

A BATTERY OF REPLIES TO PROFESSOR MARSHALL

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, JANUARY 7th, 1926

No. 37

CONTENTS

	Page
The Jarvis St. Pulpit	2
Rev. John Linton on Prof. Marshall.....	14
Dr. Sowerby's Letters to Chancellor Whidden.....	16
The Testimony of Two Students.....	19
A Bloodless Gospel, by Pastor Brown.....	20
The McMaster Calamity, by Rev. G. W. Allen.....	21
The S.S. Lesson	26
Church and Witness News	27
Baptists and Church Membership—Prof. Marshall.....	28
Professor Marshall's Sermons:	
What Baptists Stand For.....	30
God Sent Forth His Son.....	33
The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ.....	39
W. Gordon Brown Lifts the Lid.....	44

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE CONTAGIOUSNESS OF EVIL AND THE UNTRANSMISSIBILITY OF GOODNESS.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, December 6th, 1925.
(Stenographically Reported.)

"In the four and twentieth day of the ninth month, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord by Haggai the prophet, saying,
"Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Ask now the priests concerning the law, saying,
"If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy? And the priests answered and said, No.
"Then said Haggai, If one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, It shall be unclean."—Haggai 2: 10-13.



We have in these verses the statement of a law which at first blush might be regarded as a prophecy of gloom, and almost of despair; but when properly understood, is full of inspiration and hope. The case is supposed of one who has been purified and is ceremonially fitted for holy service; ceremonially, he is holy. And it is asked if, as he passes, the skirt of his garment should touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall that thing which he touches, by contact with him, be made holy? And the answer of the priests, according to the law, is "No". Then the opposite is considered: the case is supposed of one who is ceremonially unclean because of his contact with a dead body, and it is asked if he, passing by, being ceremonially unclean, should touch wine, or oil, or bread, or pottage, or meat of any kind, shall that thing which he touches be unclean? And the priests answer, according to the law, "It shall be unclean"—the principle stated here being this, that a man has no power to transmit holiness, he cannot communicate goodness; but he has power, by contact, to transmit that which is evil. In other words, evil is contagious, it is communicable by contact; but goodness is untransmissible, you cannot communicate it. It is really a terrible truth, that we have power to pollute but not to purify; to corrupt but not to cleanse; to kill but not to make alive; to destroy but not to create; to communicate evil while impotent to transmit goodness.

Here, then, we have the statement of a law that, by universal human experience and observation, has been proved to be true, namely, that evil is contagious. A few moments' reflection will convince us that the principle is always at work in human lives. Let me speak, for instance, for a moment to you parents. You will find that your child who is going to school will copy from other children much more readily their vices than their virtues, he is more responsive to their vulgarities than to their refinements. One good boy in a school may have little effect upon the crowd, but one bad boy may corrupt them all. There is not a father or a mother here who has not noticed that when a child who has been carefully nurtured and surrounded with every possible influence to safeguard it against evil, goes without the shelter of the home into the larger world without, perhaps the very first day, that child comes home, and mother notices on that child's tongue a word that shocks her. "Where did you get that?" Do you know where the child got it? From the power resident within human nature to transmit evil, but which is impotent to communicate good.

For instance, take one professor in an educational institution—though he be not a man of outstanding ability, though he in no sense be superior to his colleagues, let him teach that which is error, let him teach that which is contrary to the Word of God, and he will, in time, subvert the faith of that institution. It may be said that there are other men in the institution who are perfectly sound, and as long as these sound men are there, surely one heretical professor cannot do any very serious damage? You might just as well

say, to use a very familiar illustration, that as long as there is only one bad apple in the barrel you may rest assured that all the good apples will make the bad apple good. You know perfectly well that nothing of the sort will happen, but that one apple will corrupt the whole barrel.

We had an example of that in McMaster University: we had a group of sound professors on the staff, but for fourteen years, or thereabout, we had one man who taught that which was contrary to the Word of God. The men who opposed his teaching at that time were denounced as enemies of the institution. Our late good friend, Dr. Elmore Harris, who opposed the teaching of Professor Matthews, was represented as a man of wealth who wanted to dominate the Denomination, he was scandalized and abused like a pickpocket all over the Dominion. The case of that professor was investigated by a committee of the Senate of McMaster, and the committee reported that he was sound; and that Dr. Harris was all wrong. Since leaving us that professor has written a book which, on nearly every page, justifies Dr. Harris' criticism, and shows that a man holding such views has no right to be a teacher in any Christian institution. But his presence was suffered here. What effect did it have? It had this effect: it produced a generation of students, in the Arts Department particularly, whose influence, I dare to say, has been a positive blight on this Denomination—wherever they have gone they have been opposed to the things of God. I do not speak so particularly now of the ministerial students, many of whom were established in the Word of God before they went there; but I do say that at that time that professor's influence overwhelmed the influence of all the other professors, and gave colour to the stream of life that went out from that educational institution.

I am going to have more to say about this to-night,—and I expect to have more and more to say about it until this Denomination awakes to the fact that we have received into our university—I name the gentleman, Professor L. H. Marshall—a man who has nothing in common with the things for which this Denomination stands, and whose presence is bound to poison the springs of our denominational life, and to corrupt the whole Dominion from top to bottom. He has power to do that. I do not say that there are not admirable men in McMaster University: there are in the Institution some of the finest men I know; but this new man comes in, and before he is known, a mere suggestion is given as to his teaching; and immediately men are aroused, and the flag is waved—and nine-tenths of them do not know what they are talking about. "While men slept the enemy sowed tares." And that is what is happening in this Denomination to-day. And I want, in passing, to give that justification for my protest, to let you Jarvis Street people know, and you McMaster students know, if you are here, and the Faculty and Governing Bodies of McMaster know, that so far as this pulpit is concerned, we are only beginning our protest against this abominably corrupting influence that has been permitted to come in and establish itself in the life of our Denomination. Now, that is enough of that for this morning; we shall have more of it to-night. This evening I will produce my cause and bring forth my strong reasons.

Here is another example of this principle: twelve spies were sent yonder into the land which God had promised to give His people; and they came back, two of them bringing with them the great cluster from Eschol. Here was the evidence of the accuracy of the promise; it was a fruitful land, and here was a sample of the fruit. Two spies said, "It is a great land, it is a land flowing with milk and honey, here is the kind of fruit it produces; and we are well able to go up and possess the land." But the other ten said, "It is true enough that is the sample of the fruit; but their cities are strong, and walled up to heaven—and the children of Anak are there, they are giants; and it would be impossible for us to possess the land." And so the people had to choose between the faith of Joshua and Caleb, and the unbelief of the other ten. The other ten brought no evidence to substantiate their gloomy prophecy: they had no pictures of the walled cities, they had no representatives of the children of Anak, they simply told what they had seen; and they said, "We are not able"! And the whole congregation followed the voice of unbelief—and they spoke of stoning Joshua and Caleb. And then came the fiery serpents into the midst of the congregation, and a great plague followed.

That is ever so: it is much easier always to move people in the direction of unbelief than in the direction of faith; it is always easier to get people to doubt God than to believe God; it is always easier to undermine the faith of people than to confirm them in the faith. It requires spiritual power to establish people in Christ: it does not require even great natural ability to destroy a man's faith in Christ. Unbelief will prevail more readily than faith.

My friends, you have that illustrated sometimes in congregational life. I am going to talk to you members who have come into this church within the last four years, you did not see what some of us saw. I stood in this pulpit for eleven years, I knew the people of this Denomination, and for a long time we had a very happy fellowship in this place; but it became possible for some to spread fire among the people of God until we saw this congregation go, a large part of it, as though it had been stricken with smallpox. It is easy to communicate evil, but difficult—impossible indeed—to transmit that which is good. I read to you this morning of how the apostles preached in Iconium, and so spake that a multitude of the Jews believed—and then certain people came down and stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds "evil affected against the brethren."

Nothing is easier than to poison the mind of a man against someone else. A certain man, speaking to me of a certain very prominent man some years ago, said, "I want to ask you a question. A man came to me to tell me a story of a man in public life. He said that a certain man, who was the enemy of this man in public life, had certain facts which, if published, would drive that man out of public life. When this man told me that I said, 'I will go and see Mr. So-and-So.' 'No, no,' he said, 'don't you dare do that; I have told you that in confidence.'" The man who informed me of this said, "What do you think of that?" And I said, "I think that it is from the Devil." Here is a man who would inject his poison into another man's mind, and then put a padlock on his lips to keep him from speaking; thus allowing that poison to work its way through his mind, poisoning his mind against another man—for no reason in the world but that a fiend in human form injected that poison. That is transmitting evil! It is a very easy thing to do, to stir up people so that their minds are "evil affected against the brethren".

I could multiply illustrations of this principle, that "evil communications corrupt good manners"; but I want to look at the opposite side for a moment, to show you how impossible it is for us to transmit goodness.

II.

Perhaps the best way to prove it is to take a few outstanding examples. Look at the case of Abraham: his record is written in the Book; he was a man who lived for God, the outstanding example of the true believer for all time—a man who left his country and his kindred, and went out not knowing whither he went—and he is called the father of such as believe, to this day. And yet Abraham had living with him a nephew whose name was Lot, he was under Abraham's influence all the time; but Abraham was unable to communicate to Lot his faith, his unworldliness, his unselfishness, his devotion to God. And Lot went from the presence of this man Abraham, and deliberately pitched his tent toward Sodom. You see that illustrated in our day. No human power can communicate faith; as we shall see presently, it is the gift of God. Take the case I have mentioned of Caleb and Joshua. To me the story of these two men is one of the outstanding miracles of the Bible: Caleb and Joshua kept their faith alive for forty years, so that Caleb was able to say on his eighty-fifth birthday when he came to Joshua, "I am as strong this day as I was in the day that Moses sent me; as my strength was then, so is it now both to go out and to come in, therefore give me this mountain." That is a fine thing for a man to ask for on his eighty-fifth birthday, is it not? That old man said, "I would like to have a chance to take that mountain for the Lord before I die." For forty long years Caleb had walked with God, had believed God, had never doubted God—and Joshua too; and yet they were unable to communicate their faith to others. Look at the case of David: with one single exception he was a man of God, a man after God's own heart. David walked in the ways of the Lord; and yet in his own home there grew up a boy, Absalom, one of the blackest characters of whom we have any record.

My dear friends, you must not blame parents too readily when their hearts are broken because their children do not walk in the way of the Lord. I have seen people who, so far as I was able to judge, were godly, who lived godly lives; and yet in the very home with them were those who resisted their testimony: they had no power to communicate the things they believed. I have seen some of the saintliest women I have ever known whose husbands through long years resisted their testimony: they prayed, they wrought, they did everything in their power; but they had no power to communicate holiness, it was beyond them. I wonder if that does not come rather close home to some here this morning? I am not going to license or condone carelessness, and to say that it does not matter—we must give our witness, whether it be believed or not.

Yes, I think I will go further and say I have known some ministers who have been called to an exceedingly difficult task, to bear witness for God before the ungodly, apparently without success—but “whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear”, he must give his testimony.

