesus Christ, and boast of their readiness to follow Him. Is the *sine qua non* of Baptist faith nothing more than this? Mr. Marshall has been talking of the necessity of following Jesus without any recognition of the fact that some

people are as unable to follow Jesus as was Lazarus, or the young man of Nain. There is not in this sermon on "What Baptists Stand For" anything to suggest that loyalty to Christ involves an acceptance of His substitutionary work in our behalf, and an experience of the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost.

We come now to one of the most serious statements in the whole sermon, in which (7) Mr. Marshall says:

"Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of moderate science."

Several things are plainly implied in this statement. The first is that the Biblical account of creation is not a divinely inspired record and the last word on the subject: it is a "Hebrew tradition." Surely it means that we have no authoritative word from God on the subject of creation: all we have is a "Hebrew tradition!"

Furthermore, these words imply that there is a wide difference between this alleged "Hebrew tradition about the creation" and "the teaching on that subject of modern science",—but a man may be a Baptist and accept either "if it satisfies him." But to what modern science does Mr. Marshall refer? Does he refer to that science—falsely so-called—which accounts for the created order on the principle of evolution? Does he mean that a Christian disciple may be a Baptist and accept the evolutionary hypothesis, and base his entire thinking on that premise "if it satisfies him"? The so-called modern science which so widely differs from the alleged "Hebrew tradition of the creation" involves unquestionably the doctrine of evolution. That doctrine, in the nature of the case, denies the fact of original sin, and hence recognizes no necessity for a substitutionary sacrifice. Certainly Mr. Marshall's latitudinarian view of the content of Baptist belief provides for the admission of those who are theologically "the broadest of the broad."

Side by side with this we quote from the minutes of the Senate of McMaster as read by Chancellor Whidden at the Convention, respecting the statement of Dr. Farmer as to Mr. Marshall's attitude toward the Scriptures. The minutes state that Dr. Farmer said:

"He (Mr. Marshall) had the statement of the doctrinal position of the institution, and he gave his hearty adhesion to those statements. I pointed out in the Senate that in his department—of course his department is not the Old Testament as stated in that letter; he is in the department of Practical Theology and the Arts Bible—I stated that his general view was in sympathy with the general moderate, what may be called the Driver view, the moderate critical view. That has to deal with dates and authorship and so on. I do not know just where to draw the line, but he told me that the first chapter of Genesis was one of the proofs to him of the inspiration of the Bible and the general historicity."

Our readers will observe that Dr. Farmer says: "He told me that the first chapter of Genesis was one of the proofs to him of the inspiration of the Bible and the general historicity"; Mr. Marshall says in the sermon under review: "We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science." What are we to do with these opposing statements? Dr. Farmer appears to have understood Mr. Marshall to say that the first chapter of Genesis was one of the proofs of the inspiration of the Bible: Mr. Marshall refers obviously to the first chapter of Genesis as the "Hebrew tradition about the creation"; and expresses the view that one may be a true Baptist and accept something which is entirely different from "the Hebrew tradition about the creation," namely, "the teaching on that subject of modern science." Dr. Farmer reports his recollection of what Mr. Marshall said: Mr. Marshall's printed sermon represents what he actually did say and write. Certainly the two statements do not agree. Did Mr. Marshall say one thing in his own pulpit in England, and another thing when talking to the Dean in Theology of McMaster University in Canada? That is almost inconceivable. That there is a

glaring discrepancy between the two statements everybody must admit; and we shall have to leave it to our readers to find out who is responsible. Meanwhile, we can only accept at its face value what Mr. Marshall has said—that the Genesis account of creation is a "Hebrew tradition."

Once again: In the same paragraph Mr. Marshall says: "He (the Christian disciple) is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship." Mr. Marshall says that a Baptist may choose which he likes. He is careful to describe orthodoxy as "so-called" orthodoxy, which can mean nothing else than that he does not regard "the so-called orthodox method" as the way of right thinking. But whether or no, he certainly does not regard its opposite, "the method pursued by modern scholarship," as the way of wrong thinking. He sets the two in opposition, and says a man may be a Baptist and accept either. If our readers will follow the words emphasized in Mr. Marshall's sermon which we have numbered "7" to the end, they will see that there is nothing in Mr. Marshall's words to suggest that he has any conception that we have an authoritative and final revelation of God's truth in the Holy Scriptures. God may reveal Himself through any channel, according to his view. Among the things that Baptists stand for, we had been wont to put an unwavering belief in the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible: in all this sermon Mr. Marshall does not once appeal to the Scripture, except to say that in the matter of baptism we are following "the practice of the Apostolic Church." Surely it is significant that in a sermon on "Our Baptist Witness", or "What Baptists Stand For", there is not one solitary quotation of Scripture, nor one direct appeal to the Word of God. The only direct reference to Scripture is where Mr. Marshall refers to Genesis as "the Hebrew tradition about the creation"; and where he says also that a Baptist "is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment." Apart from these two allusions, anyone hearing Mr. Marshall's sermon, who had not learned of it before, would never know there was such a book as the Bible. And this is "What Baptists Stand For"! That may be so in England; but is it what Canadian Baptists stand for?

There are other matters in Mr. Marshall's sermon which require examination, which, though somewhat less important than those to which we have referred, nevertheless are too important to be lightly passed over, as they indicate a general attitude. In the beginning of the sermon Mr. Marshall refers to the "remarkable growth of the Baptist Church throughout the world during the last few decades"; and at the beginning of section five he says: "The Baptist Church is the only one of the older churches that has never persecuted those of another persuasion." We should like to enquire, What is the Baptist church? There is a growing tendency even in this country to speak of Baptist churches in the aggregate as a Denomination, and to assume that the Conventions in which the representatives of these churches assemble, have some sort of legislative power. In England that conception has developed to such an extent that Dr. Shakespeare, until a little while ago, Secretary of The Baptist Union of Great Britain, in his book on "The Church At The Cross-Roads," actually proposed a union of all the so-called "Free" Churches into one denomination. Now, in our understanding of the matter, that idea is as foreign to the historic Baptist conception of a church as anything can possibly be. We read in the Scriptures of the churches of Galatia, of the seven churches of Asia. It is quite correct to speak of Baptist churches; but what is the Baptist church? The obvious answer is that there is no such organization!

Once more: Mr. Marshall says in respect to the Baptists of England: "In this country we are a comparatively small body, for we have only about 250,000 members, so that members and adherents together will amount to not more than a million. In America, however, the Baptists are the strongest Protestant body. Their membership reaches seven millions, and so when adherents are taken into account, it will be safe to assume that there are twenty million people in the States associated with Baptist Churches. In Canada and in the Colonies generally the Baptists are a growing force." By Mr. Marshall's own admission, the Baptists have not done very well in England. Nor do we wonder. While in the midst of this article we received a letter from a minister in England in which he says:

"I shall await the issue of the Convention at Hamilton with great interest. Should Mr. Marshall be appointed, it will surely demonstrate that the Convention churches are as infected as English Baptist churches. On Monday last, 26th inst., Rev. Douglas Brown painted a black picture of 'open' Baptist churches. He was addressing between fifty and sixty pastors and preachers at the Metropolitan Tabernacle,—telling us of his experiences up and down the land. Large numbers of Baptist churches (not strict Baptist churches; for not one of them is tainted) 'have shown 'The Second Coming' out of the back door', as Mr. Douglas Brown remarked.

"Mrs. _____ and I heard Rev. Robertson deliver the addresses which you have reported. Mr. D. Brown said: 'I have heard many make the remark, 'How I wish Mr. Spurgeon could come back again'—but', said he, 'I speak solemnly, I could not wish him back. Were he to return, it would break his heart to see the present condition of the churches!'"

The tendency toward what is now called "Modernism," Mr. Spurgeon long ago described as a "down grade" movement. And the fact is that since the day the Baptist Union passed a resolution of censure upon the greatest preacher the world has ever known since apostolic times, it has been on the down grade. The writer is an Englishman; and those who know him, know that he is unashamed of that fact. But we say deliberately that if there is one place in all the world from which Baptists have absolutely nothing to learn about how to get "Our Baptist Witness" before the world, that place is England. It is an appalling tragedy that a man recommended by one of the rankest modernists in England, Dr. T. Reavley Glover, who has done more to destroy the faith of English Baptists than any other single living man—that one approved and recommended by such an one, should be appointed as Professor of Practical Theology to train the rising generation of Baptist preachers in this Dominion.

In discussing Mr. Marshall's sermon we have been dealing with matters of history. We venture now into the realm of prophecy. We attended the meeting of the great Southern Baptist Convention at Memphis. We observed the subtlety of Dr. E. Y. Mullins. We wrote something about Dr. Mullins after that which displeased not a few. There are few who are able to analyze a speech as it is delivered, and to recognize its defects: some people have to think a thing through a good while before they quite understand it. We were not alone in our estimate of Dr. Mullins' speech; now thousands of people all through the South are saying just about what we said. There is scarcely a paper in the South in which Dr. Mullins is not being criticized. We quote from The Baptist Messenger of Oklahoma, and from an article by Dr. T. P. Stafford, in which he says:

"I did not wish to engage in a discussion with Dr. Mullins. I returned from Memphis with the purpose not to do it. But when it became evident to me that Dr. Mullins' positions were inconsistent I felt that I should offer some friendly criticism of his utterances. I am an admirer of Dr. Mullins. I use his books as text books. Very seldom do I differ from him. . . . Because of his distinguished services to our denomination in many ways I hesitated long before saying a word publicly in disagreement with him. At Memphis I voted with him and against Dr. Stealey's amendment. I did it because I believed Dr. Mullins when he said that the issue boiled down was simply where the statement on science should be put in the document. He deceived me in that as I will show. I am speaking in kindness. I would not use an unnecessarily harsh word. But I must state the case as it is. Dr. Mullins is making a great mistake. He is undoing some of the great good he has been doing. I am greatly disappointed."

What has been the result in the Southern Baptist Convention of the attempt on the part of the leaders to run with the hare of orthodoxy, and hunt with the hounds of modernism? It is driving that great Convention into something that is very close to bankruptcy. Nearly every fund of the Southern Convention is overwhelmingly in debt; and according to the statement of their own official statistician, of the twenty-five thousand churches only five thousand are co-

operating in the Convention Budget; and the five thousand co-operating churches represent only five hundred thousand out of three and a half million members. Thus their policy has had the effect of alienating four-fifths of their churches, and six-sevenths of their membership.

Why have we referred to this? Because it is almost an exact parallel to the situation in our own Convention. To those who have eyes to see—and thousands will see it before many months are past—there is a conspiracy in McMaster University to defeat Baptist fundamentalism at all costs. The present Chancellor and the Deans in association with him, are among the chief conspirators. They have just acquired a new ally in this gentleman from England whose views are so utterly unbaptistic. If this condition should continue in McMaster University for, say three to five years, it would inevitably result in the paralysis of our Baptist work.