There are, then, these two principles: without effort we can all communicate evil, but with our utmost effort not one of us has power to communicate goodness. What is the explanation? The explanation is, first of all, in human nature itself. I have not yet read the sermon preached by Professor Marshall—I have read the text, and somebody sent me a digest of the sermon. The sermon is there for you to read, but listen to the text: “For he—Jesus—knew what was in man.” And that is an argument for the development of the good! Is it? Listen: “Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men”—and the word is the same in both cases. Many trusted Him, but He did not trust them. Why did He not trust them?—“because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man.” The reason He did not trust them was because He knew there was nothing in them to trust!—not because there is goodness, but because there is no goodness.

Moody was right when he said that a lie would travel around the world while truth was getting its boots on. That is perfectly true. You tell any evil thing about somebody, and you do not need to tell anyone not to repeat that, do you? No! I will tell you all you have to do: just whisper it and say, “Now don’t tell anyone; be sure you do not tell anybody else.” And that person says to the next one he meets, “I have just heard something which I will whisper to you in confidence—be sure you do not tell anyone!” And before nightfall a hundred people know it. But tell some good thing about somebody, and in nine cases out of ten it dies with the first person to whom it is told; he never thinks of repeating it. I remember when Dr. Torrey was here some years ago he described a couple of women talking. One woman comes in to visit her neighbour, and they have a cup of tea together; and Mrs. No. One says to Mrs. No. Two, “That is too bad about Mrs. No. Three, is it not?” “What is it? I have not heard.” “Oh, have you not!” And then she tells a story about Mrs. No. Three. “It is very sad, is it not? I never would have believed it of her. I do not want you to mention it to anyone, but I am so sorry, I am so sorry.” And Mrs. No. Two says, “I am very sorry too.” And when Dr. Torrey had finished he said—he did not call them by numbers: he called them by name. But I do not want to be personal, and I could not say Mrs. Smith, or Brown, or Jones, or Black, for they are all here, so I will resort to numbers—and when he had described that which is so perfectly natural he paused and said, “Mrs. No. One, you are a liar; if you were sorry you would not have told it.” That is true. But why does this thing spread like that? Because when that kind of thing gets into human nature it gets into its native soil, and it needs no cultivation, it grows of itself. But plant anything good in this human nature, and it needs to be cultivated; it is an exotic. You do not need to go to a seminary to learn that the old-fashioned doctrine of total depravity is true, all you need to do is to study human nature. And so when evil is abroad in human nature it is in its native element, and it spreads without any effort at all. I contend—the new professor to the contrary, notwithstanding—“that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing.” Possibly some people think that applies to the preacher as an exceptional case! But

there is no good thing in human nature, none at all, except what God puts there: "If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy? And the priests answered and said, No. Then said Haggai, "If one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, It shall be unclean." Yes, you can always make things unclean, but you cannot transmit holiness.

III

I close with two or three reflections on this principle. In the first place, it ought to humble us, it ought to make us think a good deal about the tendencies that are within us: "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." I see in garages, and other places where there is a great deal of inflammable material, this sign, "No smoking allowed." That is a very good rule—a good rule to apply anywhere for that matter, but especially a good rule where there are gasoline and other things of the sort about. You are a barrel of gasoline yourself—it only needs a match and up you go; and the Devil will see to it that the match is applied. You know that that is true. Oh, how careful we ought to be when we speak. It is so easy to inject prejudice, and so difficult to instil principles. And there is a world of difference between the two. We need to be careful how we speak, and what we speak, and the influences we exert; because it is so easy for us to help people to go down, and so difficult to help anyone up.

"Well", you say, "that is a pretty gloomy prospect, is it not? I am almost afraid to live if that is so,—if everyone I meet is evil like myself, everyone I meet able to make me more evil, everyone able to help me down, and no one able to help me up; myself just a reservoir of evil to pour out into other lives, and other lives the same that they may pour evil into me, and no power within me to help them, and they no power to help me—what is the use of being born?" There is no use in being born, my friends, if someone else had not been "born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king". There is just one Person Who has power to transmit goodness, just One; and you cannot have goodness apart from Him. But oh, blessed be God, you can have all the fulness of God through Him. Do you not remember that story of the woman in the crowd pushing her way through the throng? Somehow or another she managed to get her hand in between two or three of the disciples, and just touched His garment, and Jesus said, "Who touched me?" "Why, Master", they said, "the multitude throng Thee and press Thee, and sayest Thou, Who touched me?" But Jesus said, "Somebody hath touched me: for I perceive that virtue is gone out of me." No one else ever said that. He is the Fountain of virtue; and only as we touch Him can we be made whole—and only as we abide in Him can we be kept whole. But, blessed be His Name, there is salvation for all of us in Him. Just to touch Him, that is all! How little we need to do!—just to establish contact with Jesus, and the moment we touch Him with the touch of faith, saying in ourselves, IF I may but touch Him—"Why", someone may have said to the woman, "you cannot get to Him! There is Peter, touch Peter." "Oh, no, that will not do." "Well, there is John or James, or someone else." "No, if I may only touch the hem of His garment"—"if one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy?" Yes, if the garment be the garment of Jesus Christ.

"She only touched the hem of His garment
As to His side she stole,
Amid the crowd that gathered around Him,
And straightway she was whole."

I am glad I am not confused by being directed to many places, or many persons; I am glad it is written, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Put forth the hand of faith this morning, and touch Him.

"The healing of His seamless dress
Is by our beds of pain;
We touch Him in life's throng and press,
And we are whole again."

EDITORIAL

PROF. MARSHALL'S PAMPHLET.

We have before us a pamphlet entitled, "Professor Marshall Refutes Serious Charges," in which there is an introduction signed by Professor J. H. Farmer and Dr. John McNeill. From this it is evident that Drs. Farmer and McNeill accept Professor Marshall's explanation of his position. We quote from the second paragraph of the introduction as follows:

"In several recent issues of his paper, Dr. Shields has been publishing the following quotations from a sermon preached by Mr. Marshall in Coventry about a year ago:

'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.'

'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.'

"On the strength of the former quotation it is charged that either we must have misrepresented Mr. Marshall's views about baptism and church membership, or that Mr. Marshall was not sincere when he accepted the Charter basis, because, it is alleged, the views expressed in these quotations are apparently contrary to the express provisions of the Charter.

"On the strength of the second quotation Professor Marshall is charged with denying the inspiration of Genesis I., though he affirmed it to us at the Convention. On both grounds the University is charged with violating the Charter and betraying its trust in the appointment and retention of Professor Marshall."

The Statement by Professor Marshall

begins as follows:

"In *The Gospel Witness* of Nov. 19th, Dr. Shields quotes several times a sentence from an article of mine which appeared in the *London Baptist Times* in the autumn of 1924. The sentence runs thus:

'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.'

For the sake of clarity we now quote what we said in *The Gospel Witness* of November 26th: Dean Farmer said (from stenographic report of minutes of the Senate):

"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."

It will be observed Dr. Farmer here appeals to memory. On this matter also Dr. Farmer's memory is quite keen and retentive. He is so sure of his ground that he appeals to the memories of the members of the Committee, and, the memories of the Committee consenting, Dr. Farmer says: "Mr. Marshall stated as his own personal conviction that he believed in a membership restricted to baptized believers."

It is inconceivable that one making such a positive statement as Dr. Farmer makes, in such circumstances and on such a subject, should be mistaken. Moreover, that Dr. Farmer was not mistaken but related only plain fact, is confirmed by Dr. John MacNeill when, following Dr. Farmer's statement, he said:

"I remember I referred especially to that and asked him especially if, finding himself here in Canada—of course we know many of the Eng-

lish 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.”

Thus both Dr. Farmer and Dr. MacNeill positively affirm that Mr. Marshall said it was his own personal conviction that church membership should be restricted to baptized believers.

The interview referred to by Dr. Farmer and Dr. MacNeill took place about the end of June or in July. We know this from the following additional statement of Dr. Farmer:

“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.”

And now, over against the plain and positive statement of Drs. Farmer and MacNeill of what Mr. Marshall said in June or July, we have the written word of the same Mr. Marshall dated October 31st, 1924—less than nine months earlier:

“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.”

Therefore we have absolute proof that Mr. Marshall declared under his own name in *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, (London, October 31st, 1924, that there was “no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the gospel, or in common sense” for what Drs. Farmer and MacNeill positively assert Mr. Marshall declared to be his personal conviction less than nine months later.

WHAT IS THE EXPLANATION?

What are we to make of this? That the two statements cannot possibly be reconciled is indisputable. If someone should suggest that the new Professor changed his mind between October, 1924, and July, 1925, will someone explain how his mind was changed so greatly that that which in July last he stated was his personal conviction, less than nine months before he ridiculed as having no warrant even in common sense? If the new Professor is so unstable that his mind is conveniently made up for him by the exigencies of the hour, he has no fitness to be the instructor of young preachers; and if we are forced to accept the other alternative, that he professed what he really did not believe, it needs no argument to prove that such an one has no proper place as a teacher in a Christian college.

We call on Dr. Farmer and Dr. MacNeill as men of truth and honour to give the Convention some explanation of Professor Marshall's flat contradiction of what they said in his behalf.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S STATEMENT.

Professor Marshall, in the pamphlet before us, argues that he was discussing baptismal regeneration; and, after quoting from his article, says:

“Baptists rightly hold that to pass through the waters of believers' baptism after conversion is to put oneself completely into line with the teaching of the New Testament and with apostolic practice, but they do not unchurch those new members of other Christian communions who have

not been baptized. That means that Baptists do not regard baptism as essential to membership of the Christian Church—the Church Universal—even though they insist on immersion as a condition of admittance into the Baptist section of the Christian Church.” (The emphasis is Professor Marshall’s).

It is to be observed, therefore, that Professor Marshall tells us that by “Christian Church” in the quotation we made from his article printed in England, he did not mean the local body of believers, but the body of Christians as a whole,—“the Church Universal”; and then says that Baptists do “insist on admittance as a condition of admittance into the Baptist section of the Christian Church.” On page 28 of this issue we print the entire article from which we quoted, so that our readers may read it for themselves. This article has been in type ready for insertion in the Witness for four weeks, and has been held over only for want of space.

We now proceed to examine Mr. Marshall’s defence on this matter of open membership, but before examining the article in question, let us go back to Mr. Marshall’s speech in Hamilton, when he discussed the question of open membership:

“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 say, 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? (Hear, hear). That is liberty. I was not responsible for it. I went there in 1911 and all I will say is this, that I think I am right when I say that I did not receive into that church, at any rate one young person, who did not pass through the waters of baptism.

“In the second letter the question of open membership is raised, and he expresses his doubts whether the church in Coventry had open membership or not. I can answer him straight away. It had open membership. That is an affair of Queen’s Road. They decided it and had the right to decide it. It doesn’t matter to me or to you. Again let me say, during my ministry in Coventry I have not received any 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 emphasis in the foregoing quotation is ours.)

It will be observed that Mr. Marshall does not discuss the question of open membership from a scriptural point of view: he assumes that it is a matter which can be settled by a vote of the church, and declares that it is no affair of his, or of anybody else’s,—“They decided it and had the right to decide it. It doesn’t matter to me or to you.” Surely there is no suggestion here that Mr. Marshall believed that there was any scriptural reason standing in the way of a church’s decision not to require baptism as a condition of membership; and, according to Mr. Marshall’s own statement, with eyes wide open, he accepted the pastorate of two churches which had, by vote, set aside what we are now asked to believe Mr. Marshall accepts as a scriptural requirement. If the church has a right to set aside baptism as a term of membership, why has it not an equal right to change immersion to sprinkling, or to do away with both? But Mr. Marshall says in respect to a church’s decision to admit persons to its membership without baptism,—“It doesn’t matter to me or to you.”

Let us now come to the article itself. For the sake of accuracy we have had the printer put an exactly similar heading on Mr. Marshall’s article as that which it bore in the English paper. It will thus be seen that the article was intended to discuss, “Baptists and Church Membership.”

We come now to the words we have already frequently quoted: “To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite,” etc. Here are two matters referred to: salvation is one, membership in the Christian Church is another. If Mr.

Marshall, when he uses the term "Christian Church" has in mind "the Church Universal," why does he differentiate between "salvation," and "membership in the Christian Church"? Does he mean to say that some saved people may be outside "the Church Universal"? Or, on the other hand does he imply that anyone can hold membership in "the Church Universal" who is not saved? Further, does not his language suggest that the terms of membership in the Christian Church are something less than that which is "essential to salvation"? Here are his words: "To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe," etc. Once more: If Mr. Marshall was discussing baptismal regeneration, as such, without reference to baptism as a term of membership in the local church, why did he head his article, "Baptism and Church Membership"? Does he ask us to believe that anyone, whether a Baptist or an evangelical of any sort, reading that heading, would suppose that he was going to discuss the terms of membership in "the Church Universal"?

Furthermore: an examination of the article itself shows what he means,— "On the positive side we hold that after conversion baptism (using the word in its etymological sense, immersion) is a real means of grace,"—then he proceeds to discuss church membership,—but membership in what church, "the Church Universal" or the local church? Let us hear what he says:—"Leaving out of account the rich spiritual symbolism of baptism, we hold that the baptismal rite has great practical value. The convert who wishes to be baptized as an act of piety to Christ, and an act of loyalty to Christ in small things, is bound to derive spiritual blessing from it." What does he mean by saying that baptism is "an act of loyalty to Christ in small things"? Is baptism one of the "small" things? When Christ has given but two ordinances, shall we call either of them a matter of small importance?

But hear Mr. Marshall further: "Again, a youth who on joining the Church is publicly immersed"—joins what church? Is it "the Church Universal," or is it now the local church—"in the presence of many of his friends and associates—is bound to think far more seriously about the implications of Church membership and Christian discipleship than one who enters the Church by a sort of back door, and merely receives the right hand of fellowship at a communion service." Surely there can be no question that Mr. Marshall is discussing membership in the local church. It is true that he repudiates the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; but, having done so, his language certainly goes further when he 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."

Now Mr. Marshall tells us that he was discussing "immersion as a condition of admittance into the Baptist section of the Christian Church"? If that was what Mr. Marshall meant when he wrote his article, why did he head it, "Baptists and Church Membership"? We are now asked to believe that the article was written to discuss immersion as a condition of admission into "the Baptist section of the Christian Church." Frankly, we do not believe for a moment that Mr. Marshall had any such idea in mind when writing for English Baptists, who almost invariably practice open membership.

Mr. Marshall proceeds to say that the article to which we have referred was based upon a sermon which he had addressed to his own morning congregation. Elsewhere we reprint the sermon to which Mr. Marshall refers. We have printed it before, but we think it well to include it in this issue. We ask our readers to read the sermon carefully, and observe whether it represents the baptismal position as Canadian Baptists understand it.

Prof. Marshall prints a letter in autograph form he has received from the Rev. W. M. Robertson of Liverpool. We confess we are at present at a loss to understand the letter. But although Prof. Marshall and others have tried to make him so, Mr. Robertson has never been an issue in this controversy; and since his letters have no value in Prof. Marshall's eyes, we shall endeavour to let patience have her perfect work until we hear more from Mr. Robertson.

Meanwhile we wonder whether Prof. Marshall is correct in assuming that

Mr. Robertson refers to the articles under criticism? At all events his letter dated September 18, 1925, refers to "a recent number of *The Baptist Times*," whereas the article we have criticised appeared October 31st, 1924.

Concerning the Creation.

We come now to the section of Mr. Marshall's pamphlet headed, "Concerning the Creation," in which he says:

"Dr. Shields quotes the following sentence from my sermon:

'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 then declares that this is inconsistent with the declaration of my belief in the inspiration and general historicity of the first chapter of Genesis.

In dealing with the biblical account of the Creation we have to distinguish between two things, viz (a) the real meaning and message of the chapter, and (b) the Hebrew tradition based upon an absolutely literal interpretation of the chapter. As all careful readers of the New Testament are aware, Christ drew a distinction between the 'Law' (i.e., the Text of the Old Testament) and the 'Tradition' (i.e., the official interpretation of the Law.) See for example Matthew 15:1-9."

Continuing Prof. Marshall's Statement.

We come back now for a moment to the opening of Mr. Marshall's statement in which he refers to the question of open membership, and charges us with taking his words out of their proper setting. This he does in the following words:

"Dr. Shields carefully withholds from his readers the context of the above passage, for the simple reason that the context is fatal to the interpretation, or rather the misinterpretation, that he puts upon it."

The Hebrew Tradition.

By the changing of one name we venture to quote this paragraph against Professor Marshall himself in respect to his quotation from his sermon about "The Hebrew tradition," and say Mr. Marshall carefully withholds from his readers the context of the above passage for the simple reason that the text is fatal to the interpretation, or rather the misinterpretation, that he puts upon it. Let us give the context:

"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."

Prof. Marshall Explains?

Mr. Marshall in his statement endeavours to explain what he meant by "The Hebrew tradition" in the following words:

"According to the Hebrew tradition, the Creation was completed in six days, ordinary solar days, beginning, so to speak, on Sunday morning and reaching completion on Friday night. It is this conception of

the Creation—creation out of nothing in six ordinary solar days—that no longer appears tenable either in the light of scientific investigation or of the true principles of Biblical interpretation. There is a great mass of evidence against the Hebrew tradition of creation in six days. As a concession to this clear witness of science, even the most conservative and orthodox interpreters of Scripture declare that the term 'day' in Genesis I. must be regarded as signifying an age (e.g., Scofield). This is a departure from Hebrew tradition, and in harmony with the teaching of modern science. It is a recognition of the fact to which I appealed in my sermon—that the Christian disciple is not bound to adopt the Hebrew tradition of creation in six days, any more than he is bound to believe that the earth is flat because that was the general belief of the ancients, or that the earth is the hub of the universe because the ancients believed that too. People who do not feel their sense of trust in any way challenged by the idea of creation in six days may as well be left undisturbed. But for a Christian minister to demand of a young biologist, for example, that he must accept the Hebrew tradition of creation in six days as a condition of admittance to the church, is tantamount to a demand that he should suppress his sense of truth and stifle the witness of his conscience on entering the Church of Christ. Hence the remark, '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.'

Let the reader carefully peruse Mr. Marshall's sermon. Would anyone for a moment suppose that any such meaning was intended by Mr. Marshall's words? He sets "The Hebrew tradition" over against "the teaching on that subject of modern science". Now he tells us that he meant the Hebrew interpretation of the Genesis account of creation, which was to the effect that the world was created in six days. Will Mr. Marshall give us his authority for this alleged Hebrew tradition? Every student of Scripture knows that the actual text of the Old Testament was almost buried at some points beneath certain traditions. But what is Mr. Marshall's authority for saying that it was a Hebrew tradition that the world was created in six days? And if, indeed, he meant by the Hebrew tradition the Hebrew interpretation of Genesis I, why, in the name of common sense, did he not say so? The reason for his not saying so will be perfectly obvious if the context is examined. His next sentence is: "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." Here is another antithetical statement, and the "so-called orthodox method" is set over against "the method pursued by modern scholarship." We believe that comment on this matter is almost superfluous. Certainly he implicitly repudiates the "so-called orthodox method" as being not orthodox at all, but only "so-called", and implies that such methods are irreconcilable with "modern scholarship". To ask any reasonable person to believe that all this was written to make it clear that Baptists were not necessarily shut up to an interpretation of the Scriptures making the six days of the creation six solar days, involves a serious reflection upon average Canadian Baptist intelligence.

On page 9 of this pamphlet under the heading, "Concerning other charges," Mr. Marshall says:

"Other charges have been brought against me to the effect that I do not believe in the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ or in man's helplessness apart from Divine Grace or in the need of regeneration.

These suggestions are utterly untrue. I do believe that the death of Christ is fundamental in New Testament teaching as effecting reconciliation and making possible the forgiveness of sins and that believers are united with Him in His death and resurrection, being justified by faith and regenerated by the Holy Spirit. 'By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, that no man should glory. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works.'

While I most firmly hold—what is clearly implied in the teaching of Christ—that

'Down in the human heart, crushed by the tempter
Feelings lie buried that grace can restore.'

Yet I hold just as firmly that not by natural development, but only by the operation of the Holy Spirit can there be brought about that necessary spiritual change which is called the new birth and which makes us fit for the inheritance of the saints in light.

While I seek by fresh phrasing to make the Gospel message clear even to those who have no understanding of our theological terminology, I desire to say that I have no reserves in accepting Scripture teaching. I wish also to say in all humility that my own experience has made real to me the truth of such great passages as the following: I. Pet. 1:18,19; I. Cor. 15: 14; Col. 2: 13, 14; Rom. 3: 24-26; I. John 4: 10.

Nothing could give the editor of *The Gospel Witness* greater pleasure than to discover that Professor Marshall stands true to the great principles here enunciated. But we frankly say that we are amazed at this statement. We have had the opportunity of reading a number of Professor Marshall's sermons on subjects that would naturally, we should suppose, lead him to an exposition of the truth of man's fallen state, and of his absolute impotence apart from divine grace. When Mr. Marshall preached in Hamilton on "Coming to Christ," when again he preached in First Avenue, Toronto, on "Jesus knew what was in man," he made not the remotest allusion, it seems to us, to the necessity of the cleansing blood. Now he declares his belief "in man's helplessness apart from divine grace." But what is his conception of grace? Elsewhere in this issue we print two sermons preached in Central Baptist Church, Toronto, meeting in Castle Memorial Hall, December 20th, 1925. There is much in both these sermons that is true and beautiful; but to us, at least, they are like a doctor's prescription compounded without the main ingredients. Our readers must judge these sermons for themselves. To us they are like a non-stop express train, bound presumably for glory, but never stopping at the station where the poor sinner lives. They are like a luxuriously appointed liner, anchored somewhere off shore with no boat to ply between her and the land to take passengers on board. None of these sermons, so far as we are able to judge, recognize the necessity for repentance and faith in the substitutionary work of Christ as a means of salvation from sin. Are we to believe that such passages as Mr. Marshall quotes, and very properly quotes in this defence of his, are held in reserve for defensive purposes, and are no part of his gospel when preaching to the public? In his pamphlet he says, "While I seek by fresh phrasing to make the Gospel message clear even to those who have no understanding of our theological terminology, I desire to say that I have no reserves in accepting Scripture teaching." It is an extraordinary thing that Mr. Marshall should have failed to make his meaning clear to such a man as Dr. Sowerby, or Rev. John Linton, or Rev. W. J. H. Brown, and a host of others. When Mr. Marshall made his defence at Hamilton, why did he not quote such Scriptures as these on that occasion? Why did he say nothing then to indicate that he believed in the blood? Why did he conclude his confession of faith with the words, "and ever liveth to be the inspiration of his followers"? We know full well that we shall be charged with being ungenerous, but we must state the facts. It is ever the way of the modernist when driven into a corner to profess orthodoxy.