It is bound to affect our Foreign Mission work. The Foreign Mission Secretary has been most outspoken, up and down the country, in his sympathy toward McMaster's position. The Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board, having heard the utterly heretical speech of Mr. Marshall—we still believe that if and when Mr. Moore thoroughly analyzes that speech and fits it to his own undoubted experience of the regenerating grace of God, and his own personal passion for the Person of Christ and the souls of men—we still believe that when Mr. Moore shall have done this, he will change his mind; for we have always thought of Mr. Moore, among the leading laymen of the Denomination, as being by all odds the truest in his convictions respecting the fundamentals of the faith—but Mr. Moore, having heard Mr. Marshall's speech, denounced our action in opposing him as "criminal." Notwithstanding this harsh word, we have nothing in our heart but affection for Mr. Moore, and do not doubt for a moment the absolute genuineness of his Christian purpose; but that he is mistaken—terribly mistaken—absolutely mistaken, we are positive. But if he should continue in that course, and endorse the doctrines of the new Professor, we prophesy that his connection with the Foreign Mission Board will serve absolutely to paralyze its activities. What has happened in the Northern Baptist Convention will happen here; for there are thousands of Baptists who will not give their money to be administered by men who assume, to use Rev. John Linton's phrase, an attitude of easy tolerance toward Modernism. We love Mr. Moore; we honor him for his works' sake; and without feeling any resentment against his bitter words, we pray that God in great mercy may open his eyes and give him the courage openly to acknowledge his mistake, ere he brings the whole Foreign Mission enterprise which he leads, under the withering blight of this teaching.

In the Northern Baptist Convention things are even worse than in the South. Unitarianism openly flaunts itself; and some of the foreign missionaries of the Northern Board are worse than Unitarians: they are positively pagan. We warn the Denomination that the maintenance of this new Professor in McMaster University, or anyone else who teaches his view, is bound to lead to spiritual paralysis. The Gospel Witness will dedicate itself afresh to the great task of turning on the light, and showing the Denomination where the responsibility for this appalling condition lies. As time and space will permit, we propose to show who is chiefly to be blamed for the present condition of affairs. It will be our task for many weeks to come to produce our cause, and to bring forth our strong reasons.

Below is Mr. Marshall's sermon, followed by further comment.

WHAT BAPTISTS STAND FOR.

A Sermon Preached at Queen's Road Church, Coventry,
By the Rev. L. H. Marshall, B.A., B.D.

OUR BAPTIST WITNESS.

Text: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

(Note the order: FIRST 'make disciples,' THEN 'baptize').

Baptists have attracted a good deal of attention of late on both sides of the Atlantic. Individual Baptists have been playing a conspicuous part in world affairs. Mr. Lloyd George is a Baptist. Mr. W. G. Harding, the President of

the U. S. A., Mr. C. E. Hughes, the American Secretary of State, and Mr. J. J. Davies, the American Secretary of Labor, are all Baptists. Then, too, the Baptist World Congress at Stockholm is a reminder of the perfectly remarkable growth of the Baptist Church throughout the world during the last few decades. In this country we are a comparatively small body, for we have only about 250,000 members, so that members and adherents together will amount to not more than a million. In America, however, the Baptists are the strongest Protestant body. Their membership reaches seven millions, and so, when adherents are taken into account, it will be safe to assume that there are twenty million people in the States associated with Baptist churches. In Canada and in the Colonies generally the Baptists are a growing force. Most remarkable of all is the recent growth of the Baptists on the Continent of Europe. Continental Methodists and Congregationalists are so few in number as to be negligible, but Continental Baptists seem to be going forward by leaps and bounds even in countries where they are still liable to persecution. Such facts as these surely invite us to consider the secret of our success, for behind such remarkable advance there must be vital forces at work. We shall find the secret in our own distinctive witness, and in our peculiar contribution to the interpretation of the Christian faith.

It is unhappily quite a common thing in inter-denominational life to hear jocular remarks made, in all good humour, at our expense, with reference to our mode of baptism. But it is really just as vulgar and irreverent to speak in a frivolous manner about the immersion of believers as it would be to speak in a similar fashion about the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Some of our fellow-Christians regard our mode of baptism as a curious innovation—they overlook the fact that we have simply returned to the practice of the early Church. Others again simply dismiss it as "a harmless eccentricity," and thus show that they have failed altogether to appreciate the inwardness of our position and the spiritual emphasis upon which we insist. The question at issue between ourselves and our fellow-Christians is not simply a question as to the amount of water to be used in baptism, as to whether the mode shall be by sprinkling or by immersion. (The first English Baptists sprinkled.) (1) This question is not unimportant, for clearly the whole spiritual significance and symbolism of baptism are destroyed when sprinkling is substituted for immersion. Baptism is essentially a symbolic act setting forth the cleansing of the whole being from evil and the dedication of the whole being to God. If the practice of baptism is to be preserved at all, it should be preserved in its ancient historic form, viz., the immersion of the whole body in water, so that the modern disciple may be baptized in precisely the same way as Christ Himself was baptized. But our essential witness lies elsewhere. We have returned to a spiritual position that is nearer to that of the Apostolic Church than the position of any other Church in Christendom. Very near to us are the Congregationalists and the Quakers. But the former have adopted infant baptism—an institution entirely foreign to the spirit of the Early Church; and the latter have abolished both baptism and the Communion service, (2) and however justifiable Quaker practice may be in this regard, it is clearly at variance with the practice of the Apostolic Church—for the first Christians seem invariably to have been baptized when they became Christian disciples, and to have met together from time to time for the breaking of bread. Behind all the varied forms which it assumes, what is the fundamental principle for which we stand—the principle enshrined in the symbolism of our mode of baptism? In short, we hold that the central and decisive thing in the spiritual life is the individual's personal relationship to God, and that all disciples are alike endowed with power to deal directly with God. We are full of charity for all our fellow-Christians. We do not condemn or pass judgment on their practices, but simply maintain that it is our right and duty to be loyal to this one fundamental principle and all its implications.

I.