In this issue we print three of Mr. Marshall's sermons in full. Let our readers judge whether there is any suggestion there that Mr. Marshall on ordinary occasions preaches as one who believes that "without shedding of blood is no remission." If Mr. Marshall really believes what now at last he says he does, then we say that he is little short of criminally negligent in speaking on so many occasions since coming to Toronto without ever once teaching that salvation is through the blood of Christ.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL AND MODERNISM.

By Rev. John Linton, B.A.

There are hosts of Canadian Baptists who believe that the greatest peril confronting the churches of this generation is the menace of Modernism. Modernism is that which denies the authority and inerrancy of the Word of God. Wherever it has been received and propagated, the church has lost its spiritual power, conversions have ceased, worldliness has come in like a flood, and empty pews have taken the place of a well-filled church. The message of the modernist has never weaned the drunkard from his cups, nor the gambler from his cards. Our Canadian Baptist people know that if our pulpits were manned by modernists, our Denomination would shortly become spiritually bankrupt. It is because we believe this that our Baptist Convention at Ottawa, in 1919, voted overwhelmingly against "some new vague view" of the Scriptures; it is because we believe this that again in London, in 1924, the Convention refused to support the honouring of Dr. Faunce, a modernist.

And now the question is being raised as to the theological position of Professor L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University. We believe that Mr. Marshall's attitude toward Modernism is clearly defined in a sermon entitled, "What Baptists Stand For," preached in Queen's Road Church, Coventry, England. We are not aware of the reception accorded that sermon; but we are fully persuaded that it could not have been preached in the churches of this Convention without raising a storm of protest. That part of the sermon which indicates to us Mr. Marshall's attitude toward Modernism is as follows:

"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."

Let us make a fair and impartial examination of this passage: "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." Mr. Marshall believes that,—but certainly our Ontario and Quebec Baptists do not believe it. The "broadest of the broad" includes every modernist who denies the virgin birth of Christ, His substitutionary death on the cross, His bodily resurrection, His personal return; yet Mr. Marshall declares these men are one with Bible-believing Baptists "in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ." The Ottawa Convention did not believe that; the London Convention did not believe that; our Baptist people do not believe it to-day. Thus it is apparent that on such a tremendously important question, the views of Mr. Marshall are at utter variance with the views of our Canadian Baptist people.

Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "The scriptures cannot be broken." There are modernists—"the broadest of the broad"—who say they can be broken. Mr. Marshall says that they are loyal to Jesus Christ! Jesus Christ said, "Moses spake of me." There are modernists—"the broadest of the broad"—who say Moses never spoke of Jesus Christ. Mr. Marshall says these unbelieving men are loyal to Jesus Christ! Concerning these men Dr. Torrey well says, "Some people to-day claim to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. But when the Lord Jesus Christ says one thing, and modern scholarship says another thing, they accept the statement of modern scholarship and reject the statement of Christ. Gentlemen, I affirm that these men do not believe in Jesus Christ."

Mr. Marshall further says, "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." We have just read Mr. Marshall's explanation of this statement, and we are bound to answer that not one in a hundred would ever have understood Mr. Marshall to have meant what he now declares he meant: when he sets up "Hebrew tradition about the creation" over against the "teaching of modern science", any ordinary reader would conclude that he

meant the Genesis account of creation as against the teaching of modern science on that subject. If we accept Mr. Marshall's explanation of "Hebrew tradition", what have we then? "The Christian disciple is free to adopt the (erroneous) Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science." The answer, of course, is obvious. Thank God, we do not have to adopt either.

The second source of information is as untrustworthy as the first. Science changes its ground every year. Does any Canadian Baptist believe that a Christian is shut up to either an erroneous "Hebrew tradition", or "the teaching of modern science" for his knowledge of creation? Of course not! Our source of authority on that subject is the inspired and authoritative Word of God as found in Genesis, chapter one, and other scriptures. Why does Mr. Marshall not mention the Scriptures in that paragraph as a source of knowledge? The Scriptures deal with creation! If the term "Hebrew tradition" was not used of the Scriptures, then why no mention of the Scriptures in naming the sources of knowledge on the subject of creation?

But further: Mr. Marshall says, "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 know, of course, what Mr. Marshall means by the "so-called orthodox method"—it is that method which actually takes God's Word at its face value, and believes its solemn statements to be true. We also know what the method pursued by "modern scholarship" is: it is the method pursued by Dr. I. G. Matthews, in McMaster University, when he filled our young minds daily with doubts as to the integrity of the Word of God. Mr. Marshall believes the Christian disciple is free to adopt that latter method, so does Shailer Mathews, Dr. Fosdick, Percy Stickney Grant, Dr. Glover, and every destructive critic in the world. Mr. Marshall's statement leaves the door wide open for the rankest modernist to enter, and still call himself a Baptist.

We venture further to assert that Mr. Marshall's own method of interpretation is not the "so-called orthodox method", but the method "pursued by modern scholarship". This is abundantly evident from the passage before us. Would Mr. Marshall deny that his method of interpretation is the method of modern scholarship? Is it the "so-called orthodox method" to deny the plain statement of Jesus Christ concerning the miracle of the Prophet Jonas as Mr. Marshall does? Is it the "so-called orthodox method" to declare the gospel narratives to be contradictory to each other, as he also does?

Since Mr. Marshall applies this method to Jonas and to the alleged discrepancies in the gospels, does he also use it in his interpretation of the death of Christ? Is this the explanation of his sermon preached in James Street Church, Hamilton, after the Convention, when he undertook to preach on the subject, "Coming to Christ", and failed to make even the remotest reference to the blood by which we are made nigh to God? And this in the Convention city!—and before the very people who had heard his position challenged concerning his silence as to the blood of Christ! If Mr. Marshall believes in the substitutionary death of Christ, and the cleansing efficiency of His blood, he very successfully concealed that fact when it would have been most timely that he should declare it! Multitudes of our people who have read Mr. Marshall's sermons will feel that it is not without significance that in all these addresses there is no mention whatever of the necessity of the cleansing blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that his first direct reference to the matter should be made only when he is driven to the necessity of justifying himself—and that after almost three months' silence upon the subject!

**DR. SOWERBY'S ILLUMINATING CORRESPONDENCE WITH
CHANCELLOR WHIDDEN.**

The following letters have been handed to us by Dr. A. T. Sowerby. They were written without our knowledge. We say this because it has been the effort of McMaster University for some years to convey the impression that no one in the Denomination ever thinks of criticising McMaster unless he is inspired by Jarvis Street to do so. Those who know Dr. Sowerby, know that he has always been noted for his independence of judgment. He has exercised a great ministry, and has made a great contribution to our denominational life through the churches he has served. When a man of Dr. Sowerby's ability and experience is coolly dismissed by being told that he has "misunderstood Professor Marshall's position," as well as the attitude of both Dr. Farmer and the Chancellor, others may know what to expect. If that were really true, it would be an additional argument for Professor Marshall's dismissal; for if the Professor is unable to speak with sufficient clearness to enable a man of Dr. Sowerby's perception to understand him, he must be so lacking in the gift of expression as to be utterly unfit to teach young ministers, or to preach to any congregation of ordinary intelligence.

In one of his letters Dr. Whidden refers to a sermon by the Editor of this paper, preached in Coaticook; and says there is no reference in the sermon either to the Deity or the death of Christ. Our recollection is, but at this writing we are not absolutely sure, that the sermon was based upon Lamentations 1:12, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" We shall make enquiry on this point from those who were present. Unless we are greatly mistaken the sermon was a sermon on the Deity of Christ as absolutely essential to an adequate atonement for sin. Be that as it may, as the Editor's sermons are published weekly in this paper, his readers will be able to judge of the degree of probability involved in the Chancellor's remembrance.

1431 Lansdowne Ave..

Toronto, December 4th, 1925.

My dear Dr. Whidden:

Doubtless you are often submerged with epistles from here, there, and everywhere, many of them comforting, and many of them annoying; but at the risk of being termed "ignorant" (as so expressed by some) I am venturing to forward to you in this form my personal convictions upon certain matters, which are now, and have been commanding our attention ever since the days of Dr. Elmore Harris.

Permit me, first of all, to express to you my great pleasure at the fact that the theologs of McMaster repudiated the action of some students at Jarvis St. Church lately. It certainly did put McMaster in a bad light, and there have been a great many strictures upon the action referred to, this statement by the theologs has cleared the air.

Now, as to the sermon preached by Prof. Marshall in First Ave. Church, and reported in *The Canadian Baptist*, let me say that I have gone over it carefully, and with fair-mindedness, and I must, here and now, record my holy protest against the teachings contained therein. It sounds to me like plenty of those Unitarian sermons that we used to get in Boston—develop the good that is in us—cultivate, cultivate, cultivate. Let me say that he certainly failed to notice, or at least ignored the setting of his text, "But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men". What did He know? The badness, wickedness, and therefore "did not commit himself unto them." It was not "goodness" that He saw in them, but badness.

But now, supposing that He had seen some goodness in them, is Prof. Marshall's treatment of the remedy Baptist, or Scriptural? When Jesus met Nicodemus He did not say, "Now, Nic. I see some good in you, and I say unto you that we must draw this out, develop it in order to make you like Myself." He insisted, "Ye must be born from above", not developed from within.

There was the chance of Prof. Marshall's life to preach a searching sermon on the method and necessity of salvation. The cross was ignored, regeneration by the Holy Spirit was not mentioned, and simple development of the innate

good that is in us all was to be the means of salvation. Let me say I protest against this teaching with all my soul. I have held my judgment in this case in abeyance until this sermon has appeared. And now I am quite prepared to believe that Dr. Shields' position has been substantiated, and his attacks justified.

I have had no communication with Dr. Shields whatever, and am doing this alone, and of my own accord. I was told by one of our most prominent and useful men in the denomination only last evening that the sermon that Prof. Marshall preached in Hamilton was much worse.

Now, are you prepared to shoulder this, and carry the responsibility for such teaching? I shall fight it as long as I live, God help me.

As to that vote in Hamilton, there was certainly nothing to gloat over. 159 nays. But each one of those represents at least 50 members. So that 159×50 equals nearly 8,000—no small split in our body, and growing.

Let us get back, and if there is to be a house-cleaning, let us have it for Christ's sake. I am a graduate of McMaster, and have preached over 41 years, a theology, which no one has ever questioned; and I am sick at heart that this is going on. What is to be done? Hold on, and push him along in the face of such a storm? Let me say to you that Dr. Shields is not alone in this matter; there are hundreds who are with him in the position which he has taken, but have not spoken out very loudly.