On the strength of this principle, for ourselves we reject professional priesthood in every shape and form. We hold that every disciple may be a priest unto himself. Our ministers are not priests. We do not believe that any man—either by virtue of the figment of apostolic succession or of episcopal ordina-

tion—can be endowed with priestly powers which raise him to a spiritual level beyond the reach of his fellow Christians. We maintain the absolute equality of all true Christian people before God—all alike can enter into direct personal fellowship with God without the aid of either priest or sacrament. We regard ministers as being laymen, who, by their fitness for the task and their sense of an inward call, dedicate themselves to the work of promoting the spiritual welfare of their fellowmen. In the Christian life there is no such thing as a monopoly of grace or a specially privileged class—whether we are bishops or ministers, tradesmen or miners, shepherds or sailors, housewives or charwomen, as disciples of Christ we are all capable of precisely the same intercourse and direct dealings with God. We do not expect a higher standard of spirituality or moral behaviour from our ministers than from ordinary Church members. All alike have taken the same vows to the same Lord. The spiritual heights that ministers may scale are heights that all disciples can scale. All Christian people meet on a basis of absolute equality before God. Any disciple—man or woman—who can preach, may preach. Any disciple—man or woman—may, if the Church wishes, preside at a communion service or administer the ordinance of believer's baptism. All who are endeavouring to live in personal fellowship with God and personal loyalty to Christ are alike priests. Amongst such there are no different ranks or classes or privileges, but perfect equality. Any disciple—man or woman—who feels called of Christ to the ministry, and shows himself or herself capable of exercising the ministerial office, may enter the ministry. (3) We should have no difficulty in finding a Miss Maude Royden both a pulpit and a Church. Granted the inward call and manifest fitness, episcopal ordination is superfluous. The all-important, all-decisive thing is the soul's personal relationship to God.

II.

Similarly we believe that an individual can become a member of the Church of Christ only by his free personal decision and choice. The sprinkling of water upon an unconscious babe by a priest cannot make anybody "a child of God, a member of Christ, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." We cannot enter the Church by proxy, though the King and Queen be prepared to act as our sponsors. We can enter the Church only when we wish to enter by the spontaneous and free dedication of our lives to Christ. The whole thing hinges upon the individual's attitude. That is why we postpone baptism until the individual wishes to be baptized. We do not stand for adult baptism, but for believer's baptism. (4) Anyone who shows a sincere desire to lead a Christian life, be he twelve years old or fifty, may join the Church of Christ and confess his allegiance in the historic way by immersion. Baptism does not make people Christians—anyone who is not a disciple before the ceremony does not become one by virtue of the ceremony—it is simply the mode by which they publicly declare their sincere desire to be the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. We hold this principle to be of vital importance. It is indeed an historic fact that nothing in the history of the Church has so tended to lower the moral and spiritual tone of the Church as the introduction of infant baptism. During the first century and a half of its existence—as is the case in Baptist Churches to-day—no one could join the Church except by profession of personal faith in Christ and devotion to Him. Consequently the standard of Christian character was high. But when people began to join the Church by baptism in their infancy, a high moral and spiritual standard became impossible. Every member of the Christian community became ipso facto a member of the Church. Thus the difference between the Church and the community largely vanished, and people of low character were nevertheless reckoned in the number of baptized Christians. It has been asserted that the Christian life is intenser among Baptists than even among Congregationalists, simply because in the case of Baptists baptism is deferred until years of discretion are reached. (5) It is clear that a young person who is publicly baptized at his own choice is bound to think far more seriously of what Church membership involves than one who, having been baptized in infancy, later on simply receives the right hand of fellowship at a Communion service. Thus we cling tenaciously to the Apostolic principle that no priest and no baptismal ceremony can make anybody a member of the Church of Christ. Nothing can do that but the

individual's own personal choice and personal desire to be a true disciple and servant of Jesus Christ.

III.

Our attitude on the question of creeds is simply an application of the one essential principle which underlies our whole religious life. We have no definitely formulated creed which is binding either upon ministers or Church members. We do not insist on adherence to the Thirty-nine Articles or to the so-called Apostles' or Nicene or Athanasian Creeds. We do not take up this attitude because we suppose that it does not matter what a man believes. We are as alive as any other section of the Church of Christ to the fact that what a man believes is a vitally important matter. But all (6) that we insist on is personal loyalty to Jesus Christ—granted that, everybody has full liberty, his creed is a matter between himself and God. We agree with Tennyson when he said: "It is impossible to imagine that the Almighty will ask you when you come before Him in the next life what your particular form of creed was." The essential thing is the earnest prayerful endeavour by God's grace to lead a Christlike life in all domestic, business and social relationships. Thus it comes about that in the Baptist Churches there is a remarkable spiritual unity in spite of a great diversity of thought. (7) Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship. We are not in any way bound by the traditions of the past, but are perfectly free to welcome all light and truth from whatsoever quarter they come, in the sure confidence that all light is God's light and all truth is God's truth. Living in personal loyalty to Christ, we have at the same time open minds for all new truth which God vouchsafes to reveal to mankind through any channel.

IV.

As a result, too, of our one fundamental principle, we hold that the individual members who compose the Church are quite competent to manage their own affairs without interference from outside. Unlike the Anglican Church, we are perfectly free to conduct our public worship in any way which commends itself to our judgment and experience as being the most spiritually helpful and beneficial. We are perfectly free to pray as we are led to pray, to read the lessons we choose to read. To have every item of public worship—every form of prayer, every lesson—definitely prescribed and rigidly fixed by law, is, in our judgment, the stultification of worship and the paralysis of the spirit. We reject in toto the idea of State control. A State-controlled Church is apt to become an external institution in which "order is more important than spirit, form more important than substance, obedience of more value than truth." If we wish occasionally to use a prayer from the Prayer Book we are free to do so. We are not in any way bound. If we were to decide—a thing impossible to contemplate—that an elaborate ritual, the lighting of candles, the burning of incense, processions, and gorgeous vestments would be helpful to us in our worship, we should be free to adopt them, and no outside authority would have the right to intervene.