Yours sincerely,

"A. T. SOWERBY."

December 8th, 1925.

Rev. Dr. A. T. Sowerby,
1431 Lansdowne Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Dr. Sowerby:

Your letter of December the 4th reached me Saturday morning on a very full day which was followed by out of town duties on Sunday. I have read carefully and with interest what you say, and appreciate your sincerity in writing thus frankly.

The attempt on the part of certain zealous but misguided students to distribute copies of the pamphlet published by a large group of the McMaster men was ill-advised to say the least. In fact, I learned after the mistake had been made during my absence from the city that the committee in charge had positively decided against following any such plan, but they were all out of town for the week-end preaching. Of course, we must not forget that these young men who made the mistake simply employed Dr. Shields' own methods followed at two or three different Conventions. Personally, I made known at once and very emphatically my disapproval of such a procedure.

With regard to the sermon preached by Professor Marshall at the First Avenue Church, and published in *The Canadian Baptist* of November the 26th, I have these things to say. It is not the kind of sermon one of us who knows fully our Canadian constituency would have preached on an occasion of that kind. I do not for one moment think there is a single sentence in it which, if carefully interpreted in relation to all that Professor Marshall has said since he came to Canada, could be considered as having a Unitarian slant. He certainly might well have carried his most important points much further than he did, but is it not fair for us to try to interpret his meaning in the light of his confession of faith made in all sincerity to the Convention at Hamilton? We have statements from several of our strongest Baptist leaders in the Old Land who are pillars of orthodoxy concerning the evangelical position and passionate zeal of Mr. Marshall. Surely they are not all misguided in their understanding of his position and his work. However, I would like much better to talk this over with you than to write about it. Will you be patient a little longer until you see a further statement which will be made in all good faith by some of us?

If Professor Marshall does not believe in the duty and the vital atonement

of Jesus Christ, I for one do not wish to see him continue in our midst. Only my conviction that he does hold such beliefs leads me to write as I have above.

By the way, I think you and I have read sermons of outstanding preachers representing British and American pulpits, who, when discussing certain themes, have not dealt with either the person of Christ or His work. And yet we know from their repeated statements in many other sermons and articles just what their position was. The only sermon which it has ever been my privilege to hear Dr. Shields himself preach was one given to the Eastern Association at Coaticook a year ago last June. It was a strong sermon and with all its main statements and implications I was in full accord, but so far as I could hear he did not once refer to the deity or the death of Christ. It was not preached for that purpose. Yet it was certainly a thoroughly evangelical discourse.

Just one thing more I feel I should add, namely this: Several important positive statements made in the sermon as preached at First Avenue did not appear in the sermon as printed in *The Canadian Baptist*. Just why these omissions were made I cannot say, but I thought you should know this fact.

With kind regards and hoping to see you in the near future, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

"HOWARD P. WHIDDEN."

1431 Lansdowne Ave.,

Toronto, Dec. 10th, 1925.

My dear Chancellor Whidden:

Your favor of the 8th inst. in reply to my letter of the 4th inst. came to hand in due time, and was read with interest, not to say surprise. It was the answer that I expected, and in perfect accord with the views put forward by Dr. Farmer when I spoke to him over the 'phone re this same matter. It will certainly keep you both very busy if you undertake to defend that kind of thing.

Now to the issue:

1. To my mind it was one of the most absurd pieces of exegesis that I ever saw in my life, and certainly did not do great homiletical credit to the author as one under appointment in a university to teach such work. It was miles away from the intent of the text, and going in the wrong direction. But this was of little account as compared with the *doctrinal* teaching of the sermon. It surely passed from comedy to tragedy.

2. How could you or Dr. Farmer defend the line of thought in that sermon in the slightest degree? It certainly teaches salvation without atonement. The text and context have nothing to do with the *method of salvation*. You in your reply have put up some three defences.

(a) You had heard Dr. Shields in Coaticook preach a sermon in which he made no reference to the cross or regeneration. Quite true. If I were preaching a sermon upon creation, or providence, or strife between Christians, or loyalty to the king, I would not need to refer to the cross or regeneration by the Holy Spirit. But if I were preaching on the method and means of salvation I would of necessity bring in the shedding of blood, atonement, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, repentance, etc. This Prof. Marshall signally failed to do, but brought in a teaching which, I believe, is in no sense in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. Therefore, I again protest with all my soul.

(b) You refer to his statement at the Convention as being all right, and as, therefore, wholesomely modifying his doctrinal teachings in this sermon. It does not so impress me. If he made such satisfactory statements when, to all intents and purposes he was on trial, and *afterward* presented the teachings of this sermon, it would very seriously affect my opinion as to his real inner convictions re the McMaster statement of doctrine.

I may just as well tell you at once that I am of the opinion that his own doctrinal views re salvation are truly presented in this sermon.

(c) You say that part of the sermon was not published in *The Canadian Baptist*.

To this I would make a threefold reply—

(1) Evidently the copy for the press was provided by Prof. Marshall as there was no indication that it had been stenographically reported.

(2) The sermon was all of a piece, and was but a reiterated emphasis of the cue given in the first few introductory sentences which to my mind was an outrageous assumption in view of the teachings of Jesus and Paul.

(3) A gentleman of intelligence, who heard the sermon delivered, said that in his opinion the worst part of it was left out of *The Canadian Baptist*.

Now, Dr. Whidden, you and Dr. Farmer cannot fix up that sermon, and make it out to be Baptist and Scriptural—(I refer you, again, to Christ and Nicodemus as treated in my former letter).

In view of this I reaffirm my determined stand against such teaching coming from our University; and I certainly will oppose it.

Indeed, if you brethren persist in such a course of action, then you may at once reckon upon me in the opposition. There are some things that I cannot swallow. Sheer convictions on the necessity and method of salvation leave me no alternative.

If I discover that some person has tampered with the railway track so as to endanger life, I will flag the train, and notify the Head.

I, therefore, protest again and assure you kindly but firmly that I will battle for Baptist doctrines.

Yours fraternally,

"A. T. SOWERBY."

December 21st, 1925.

Dr. A. T. Sowerby,
1431 Lansdowne Ave.,
Toronto.

Dear Dr. Sowerby:

I wish to acknowledge the receipt of your second letter of recent date, and to assure you of my regret that you have evidently misunderstood Professor Marshall's position as well as the attitude of both Dr. Farmer and myself.

I trust, however, that this may be cleared up at some early date.

With kind regards, and wishing you a very happy Christmas.

Sincerely yours,

"HOWARD P. WHIDDEN."

STUDENTS W. S. WHITCOMBE AND W. GORDON BROWN.

We print below a statement made by two graduates in Arts of McMaster University who are now students in the Theological Course. They graduated together in Arts last spring, and are in the 1927 class in Theology. Their statement is made for *The Gospel Witness* in the light of Professor Marshall's apologetic pamphlet. Their statement is crystal-clear; and we believe there is little danger of its being misunderstood by any of our readers. It is a further illustration of the principle that a deep conviction of truth puts iron into the blood. Our readers will readily believe that nothing short of a profound sense of duty could move these splendid young men, still in the midst of their Theological course, to write in this way.

THE BIBLE OR SCIENCE.

By Will S. Whitcombe, B.A., and W. Gordon Brown, B.A.

"Truth is a priceless jewel," and on its discovery alone are we bent, no matter what the cost may be for us in time, friendship, or esteem.

This article is a simple statement of the facts with regard to Prof. Mar-

shall's attitude toward the Bible and science as the writers obtained them in personal conversation from the professor's own lips. It lays no claim to being a verbatim report but it is an accurate representation of his views as he expressed them to us.

In the minds of many the Bible and science stand in direct opposition, telling two conflicting stories, but in our opinion they are one. The findings of modern science only confirm the age-long statements of the Bible. All truth is of God: hence it is harmonious whether it is found in nature or revelation. But we must remember that the work of science is far from being complete, and on that account contradictions between its teachings and the teachings of the Scripture arise from time to time. In such cases we place the Bible before science and would accept its unchanging declarations rather than the varied pronouncements of scientific research.

But what of Prof. Marshall's view? In a case such as we have described, where the teaching of science and the statement of Scripture are in direct opposition to each other, we enquired from him what his attitude would be. He unhesitatingly replied that under such circumstances he would choose science. He stated that he believed that he must accept truth from whatever quarter it came. We recall that the phrase he used was that he could not go to God with a lie in his mouth.

Most of our Canadian Baptist people will not believe that a man does go to God with a lie in his mouth if he accepts the plain teaching of Scripture even though that be in contradiction to the teaching of modern science. To the dogmas of modern science they would reply with the Teacher of teachers: "It is written."

(Signed) WILL S. WHITCOMBE,
(Signed) W. GORDON BROWN.

A BLOODLESS GOSPEL.

Rev. W. J. H. Brown Renews Attack on Professor Marshall.

Preaching to a capacity congregation last night, Rev. W. J. H. Brown at the Annette Street Baptist Church said that Professor Marshall, of McMaster University, had no right to call himself a Christian if he does not believe that Jesus Christ died as his substitute. This statement was applauded by the whole congregation rising in approval of the stand the pastor is taking on this matter.

"During the 17 years of my ministry here I have placed the emphasis in my preaching on the atonement because it is there that God placed the emphasis in His Word," said Mr. Brown. "To surrender this was to surrender Christianity."

He then threw out his challenge: "Does Professor Marshall believe this? He certainly has not preached it since he came to Canada. Preaching in the city at Christmas time the Professor said, 'Paul was particular—wisely particular—about his fundamentals and I don't think he was a heretic. And I am prepared to be a heretic if Paul was one.'"

Mr. Brown's reply to this was to assert that "Paul preached the Blood. If the professor believes Paul's teaching why does he preach a bloodless gospel? Paul himself said that if any man preach unto you any other gospel than that which ye have received let him be accursed."

In conclusion the pastor said that the "plague of the bloodless gospel" is all the more dangerous when preached by a man of high education and culture."
—From the Evening Telegram, Jan. 4.

"The McMaster Calamity"

A MESSAGE DELIVERED IN

Ossington Ave. Baptist Church, Toronto

BY THE MINISTER

REV. GEORGE W. ALLEN

January 3rd, 1926

Since I stated my position last Sunday regarding the matters now disturbing our Convention, all sorts of wild rumors have been flying about. Early last week the Superintendent of Home Missions phoned me, stating that he had been told that the Pastor of Ossington Avenue Church had put a resolution through his church, cutting off all gifts to Home Missions. He was anxious to know whether or not the report was true. I told him that nothing could be further from the truth than that report. A little later it was intimated to me that I was not a supporter of our Foreign Mission work. That, too, is a complete fabrication, without any foundation whatsoever. But because of these gross misstatements, I feel obliged to explain my position again, and if possible, to make it clearer.

I am a Baptist—a Regular Baptist—a fully acknowledged member of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. If I were not a Baptist, I would not bother myself to make any declaration on this matter, and thus receive a deluge of bitter and untruthful attacks from certain quarters. But because I am a Regular Baptist, and a sinner saved by grace, I do feel deeply concerned, and believe it my DUTY to warn every fellow-Baptist in the Convention, as far as God gives me grace to make myself heard, of the CALAMITY that has come upon our beloved university,—McMaster. That is my problem, and it is the problem right now of several thousands of our Baptist people.