We hold, too, that the members of a Church are competent to choose their own minister, and that it is hurtful to the highest interests of the Church when a minister is foisted upon it by a bishop or any outside authority. The relationship between minister and people is so intimate and so delicate, that it is essential that the people who constitute a Church should have the minister of their own choice. We stand for the democratic principle in Church life. Each true disciple has an equal right with the minister and his fellow members to a voice in Church management and control.

V.

Just as we stress the rights of the individual in our own Churches, so we respect the attitude of those who think differently from ourselves. The Baptist Church is the only one of the older Churches that has never persecuted those of

another persuasion. The record of the Roman Catholic Church in this regard is grim in the extreme. The Anglican Church condemned some of our pioneers to the scaffold, some it sentenced to the pillory and shocking forms of mutilation, hundreds it sent to gaol. During the Puritan Revolution even the Congregationalists and Presbyterians were inclined to be somewhat tyrannical to Christian people in other camps. But whatever our faults and defects may have been and are, we have reason to be proud that we have never been a persecuting Church. We have always respected the rights of individual judgment. Further, it was Baptists who were the first to champion the cause of full religious liberty. It is the unique distinction of the first London Baptist Church that from its "little dingy meeting-house, somewhere in Old London, there flashed out, first in England, the absolute doctrine of religious liberty." For Leonard Busher, a member of this Church, a poor man, labouring for his daily bread, issued a pamphlet in which he stated that it should be "lawful for any person or persons, yea, Jews and Papists, to write, dispute, confer and reason, print and publish any matter touching religion." Similarly in America it was a Baptist, Roger Williams, who first declared for full religious liberty for all.

So in the religious realm we pursue a policy of live and let live. We quietly but firmly hold to our own convictions as the most reasonable and sound and sane and spiritual that the Christian man can hold; without quarrelling with those who feel they need the help of elaborate ritual, priestly powers, and sacramentarian graces. We have a great history—the author of the "Pilgrim's Progress" was a Baptist, the pioneer of modern missions was a Baptist—and we believe that God has a great work for us yet to accomplish in the world.

MORE NEWS OF PROF. MARSHALL FROM ENGLAND.

Baptists in this country have almost invariably held that baptism was a prerequisite to church membership. That, at all events, is clearly the position taken by the people called "Regular Baptists". It is stipulated in the Charter of McMaster University that a member of the Theological Faculty of that Institution shall be a member of a Regular Baptist Church. Nothing can be clearer than that it was the intention of the founder of that Institution that it should propagate the principles held by Regular Baptists.

In the discussion over the appointment of Professor Marshall to the staff of McMaster, the question of his position in relation to the ordinances has been raised. The gentleman who wrote to England to enquire respecting Mr. Marshall's position evidently enquired as to his own or his church's attitude respecting baptism as a prerequisite to church membership. It was on this account Rev. W. M. Robertson replied that the church in Liverpool which Mr. Marshall served was an open membership church, and that he did not know what position was taken on the subject by the church at Coventry. This reference to the question in Mr. Robertson's letters brought the matter up at the Senate meeting, the minutes of which were read at the Hamilton Convention. We quote two paragraphs from the minutes: one a statement by Professor Farmer; the other, by Dr. John McNeill:

PROFESSOR FARMER: "May I add another word? With reference to his being a member of a certain kind of church, the Committee met Mr. Marshall, and that matter was referred to. The members of the Committee remember that Mr. Marshall stated as his own personal conviction that he believed in a membership restricted to baptized believers."

DR. McNEILL: "I remember I referred especially to that and asked him especially if, finding himself here in Canada—of course we know many of the English churches are open membership—if in spite of the fact that that obtained in the Old Land, he would be thoroughly in accord with our position. He said absolutely he would, and that was his own conviction. So that should not be held against him."

In Professor Marshall's speech before the Convention, he himself referred to this matter in the following terms:

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: "Well now, I must say a word or two about these letters. In the first place, let us just look for a moment at letter number one. I notice that Mr. Robertson sneers at the fact that I was the minister of a church at Princess Gate, Liverpool, where the membership was open. Well, let me ask, why should that be cast as a slur on me? That church was made an open church in the year 1909 by the free will of the whole church in a church meeting. What has that got to do with Mr. Robertson? What has that got to do with you? Is not the individual Baptist church a commonwealth with the right to manage its own affairs? That is liberty. I was not responsible for it. I went there in 1911. All I will say is this, and I think I am right when I say it, I did not receive into that church at any rate one young person who did not pass through the waters of baptism.

"Then in the second letter the question of open membership is raised, and Mr. Robertson expresses his doubts whether the church at Coventry had open membership or not. I can enlighten him right away. It had open membership. That is the affair of Queen's Road; it does not matter to Mr. Robertson, it does not matter to you, it does not matter to me. They decided it. They had the right to decide whether they should have open or closed membership. But again, let me say that during my ministry in Coventry I did not receive a person into the church without passing through the waters of believer's baptism. I have been absolutely loyal to Baptist principles all the way through."

We are informed therefore by Professor Marshall himself that the Princess Gate Church at Liverpool was an open membership church. We are told that he did not make it so, but that it was made an open church in the year 1909; and he asks what that has to do with us. We are told further that the church exercised its right in determining its policy, and that he was not responsible for it. Of course, the fact remains that, knowing the policy of the church, he accepted their call to become their pastor; and agreed, we assume, to the practice of the principle of open membership. He says that he thinks he is right in saying that he did not receive into the church one young person who did not pass through the waters of baptism. Dr. Farmer said that "Mr. Marshall stated as his own personal conviction that he believed in a membership restricted to baptized believers." Dr. McNeill enquired whether Mr. Marshall would be thoroughly in accord with our position, and, according to Dr. McNeill, he said, "Absolutely he would, and that was his own conviction." But according to his statement respecting the Princess Gate Church at Liverpool, he accepted the pastorate of a church whose practice in this matter, if Drs. Farmer and McNeill rightly understood Mr. Marshall, must have been contrary to his own conviction. Mr. Marshall is careful to say that he does not think he received one "young" person who did not pass through the waters of baptism. Respecting Coventry he said: "It had open membership. That is the affair of Queen's Road; it does not matter to Mr. Robertson, it does not matter to you, it does not matter to me. They decided it. They had the right to decide whether they should have open or closed membership."

In both these instances it would appear that Mr. Marshall does not enquire whether open membership is scriptural or not,—the church has a right to decide what it will practise; and when it has been decided, Mr. Marshall says, "It does not matter to me." He accepted the pastorate of a church whose practice, according to the statements of Dr. Farmer and Dr. McNeill, was contrary to his own conviction.

Respecting Coventry, he says: "During my ministry in Coventry I did not receive a person into the church without passing through the waters of believer's baptism. I have been absolutely loyal to Baptist principles all the way through." The fact remains, of course, that the church was an open membership church: whether they joined in Mr. Marshall's time or not, there were people in the membership of the church who had never been baptized in the scriptural way,—but according to Mr. Marshall, "That is the affair of Queen's Road; it does not matter to Mr. Robertson, it does not matter to you, it does not matter to me. They decided it. They had the right to decide whether they should have open or closed membership"—not a word about the teaching of Scripture on the subject. Mr. Marshall does not seem to recog-

nize there is a Book that Baptists generally have supposed had something to say on these matters! A Baptist church is a law unto itself, even in respect to the ordinances; and, apparently, it is nobody's business what the church decides to do. Of course, every church is free to decide these matters; but, having decided them, it may still be a question in the minds of some as to whether such a church or such a minister is in accord with the principles which Baptists have believed are taught in the New Testament.

But it as occurred to us that it might be interesting to our readers to hear a voice from England on this subject. Of course, it is generally known that many, and perhaps the majority, of churches called "Baptist" in England practise open membership. But we have generally supposed that such practice was adopted as a matter of expediency, and as a concession to the desire of those who did not wish to be immersed. But we have met with one English Baptist who takes much stronger ground on this question than that it is merely a matter of expediency. Let us hear him:

"To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite a crucial importance for which there is no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense."

Here, then, is an English Baptist who proclaims the principle of open membership to be his own personal conviction: in the most emphatic way possible he teaches that baptism should not be made a condition of church membership; and he says that to so regard it "is to ascribe to the baptismal rite a crucial importance"—let us hear him carefully, weigh every word—"for which there is no warrant in the New Testament"—this surely is strong language,—**"OR IN ANY TRULY SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE GOSPEL"**—and lest he should have left one inch of ground for one who believes that immersion should be made a term of membership to stand on, he adds, **"OR IN COMMON SENSE."**

The world-renowned Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick demanded as a condition of his acceptance of the pastorate of Park Avenue Church, New York, the adoption of what he called a policy of "inclusive" membership. In the matter of the ordinances this writer takes a similar position. Let us hear him again:

"To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite a crucial importance for which there is no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense."

It will be observed that our author tells us, in effect, that there is no warrant, either in revelation or in reason, for the practice of restricting the membership of the church to baptized persons—a practice which has been followed almost invariably by our Canadian Baptist churches. Our English author tells us that we have neither the New Testament, nor any truly spiritual interpretation of the gospel, nor even common sense, to support our long-established practice. This is a very severe indictment. What a pity we have not with us some of the fathers of the faith, like Fyfe and others, who fought these battles long ago! We wonder what they would say were they told to their faces that the principles upon which they insisted, showed them to be destitute of a knowledge of the New Testament, or even of common sense?

We are anxious that all our readers should really understand this great principle set forth by an English Baptist, and among those who read there may be some whose eyesight is a little dim, or their glasses may be out of order, therefore that none may miss the import of these striking words we print it once again—and this time in still larger type:

"TO REGARD BAPTISM AS ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION OR EVEN TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IS TO ASCRIBE TO THE BAPTISMAL RITE A

CRUCIAL IMPORTANCE FOR WHICH THERE IS NO WARRANT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, OR IN ANY TRULY SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE GOSPLE, OR IN COMMON SENSE."

But some of our exceedingly charitable brethren will be disposed to say when they read this, that this cannot be a representative view: this must express the opinion of a man who is somewhat singular among English Baptists. Perhaps some will say we do an injustice to English Baptists in quoting these words, and that there cannot be very many Baptists in England holding these views. Our answer is perfectly plain. Let us whisper: we have learned that there is at least one less Baptist in England holding these views than there was a few months ago, for the reason that the author of these striking words is now Professor of Practical Theology at McMaster University—and his name is the Rev. L. H. Marshall, B.A., B.D.

The words we have quoted are taken from an article having the following heading: "Baptists and Church Membership"; and it appears in The Baptist Times and Freeman (London, Eng.) of October 31st, 1924.

**DEAN J. H. FARMER, DR. JOHN MACNEILL
AND
PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL, ON OPEN MEMBERSHIP.**

Dean J. H. Farmer.