I understand that last Sunday night no less than three Baptist ministers in Toronto alone, spoke on this same topic, at the same hour. Some have said that it was a deliberate and well laid plan that caused us to all speak at the same time. But I wish to declare to you that I KNEW NOTHING WHATSOEVER of any other man's programme for last Sunday night, and even now I do not know who the third preacher was.

At first I was inclined to treat this incident lightly; but upon further thought I became convinced that there was a real explanation for it. DO YOU STILL BELIEVE IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE

HOLY SPIRIT? I DO! For that reason, before I seek a Sunday message, I ask God for it, and I did so in preparation for last Sunday night. Friday I phoned Pastor Brown, of Annette Street Church and asked him how he happened to speak on the same subject. His reply was this, "If ever anything was laid upon me to speak on, that was. I felt constrained in Spirit." You ask me to explain how we came to speak on the same topic at the same hour? My answer is, "The Holy Spirit, in answer to prayer, was directing affairs".

Into McMaster, which is responsible for the preparation of the majority of the young men entering out Baptist ministry, has been brought a teacher whose utterances and statements do NOT harmonize with the statements of the Holy Scriptures, as we Canadian Baptists interpret them. I refer to Rev. L. H. Marshall, lately come from England where he was the pastor of two churches that call themselves Baptist, although neither require Baptism of those who are received into their membership. In other words, Mr. Marshall was, from 1911 until shortly before coming to Canada, pastor of two "Open membership" churches, and as far as we can observe, without any protest against their unscriptural practice.

Regarding his coming, we read in a booklet issued by the Senate of McMaster since the Convention last October, a full photographic account (prepared by Mr. E. J. Bengough) of the Educational Session, in which it is stated (page 9, tenth line from the top), that Mr. Marshall subscribed to the doctrinal statements set forth in the Charter before ever coming to Canada. To many who are unaccustomed to dig at all below the surface of things, it is perfectly satisfactory when a man subscribes to that statement. But we have to remember that frequently statements are made by modern scholars that carry double meanings. For example, a scholar in the U.S.A. declares that he believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures. That in itself looks good. But the same man also says that he believes in the inspiration of his mother's letters. Many

you know something of the CALAMITY that has been brought into McMaster, and that caused me to both speak and act. And you will understand me better when I say that I shall continue this stand, by the grace of God, UNTIL THE SENATE DOES A PROPER HOUSECLEANING OVER THERE, for I firmly believe that Prof. Marshall does indeed preach and teach "What he believes," and that it is not in harmony with the Bible doctrines long cherished by our Ontario and Quebec Baptists. If this Professor is allowed to go on equipping our young men with this sort of doctrine, I venture to predict that it will be but a few years before our beloved Denomination will be as cold and lifeless in spiritual things as are some other Denominations about us, who once had a burning passion for the Gospel of the Blood of Jesus Christ.

But the Charter states (page 9, the 11th line from the bottom) that our doctrine includes, "The divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice." When Prof. Marshall subscribes to that what does he really have in mind? Does he mean the same as the rank and file of our Convention would mean? Does he believe, for instance, that the statements made in the Book of Jonah are historical facts, or just Allegorical, that is to say, "Figurative"? The impression and firm conviction which some of the professor's students have certainly received from him is that he considers the book as Allegorical, rather than historically correct as to FACTS. But our Lord and Master evidently believed the story of Jonah was a historical FACT, for He said in Matt. 12:40, "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish, so will the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." If Jesus was mistaken about the historical accuracy of the story of Jonah may He not also be mistaken about His power to redeem lost sinners? If Jonah's experience in the great fish is only Allegorical, then are we to understand that Jesus' experience in the heart of the earth is only Allegorical, too? If the Book of Jonah is only Allegorical, is Nineveh and her citizens also allegorical? Or if Nineveh and her people are historical FACTS, and only Jonah is "Figurative," then how will the children of Nineveh rise up at the judgment and condemn ANY generation "Because they repented at the preaching of Jonah," if so be that Jonah is only "Allegorical"?

But again, in reference to the divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, we are told on page 5 of the Senate's report that Mr. Marshall

holds a "Moderate critical view." Well, if a man in his position as an instructor of students for the ministry, holds a "Moderate critical view," of parts of the Scriptures; and if "He will preach what he believes"; and if he tells his class "Do not preach sin: it will tend to drive some of your congregation away. Speak of it as evil." (This is what some of his students declare he stated to them). Then what kind of a harvest of ministers for our churches can we logically expect from this man?

Before bringing my observations to a close, I must touch upon one other exceptionally important point. The authorities at McMaster should recognize that any explanatory statement that they might issue in the future could have but little weight since it would come AFTER the Professor has spoken. He has already been preaching a good deal, and TELLING WHAT HE BELIEVES, perhaps unconsciously, and his expressed beliefs do NOT tally with his acceptance of the Charter, or with his declaration at the Convention, as the rank and file of our people understand it; and for this reason his statement at the Convention, as well as his subscription to the Charter of McMaster, MUST BE INTERPRETED IN THE LIGHT OF HIS SERMONS AND ADDRESSES SINCE DELIVERED. If a man were caught in wrong doing, and brought before the authorities, he would, naturally, make all sorts of explanations; but even if there were a measure of sincerity, his explanations would have little value under the circumstances which called them forth. So it is with this case at McMaster. The wrong HAS BEEN DONE, and the effect cannot be "Explained" away.

We are referred to Dr. Rushbrook, Mr. Aubrey, Dr. Shakespere, Dr. Carlile, Dr. Chas. Brown, and Dr. Glover, as men who have great confidence in Prof. Marshall, although as far as I can remember, WE HAVE ONLY THE PROFESSOR'S PERSONAL WORD FOR THEIR CONFIDENCE. And the inference is that, since these have confidence in him, therefore, we should also. But on the other hand, the opinions of Mr. Robertson, which are anything but complimentary to the new Professor, are to be totally disregarded, ALTHOUGH THEY ARE HIS OWN PERSONAL, WRITTEN STATEMENTS, OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

Let me ask how many of you, know personally, Dr. Carlile, Dr. Brown, Dr. Glover, etc. ANY BETTER THAN YOU KNOW MR. ROBERTSON? How many of our Convention folks do? Then is it not logically fair that if you are to disregard one, you should disregard all the others?

But in addition to these references given us,

many here in Canada who never knew Mr. Marshall before, have undertaken to come to his defence and say "He DOES believe" this and that. But why should they need to do so? He has spoken. He has preached several times, and frequently revealed his doctrine of faith; and his OWN statements are INFINITELY SUPERIOR as a help to us in forming a correct estimate of his stand, than the varied attempts that have been made by his admirers to defend him.

As for the students who back up the Professor, that is quite natural on their part, especially since his teaching is accompanied by a somewhat winsome personality. I myself, as a student at McMaster in 1910, stood loyally for Prof. I. G. Matthews, just because he had a gracious way with us, and we did not perceive the destructiveness of his teachings. But after I got out into the work, and took more time for thought and prayer, I saw my mistake and greatly regretted it. So will it be with these students who, at this time, are stoutly defending Prof. Marshall. If they really love the Lord Jesus Christ in all sincerity and truth, they will know more ten years from now than they evidently do now, and I believe that many of them will bitterly regret that they ever defended a teacher who preached about the "Celestial

fire" and "Divine element" within man, and who said that "When a young person chooses a vocation in which the powers God has given are used to the utmost, then he can truly say he has come to Christ." In the meantime, those of you who have real Spiritual discernment, will not take very seriously their pamphlets and speeches in defence of Mr. Marshall. Since Mr. Marshall has "Preached what he believes," and the same has been put into print by the Senate, the Canadian Baptist, and several other institutions, LOOK FOR YOURSELVES, praying God to guide you.

I am not trying to lead this church of which I am Pastor, out of the Denomination, as one or two have insinuated! but I am trying to make this church a power WITHIN THE DENOMINATION, to keep things clean and true. FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 23 YEARS, I find myself unable to support McMaster because of this present situation, and I long for the day when the Senate will cease their blind, stubborn course, and will restore the confidence of our people by the appointment of a professor whose views will harmonize with those of the Convention, not only in theory, but also in practice.

The Senate has made a great blunder: they must make a great correction!

THE WHOLE BIBLE S. S. LESSON COURSE
of the BAPTIST BIBLE UNION of NORTH AMERICA

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

NO. 1.

Lesson 6

FIRST QUARTER

Feb. 7, 1926

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE MODEL PRAYER

LESSON TEXT: Sixth chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with lesson text: Luke, chapter 6.

I. WE ARE TO LIVE OUR LIVES BEFORE GOD RATHER THAN BEFORE MEN.

It is characteristic of the wicked that "there is no fear of God before their eyes". These verses before us suggest that in the doing of alms, and even in the exercise of prayer, many are actuated by a desire to be seen of men. Such people our Lord describes as "hypocrites". He admonishes us, therefore, to live for the favour of God rather than for the favour of men, and to do our alms as unto God, and to offer our prayers in the secret place. This, of course, does not mean that we ought not to pray publicly; but it does mean that true prayer is for the ear of God, not for the ear of men. When thus we live to please God we may be sure we shall be rewarded of our Father which is in heaven; therefore we have our choice whether we will be content with the reward of the hypocrite, or seek such reward as only God can give.

II. THE MODEL PRAYER.

1. It is addressed to the Father in heaven. We do well to consider to whom we pray. Is our God the Maker of heaven and earth? Does He dwell in heaven? Have we been born again? Have we a right to call Him our Father? True prayer then is a child talking to his father. 2. Prayer has in it an element of worship. The name of God is hallowed: it is set apart. There is much in a name. If one signs another man's name he is in danger of getting into the penitentiary. We must not take the name of God in vain. Christ has been given a name that is above every name; therefore as we pray, we should not take the name of God upon our lips lightly. It is said that the ancient scribes were wont to wipe their pens always before they wrote the name of God, or of Jehovah. There is opportunity here to enforce a useful lesson upon boys and girls, and to teach the importance of reverence for the name of God. 3. It is a prayer for the coming of the kingdom. The kingdom will come when the King returns. Thus we are taught to love the appearing of our Lord. 4. The rule of the kingdom is defined. God's kingdom will come when His will is done on earth as it is in heaven; not under compulsion; not by any legislative powers, but because men's hearts have been changed. 5. The daily bread for which we pray suggests daily contact with the Source of supply. When the Prodigal was given his portion of goods he went to a far country immediately. After his return we may safely infer he was content with his daily bread: "As thy days, so shall thy strength be" is the rule of the promise. 6. We are plainly told that only a readiness to forgive others implies a fitness to be forgiven. 7. We are not to desire temptation, but rather to be delivered from evil. It is folly to see how near to the precipice one can go: it is much safer to keep as far away from danger as possible. 8. A mighty argument of the prayer is that the kingdom and power and the glory belong to God, and therefore He is able to answer the cry of His children.