From the minutes of the Senate of McMaster University, as read to the Convention at Hamilton by Chancellor Whidden:

"May I add another word? With reference to his being a member of a certain kind of church, the Committee met Mr. Marshall, and that matter was referred to. The members of the Committee remember that MR. MARSHALL STATED AS HIS OWN PERSONAL CONVICTION THAT HE BELIEVED IN A MEMBERSHIP RESTRICTED TO BAPTIZED BELIEVERS."

Dr. John McNeill.

From the minutes of the Senate of McMaster University, as read to the Convention at Hamilton by Chancellor Whidden:

"I remember I referred especially to that and asked him especially if, finding himself here in Canada—of course we know many of the English churches are open membership—if in spite of the fact that that obtained in the Old Land, he would be thoroughly in accord with our position. HE SAID absolutely he would, and THAT WAS HIS OWN CONVICTION. So that should not be held against him."

Professor Marshall in His Speech Before the Convention.

"Well now, I must say a word or two about these letters. In the first place, let us just look for a moment at letter number one. I notice that Mr. Robertson sneers at the fact that I WAS THE MINISTER OF A CHURCH AT PRINCESS GATE, LIVERPOOL, WHERE THE MEMBERSHIP WAS OPEN. WELL, LET ME ASK, WHY SHOULD THAT BE CAST AS A SLUR ON ME? That church was made an open church in the year 1909 by the free will of the whole church in a church meeting. What has that got to do with Mr. Robertson? What has that got to do with you? Is not the individual Baptist church a commonwealth with the right to manage its own affairs? That is liberty.

I WAS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR IT. I WENT THERE IN 1911. All I will say is this, and I think I am right when I say it, I did not receive into that church at any rate one young person who did not pass through the waters of baptism.

"Then in the second letter the question of open membership is raised, and Mr. Robertson expresses his doubts whether the church at Coventry had open membership or not. I can enlighten him right away. IT HAD OPEN MEMBERSHIP. THAT IS THE AFFAIR OF QUEEN'S ROAD; IT DOES NOT MATTER TO MR. ROBERTSON. IT DOES NOT MATTER TO YOU, IT DOES NOT MATTER TO ME. They decided it. They had the right to decide whether they should have open or closed membership. But again let me say that during my ministry in Coventry I did not receive a person into the church without passing through the waters of believer's baptism. I have been absolutely loyal to Baptist principles all the way through."

Professor Marshall in an Article in The Baptist Times and Freeman, of London.

"TO REGARD BAPTISM AS ESSENTIAL to salvation OR EVEN TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IS TO ASCRIBE TO THE BAPTISMAL RITE A CRUCIAL IMPORTANCE FOR WHICH THERE IS NO WARRANT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, OR IN ANY TRULY SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE GOSPEL, OR IN COMMON SENSE."

IS THIS A VIOLATION OF TRUST?

In the Deed of Gift of the land upon which McMaster University stands to-day the late Senator McMaster had it clearly set out that the property was held in trust for the education and training of students intending to be engaged in pastoral, evangelical, or other missionary work,

"In connection with the Regular Baptist Denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches holding immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the only Gospel baptism, and that parties so baptized are alone entitled to communion at the Lord's Table."

There is a stipulation also in the Charter of the University to this effect:

"No person shall be eligible for the position of principal, professor, tutor, or master in the Faculty of Theology who is not a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church."

The latest appointee to the Faculty of Theology of McMaster University says:

"TO REGARD BAPTISM AS ESSENTIAL to salvation OR EVEN TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IS TO ASCRIBE TO THE BAPTISMAL RITE A CRUCIAL IMPORTANCE FOR WHICH THERE IS NO WARRANT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, OR IN ANY TRULY SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE GOSPEL, OR IN COMMON SENSE."

WHAT IS THE INEVITABLE CONCLUSION?

That the Governors of McMaster University in their latest appointment have been guilty of an unblushing betrayal of the trust of the Denomination

and an inexcusable violation of the principle of the Trust Deed of the University; or, otherwise, the new Professor of Practical Theology has utterly deceived them. If the Professor is to blame, he ought to be dismissed; if the Governors are to blame, they ought in common honesty, either to resign or to hand back the property they are charged to administer to the legal heirs of the late Senator McMaster.

Don't Forget, That in His Speech at the Convention, Dr. J. H. Farmer said:

"I have been trying honestly to work on the basis of the charter, and when this thing was in its crisis in July, and I had to make up my mind as to my action, I faced the thing then, before God and in my own room, and I said to myself: As an honest man and as a Baptist Christian man, I cannot turn down a man like that whose spirit is so fine and who so exults in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. And I took my stand, and I am going to stand by it."

A GREAT GOSPEL WITNESS ANNOUNCEMENT.

Elsewhere in this issue we print an advertisement, offering *The Gospel Witness* for one year beginning with the first issue of January for \$1.00. This is actually below cost so far as Canada is concerned; but we want a largely increased circulation—and are determined to have it. We ask all our friends to assist us. Before last Christmas we offered to send *The Witness* for three months for 25c, and on that account received in a few weeks two thousand new subscribers. We now offer the same rate for a whole year; and we suggest to our many friends all over the Continent, and to those living in England and foreign countries if this should reach them in time, that they send *The Gospel Witness* as a Christmas present to their friends. Make an investment for the Lord on this matter; and if there are those who can help in our Gospel Witness Fund, we earnestly solicit their co-operation to the extent even of thousands of dollars.

TWO WEEKLY EDITIONS OF THE WITNESS.