III. WE ARE ADMONISHED TO LAY UP TREASURES IN HEAVEN.

It is well to remember the emphasis of our Lord: He emphasized the importance of the future rather than of the present, of heaven rather than of earth. The humanitarianism of to-day that passes for Christianity in so many quarters, has entirely reversed the emphasis, putting it upon time rather than upon Eternity.

IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF SINGLENESS OF AIM. (verses 22, 23.)

An argument against the evil of double mindedness. Only as we are actuated by pure motives shall we have a clear vision: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine". So also we are warned against the attempt to serve two masters (v. 24). A man must live for eternity or time, for God or mammon; he cannot live for both. The church cannot serve her Lord, and the world at the same time. Here is an opportunity to press the question. Who is your master? What is the supreme motive? What is the chief aim of life? What is the supreme authority? Whose will is law?

V. AN EXHORTATION TO TRUST GOD.

1. We must trust Him for the greater things,—for life, that is beyond our control. Why not, therefore, trust Him for the lesser, even food and raiment? 2. We are to deliberately exercise as faith a trust which is instinctive to the fowls of the air: hence the God of grace is not less careful than the God of nature. 3. There is a suggestion here respecting Christ's view of the material universe, and the laws by which it is regulated. No evolutionist can use this language. Christ here reveals God as a transcendent Personality, whom He calls our Heavenly Father; and He tells us that He feeds birds, and makes the lilies grow, and clothes the grass of the field with beauty. To lose this conception of God is the destruction of faith, and the end of prayer. 4. We are to put God first in all things, with the assurance that God will Himself attend to all secondary matters.

Published quarterly in weekly parts by the UNION GOSPEL PRESS for the BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA—Publishing office, 2375 Thurman St., Cleveland, Ohio.

TERMS: Each set, a quarter, 4 cents; a year, 16 cents.

ADDRESS UNION GOSPEL PRESS, P. O. Drawer 688, CLEVELAND, OHIO

CHURCH AND WITNESS NEWS.

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

The attendanse at the Bible School last Sunday morning was 1,137, including 416 in the Pastor's class. Several came forward at the close of the morning sermon. In the evening the church was again crowded to capacity. Twelve were baptized; fourteen came forward at the invitation; the Communion Service filled the entire downstairs of the auditorium; and forty-three new members were received. At the conclusion of the service, by unanimous vote, the House Committee was authorized to have stairs built from the gallery down to the platform at the pulpit end of the church, to facilitate the response when an appeal is made for confessions; and also to provide for the inevitable overflow from the ground floor to the gallery in future Communion Services. One minister of wide experience who was present, said that it was the largest Communion Service he had ever seen in his life. For every blessing the Lord's name is to be praised.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

New subscriptions continue to pour into our office, but we desire to announce once again that the offer of *The Gospel Witness* for \$1.00 per year to all new subscribers outside of Toronto still holds, and will hold till further notice; in Toronto, the subscription price to new subscribers is \$1.50. We are sure that our *Gospel Witness* family will understand that we are doing this as a means of advertising *The Witness*. It costs us more than that figure to print, and we are looking to the Lord to provide us with funds to carry on the work.

This issue of *The Witness* provides an additional reason for its continued publication. The policy of *The Canadian Baptist*, as shown by Dr. Sowerby's letters appearing in this issue, and which *The Baptist* refused to publish, and now by McMaster University's use of their magazine to present but one side of a denominational issue, and refusing all expression to the other, as is shown in Mr. W. G. Brown's article, all point to the necessity of an independent organ of opinion through whose columns conscientious Baptists may still find expression. We are glad that so many brethren express their views in this week's issue of the paper; and we have no doubt that many others will desire to use these pages for a similar purpose. We shall be glad to hear from pastors and laymen all over the land, especially within the bounds of this Convention, expressing an opinion respecting Mr. Marshall's position as shown by his utterances.

We urge all our readers who are sympathetic with our position to help us to the utmost in getting new subscribers, particularly among the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec.

III.—Baptists and Church Membership.

By the REV. L. H. MARSHALL, B.A., B.D.

With regard to baptism, on the negative side, we reject all theories of baptism regeneration. The idea that the baptismal ceremony performed upon an unconscious infant removes the taint of original sin, or that it confers the gift of spiritual life (as was maintained to the present writer a day or two ago by some Anglican clergymen), or that, as the Roman Catholics hold, it bestows some grace that is essential to salvation, we dismiss as absurd and magical, entirely foreign to the religion of Jesus Christ. As Dr. W. N. Clarke says: "There is no place in Jesus' plan for deliverance from evil by any process of a magical nature, or by any process that does not imply a moral experience. . . . Externals do not reach where the evil is. No such thing as baptismal regeneration is conceivable within the circle of Jesus' ethical and spiritual ideas. The evil that resides in character must be put away, and the work that transforms character must be inward, intelligent, experimental, reconstructive. Only in actual living experience can the escape from evil be made." The theory of baptismal regenerations has been put to the test by Catholic priests on the mission field, where heathen babies—and adults, too—have been baptised wholesale, and the result was precisely what one would expect. The sprinkling of water upon an unconscious babe never did and never will make anyone "a child of God, a member of Christ, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." 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.

Christ Himself was baptized, but He does not appear to have said much about baptism. According to John's Gospel, Christ left to His disciples the task of administering baptism to new adherents. Paul quite frankly regards baptism as being of small importance in comparison with conversion. He says: "Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel." One of our main contentions as Baptists is to the effect that baptism cannot make people Christians. Anyone who is not a disciple of Christ before being baptized does not become a disciple by virtue of that ceremony. Baptism is the mode—sanctified by Christ's example and by Apostolic practice—by which the fact of conversion and discipleship is publicly declared and registered. There is no value in being baptized unless the person who passes through the ceremony has already made

a conscious response to the inward appeal of the Spirit of God. Baptism, in the true Christian sense of the term, presupposes conversion. To ignore that fact is to do serious damage to all the spiritual interests involved.

The practice of infant baptism, soon after its introduction,

Lowered the Moral and Spiritual Tone of the Church.

During the first century and a half of its existence, no one could join the Church except by profession of personal faith in Christ and devotion to Him. But when people began to join the Church 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 distinction between Church members and members of the Christian community vanished, and every Dick, Harry and Tom, however spiritually dead, or morally inert, lax, or corrupt, came to be reckoned in the number of baptized Christians.

The practice of infant baptism necessarily led to the institution of god-parents, who make promises for the child that the child cannot make for itself. But we

Cannot Enter the Church by Proxy,

even though saints and angels be prepared to act as our sponsors. We can enter the Church only when, in response to the appeal of Christ, we desire freely and spontaneously to dedicate our hearts and lives to His allegiance. The case for infant baptism is so weak, and the case for believers' baptism is so strong, that if the issue were considered purely upon its merits, and in the clear light of the New Testament, the return to the Apostolic practice in the matter would be far more widespread than it is. But infant baptism is so deeply rooted in custom and tradition, that mere inertia prevents many of our fellow Christians from taking their stand with us in this matter.

On the positive side we hold that

After Conversion

baptism (using the word in its etymological sense, immersion) is a real means of grace. Leaving out of account the rich spiritual symbolism of baptism, we hold that the baptismal rite has great practical value. The convert who wishes to be baptized as an act of piety to Christ, and an act of loyalty to Christ in small things, is bound to derive spiritual blessing from it. Again, a youth who on joining the Church is publicly immersed—in the presence of many of his friends and associates—is bound to think far more seriously about the implications of Church membership and Christian discipleship than one who enters the Church by a sort of back door, and merely receives the right hand of fellowship at a communion service. If it be true, as has been alleged, that the Christian life is intenser among Baptists than among Congregationalists, the reason is probably to be found in the institution of believers' baptism. It is wise to see to it that the act of joining the Church is not made too easy. Compulsory attendance at a Church preparation class and baptism at a public service are obstacles that may quite reasonably be placed in the path of the young aspirant to fellowship with the Church of Christ. Those Free Churches which, while repudiating all ideas of baptismal regeneration, cling to the practice of infant baptism and invest it with ideas that have no more to do with baptism as an historical institution than chalk with cheese, miss something of great spiritual value in not requiring of new Church members the solemn public profession of personal self-dedication which believers' baptism involves.

Professor Marshall's Sermons

EDITORIAL NOTE: The sermons of Professor Marshall which follow are not endorsed by The Gospel Witness. They of course contain much that is true, but are published here in proof of our contention that they set forth a salvation that is of works rather than of grace, and that they recognize no necessity for the cleansing blood of Christ.—Ed. of Witness.

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, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

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

(The passages in black type represent our emphasis, not Mr. Marshall's.—Ed. Witness.)

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.) 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 re-

turned 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, 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 priestcraft 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 ordination—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. 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. 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. 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 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. 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.

SERMON

By Professor L. H. Marshall of McMaster University.

Delivered on the morning of Sunday, December 20, 1925, before the Congregation of Central Baptist Church, Toronto, in the Castle Memorial Chapel, McMaster University.

(Stenographically reported by Berryman, Emerson & Co., Parliamentary, Court and General Reporters.)

This morning I want to say a word or two about the spiritual message of Christmas, and I propose to base my remarks upon a sentence in the Epistle to the Galatians, Chapter 4, verse 4: "God sent forth his Son, born of woman." This text reminds us of the truth on which we generally base the very centre of the faith of the Christian church.

The coming of Jesus Christ to this earth of ours was an altogether unique act of God. Christ was not a prophet of his age; he did not emerge out of the circumstances of his time; he was not simply one who happened by one of the accidents of history to develop into an amazingly spiritual mind and virtuous person. He is not to be regarded as a great man who did a great work in the realm of religion just as Copernicus did in the realm of astronomy or Shakespeare in the realm of letters. He is not to be thought of as a man of supreme achievement in the quest after goodness and after God. Nothing of the sort. His position is unique. As Paul says, God sent his Son. The Divine Helper took pity upon our race, laid aside his heavenly attributes, entered into our world, clothed himself with our flesh, and after living a peerless life, after teaching with accents never heard before or since, he eventually sacrificed himself for us men and for our salvation on the cross.

And the advent of this Christ to our world is the event which we are celebrating to-day. God sent forth his Son. The significance of Christ it is impossible to exhaust, but there are just two thoughts—I have no doubt there are many more but one cannot say everything in a sermon—there are just two thoughts envisaged in this text to which I want to call your attention this morning. They are very simple thoughts too. But it seems to me that here we get the essential spiritual message of Christmas: Jesus came to show us what God is like. And on the other hand, we need to remember that Jesus also came to show us the possibilities of this human nature of ours under God's redeeming grace.

Now, both those thoughts are contained in these words: God sent forth his Son, born of woman. Let us look at the first: God sent forth his Son. Whatever other purpose God may have had in mind, I think there is no doubt that the main purpose was that we might become personally acquainted with God, that we might know the love of God. It has been very aptly said that truth has to become alive and be seen walking among men; truth can be effectively revealed only through personality. Bishop Westcott, great scholar as he was, testified that he owed far more to the living voice of Christ than to the dead letter of books. What he meant, of course, was that he had learned more through personality than he had ever learned in any other way; and I suppose we will all say the same. All those powerful influences that have been brought to bear on your life and on mine are personal influences. As George Eliot so very beautifully said: Ideas are but poor ghosts; we cannot discern them; they pass before us in thin vapour and cannot make themselves felt. But sometimes they are made flesh, they come to us in a person, and then their presence is a power: they shake us like passion; we are drawn to them as flame is drawn to flame.