Beginning with the first issue of January, a special American edition will be published each week, printed in the United States. For this purpose we shall have a publishing office in Cleveland, Ohio. Part of the time the two editions will be identical; but in our battle for the Book in Canada we have had to keep in mind that *The Gospel Witness* goes to thousands of people who know nothing about our local affairs. Therefore, we have not been able to give all the space we have desired to give to Canadian Baptist affairs. From the first of January we shall have a double-barrel gun,—one to fire in the United States, and one to fire in Canada. That will enable us to devote the Canadian edition to Canadian affairs. The present situation, resulting from the Convention's undoubted misunderstanding of the true facts of the case, requires that we should give special attention to Canadian Baptist affairs. We shall now have our entire editorial space for the whole year to use as a powerful searchlight, to bring to light the hidden things of darkness.

We expect to see our circulation this year trebled or quadrupled; already it is growing by leaps and bounds. Hitherto *The Gospel Witness* has been something like General French's "contemptible little army",—face to face with a powerful organization, and with only little ammunition. We have just arranged for the organization of a Munitions Department which will provide us with a liberal supply of high explosives. We do not say this in any light way at all; we were never more serious, and never more determined to fight the modernist element in McMaster University than we are now. We solicit the help of all our friends and the prayers of all our readers. From the first of

January our *Witness* family will be able to think of another edition going out weekly from a publishing house in the United States, which we are confident will reach thousands of people. Of course, every matter which relates to our Canadian affairs which is of general interest, and has to do with the war on Modernism in general, we shall share with our American readers. We believe it is important that as many Baptists as possible should be informed of the facts.

Begin to-day to pour in your subscriptions. We print below for the encouragement of our *Witness* family a letter just received, which is but a sample of others, and will speak for itself:

Ontario,
November 10th, 1925.

"T. T. Shields, Esq.,
Jarvis St. Baptist Church,
Toronto.

"Dear Brother Shields:

"After reading *The Canadian Baptist* and your *Gospel Witness*, I have decided to send you a cheque for \$25.00 to enable some to receive *The Gospel Witness* who otherwise might not receive same.

"Might also say that the writer is of the same opinion as some who were at the Convention and heard Mr. Marshall and were there unbiased, and thought that he missed the opportunity of his life in not giving his personal experience of accepting Christ as his personal Saviour, as well as his call to the ministry; and his confidence in the Bible from cover to cover as the inspired Word of God, in which case he would have accomplished more. Several Baptist members have expressed themselves that they will not support McMaster as long as Mr. Marshall remains in the Institution.

(Signed) _____

A friend of McMaster University and of
The Gospel Witness."

THE McMASTER MONTHLY.

Only very rarely are we privileged to see this very excellent periodical; but literally last week "our attention was called" to the first article in this magazine entitled, "An Unfortunate Necessity." Someone who brought this to our attention seemed to think that a new gun was speaking from McMaster Heights; but on investigation it turned out to be only a little Baptist boy who was setting off some fire-crackers which he had obtained from a Presbyterian store. "Lay on, Mac"—nab!

REVIVAL SERVICES AT OSSINGTON AVENUE AND MT. PLEASANT ROAD CHURCHES.

Rev. C. E. Neighbour, Evangelist, and Mr. R. E. Neighbour, Jr., Violinist, sons of Rev. Dr. R. E. Neighbour, of Chicago, are now holding special services in Ossington Avenue Baptist Church, and will commence special services in Mount Pleasant Road Baptist Church, on Tuesday December 1st, continuing for two weeks

Rev. C. E. Neighbour is a very strong preacher of the Word. It is claimed that he is as great a preacher as his father, and, like his father, he is absolutely true to the great fundamental truths of the gospel. Mr. R. E. Neighbour has few equals as a violinist. He has studied under the greatest masters, and is consecrating his great musical ability to the work of the Lord.

We would recommend our readers to endeavour to hear these two sons of a great father, and thus help on the work in our sister churches.

1 YEAR'S

**S. S. STUDIES IN LIFE OF CHRIST
EVANGELISTIC SERMONS
NEWS OF RELIGIOUS WAR
FUNDAMENTALISM vs. MODERNISM
VIGOROUS EDITORIALS In Defense of
FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED**

All for ONE DOLLAR

The Gospel Witness

edited by **Dr. T. T. Shields**, Pastor Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Canada, published weekly, contains all the above.

Nothing in Modern Times surpasses the miraculous transformation of Dr. Shields' church from a formal, aristocratic, church into one of the greatest centres of Evangelism on this continent, where conversions occur at every service; or the growth of the Bible School, in three years, from less than 400 to the greatest School in Canada. This revolution took place in the eleventh year of Dr. Shields' pastorate, and the great revival which followed the withdrawal of 341 members has in four years added more than 1,500 to the church, and the revival still continues.

Next-best to living in the spiritual tropics of this great church is to read the sermons (stenographically reported) through which scores are converted and which appear weekly in "The Gospel Witness." This Paper, less than four years old, now circulates all over the world and is already being read by more than 1,000 preachers weekly.

Beginning in January, "The Witness" will contain a weekly exposition in the **Whole Bible Course of the Baptist Bible Union** by Dr. Shields, and which will cover the **Life of Christ in one year.**

Regular subscription to "The Gospel Witness" is \$2.00 per year. To introduce the "Witness" to new readers, it is now offered with above special features **from January 1 to December 31, 1926 for One Dollar.**

All subscriptions at this rate must be received by December 20th at **The Gospel Witness Office** (please mark envelope "Special Offer"), 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, Canada. Mail this with order. If money is sent by cheque, 25 cents must be added for exchange. Postal rates compel us to charge \$1.50 for this special offer in Toronto. Send your order at once.

ORDER BLANK

"The Gospel Witness," 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, 2, Canada.

Please send "The Gospel Witness" to the undersigned for one year beginning with the first issue in January, 1926, for which find enclosed one dollar, as per your special offer:

NAME (Rev., Mr., Mrs., Miss)

ADDRESS.....

N.B.—No subscription can be accepted for less than the year at the special dollar rate.