Aimless theorizings about kindness would probably leave us cold; but we cannot possibly get into touch with one in whom the spirit of kindness is veritably incarnate without feeling that the milk of kindness flows more freely through our own veins. Merely to witness a fine act of self-control is of greater inspirational value than all the essays that were ever written or all the sermons that were ever preached on self-control. To enter into fellowship and personal contact with one who is the soul of integrity, the soul of honour, the soul of purity, acts on our courses just as weeding acts on our gardens. Truth comes most effectively through personal contact. It must be lived before it really influences us in any very great degree.

Some of you men here might desire to buy a volume of the world's greatest classical sermons, and say to yourselves: Now, we will stay at home and read these on Sunday mornings instead of going to church. But let me urge you to remember this, you will gain far more spiritually even by listening to the feeble discourses of a truly devout man of God than by the mere reading of classical sermons at home; for this simple reason, truth that comes warm and vital with personality has an arousing power that the dead letter of the printed page can never possess. And that is why in a religious sense a little child can be far more deeply aroused by the child's contact with one in whom religion is incarnate, is nobly and radiantly and beautifully active, than through all the creeds and all the catechisms that were ever drawn up. That is why a devout

mother, living in fellowship with God can do more for the religious development of her child than any system of religious education. Religion must reach the child through personality. Yes, brethren, don't you see how true it is that truth incorporate in a life has a power that mere abstract truth cannot, does not possess?

You know this principle, which is one of the most obvious, applies just as much to the truth about God. It is quite clear that there was a knowledge of God before Christ came, but it was very imperfect, it was very inadequate. This knowledge of God after a fashion obtains in the heathen world to-day, where Christ is not known, but it is very imperfect, very inadequate, very vague, very dim, very shadowy without Christ. As Dr. T. M. Glover has said: Without Jesus Christ God would be little more than an abstract noun. I think that is a very profound saying.

It is quite true, of course, that men the wide world over from the most cultured philosopher to the very rudest savage are at times more or less conscious of some mysterious spiritual power—mysterious but real, unseen yet not unfelt—Yes, a power inscrutable. It is certainly something not to be despised when a great historian after surveying the history of the past can tell us that the latest history of the world reveals the fact that there is a moral power presiding over the destiny of men and nations; that history itself makes it perfectly clear that we live in a moral order under a moral governor; that righteousness, and righteousness alone, can exalt nations; that nations that do evil perish; that all cruelty and oppression, all falsehood and fraud, all lust and vanity, have to be paid for at an awful price in the long run. When a great historian talks like that about history to-day there is a value in his message; but it is a somewhat vague and shadowy conception of God.

To my mind too it is very delightful and very refreshing to notice nowadays how many men of science are talking in a similar way, telling us that the very world in which we live, apart altogether from the Bible, apart altogether from Jesus Christ, is a manifestation that there is a creative power behind all things, a directing mind presiding over all, and a great purpose pervading all things; that chance is after all but a direction that we cannot see, that all the apparent discord is simply harmony and is not understood. One of the very greatest in his last work began with these lines:

God carnate rose,
So that the story be
The mighty tide of being flows
Through countless channels, Lord, from Thee.

Another, for instance, said: He regarded this visible world of ours simply as the living work of a transcendent god. Oh, yes, there is a knowledge of God in that direction I think; and it is well to notice how sometimes men of a very agnostic temper frequently testify in strange ways—in what to you and me is so vague, so shadowy, so unsatisfactory—that they have at any rate some experience of God. One of them, for instance, speaks of an unknown something sucking him up.

Shortly before I left England a number of public men wrote to one of the leading newspapers articles under the title "My Religion." All these men were out of fellowship with the Christian church. They had a religion, vague and shadowy I know, but a religion, and the interesting thing, I thought, was how they all spoke of God, of the reality of God. They did not seem to know God very well. Even a man like Arnold Bennett said: Oh, yes, I am quite clear about God; the Law governs scientifically, the Universal Mind—me and my own conscience in me testify of God. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle said: Yes, this marvellously ordered universe postulates a central intelligence. He is quite sure of God. He may not know much about God, but he knows about Him.

It is better to have vague ideas of God than no ideas at all. It is better to think of God as a power in the darkness of whom we guess than to have no thought at all. Inspired it is within its own limits. When a man like

Matthew Arnold speaks of God as a power, a power within ourselves that makes for righteousness, is there one of you here this morning who has not felt in his own heart an experience of that kind—some strange, mysterious power within ourselves making for righteousness?

To me the inner light, the inner voice, the mysterious spiritual urge for righteousness, is to be remembered among the supreme realities of existence. It is quite true that God approaches us in many ways, and none of the ways are to be despised. And yet, brethren, let us ever remember that the message of Christmas Day is this, that God sent his Son that we might really know him. The truth about God in Jesus comes to us in a person, in the supreme Person—God sends his Son to us.

We see the light, the knowledge, the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. You can never be any longer in doubt as to the precise nature of God when you know Christ, because God sent forth his Son. To gaze into the face of Christ is to gaze into the face of God. To understand the character of Christ is to understand the character of God. To hear the voice of Christ is to hear the voice of God. To follow Christ is to follow God. To do the will of Christ is to do the will of God. Christ came to us out of the very heart and centre of the universe that he might make God known to man. The Creator, the Ruler of the world, in whose hands are all the issues of our life, in Christ speaks to us and to all mankind.

God sent his Son. Christ is the one instance of the perfect shining of God's light, the perfect fusion of the human and the divine, the full indwelling of the Godhead. That is why I love those words of Martin Luther's: He who would know of God, let him go to the manger.

So it is true that in Christ alone we get to know God, not as a moral power or a central intelligence, but as Father, as Friend, as Helper, as Saviour. And that is not mere sectarian dogma, that is not mere speculative theology; it is something that can be verified. I would not preach it if it could not be verified. No, I will not preach speculative theology for anybody; I want something that can be verified. I can verify this, and I will tell you how. (Remember, brethren, that the more you and I follow Jesus Christ by God's infinite grace, the more Christlike you and I become through the Holy Spirit's energies, the more Christlike in character and in conduct, the deeper, the intenser, the sublimer, the richer our knowledge of God and our sense of God. You can put that to the test by experience. Yes, God sent his Son that we might know the Father. What is life without God? The most important thing for all of us is to know God. God sent his Son that we might know God.

On the other side, he was born of woman. That means he took on the nature of man. And remember what that means. It means that God sent his Son to take our human nature. Why? Well, that he might reveal the spiritual destiny of man, in order that Jesus might show to the world what God can make of this human nature of ours when completely handed over to him. Remember, our Lord was very wonderful and very beautiful. He was born of a woman. He took on our human nature to show us that it could be made magnificent. Oh, is not that glorious!

I know some people will say: Oh, it is not the gospel. Yes, it is the gospel. What is human destiny? According to the Apostle Paul—and I do not think Paul was a heretic; I am prepared to be a heretic if he was one—according to him it is to grow unto the perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. That makes life worth living. Oh, that makes life infinitely worth living: if that is the destiny, if that is the goal of the believer; to grow unto the perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

We could not have hoped, we could not have believed that, it would have been too good to be true but for the fact that Jesus Christ himself, God's Son was born of woman—took this human nature of ours. Remember, he not only was born of woman; he was born under circumstances amazing. In looking at that we must first of all get rid of the halo of glory that has gathered around the manger since the birth of Christ. Music and art and poetry have vied with

one another to invest that early scene in our Lord's life with a majesty and splendour that it never really possessed.

Nobody would have expected that the conditions of the birth of God's Son in this world of ours would have been such as they actually were—obscure and lowly to a perfectly extraordinary degree. He was born of a poor peasant woman who had just tramped all the way from Galilee to Judea. He was born not even amid the mean comforts of a country cottage; he was born in the wretched courtyard of an oriental caravansery, a place where the cattle dwelt. So far as we can judge his mother was so poor that she could not afford to have a nurse or an attendant; when her little boy was born, with her own hands she wrapped the little mite in swaddles and laid him in a manger.

I think if the arrangements for the birth of God's Son had been in the hands of man it would have been very different, for man would have decided that it must take place in a palace amid comfort and luxury; but God desired that it should take place in a manger, and that the boy should be brought up in a peasant's home. And if man could have decided, he who was going to do such a great world-wide work would have been born in a great cosmopolitan centre and brought into touch with the highest culture and the finest education and would have had intercourse with all the leaders of mankind. God decided otherwise, he decided that his Son should be born in one of the obscurest corners of the world. If man had decided, God's Son would have been free from poverty and from hard toil; but God desired it otherwise. His Son was to have nothing in the way of what is commonly called worldly privileges and worldly advantages. No one should be able to say that the beauty of his life and the sublimity of his message and teaching were due to the glorious worldly tribute that he enjoyed. It was to be made perfectly clear that all the glory was due to his own spirit—just to his own spirit. He was born of a woman—ay, lowly.

You know, you and I are apt to assume that for anything very heroic and noble worldly possessions and influence are essential. It is well to remember that One who led the sublimest life on earth knew nothing of those things at all. It reveals the latent moral and spiritual capacity in human nature, apart from those adventitious aids of education, social position and wealth. He made it clear thereby that in life the lowliest of the lowly that is brought under the control of the spirit of God absolutely can become sublime. It was a great message. That is why he was sent in that way, because after all, what are the outward signs of our Lord's divinity? I am speaking now not of meta-physical qualities but of moral attributes. The glory of Jesus was one with the glory of the Father. His gracious charity, his good will, his boundless love embraces all, ay, the outcast and the harlot, it passes all national and racial bounds and encompasses all races. The magnificence of his love manifested His loyalty to the will of God, his fidelity to his position. Nothing could daunt him to carry out the work of his heavenly Father, whatever it might cost in the way of shame, suffering, the agony of the bloody sweat, the crown of thorns, the cross—he could go through anything so long as he knew he was doing his Father's will. Those are the moral attributes that testify the divinity of Christ.

The divine moral qualities are very simple, though they are very profound. You remember how Tennyson in his Ode to the Duke of Wellington says:

And, as the greatest only are,
In his simplicity sublime.

I sometimes think when I read John's gospel that the greatest attribute of Christ was his simplicity. Do you know, brethren, because those divine moral qualities are so simple you and I have a chance to become the children of God; yes, to be the real children of God. I know there must always be a vast distinction between Christ and the most perfect Christian. He is the first-born; you and I can never attain to any place among his many brethren. But remember, you and I would miss the spiritual message of Christmas Day unless we

realized vitally and vividly that when Christ, God's Son, was born of woman he revealed the sublime possibilities of our human nature; we are held to be real children of God.

When he was born of woman Christ illustrated the eternal, ever-operative law of incarnation. It is a law ever operative, because what does it really mean? I wish we could simplify our terminology. You know, this high-sounding word "incarnation" is really very simple. The great purpose of God is incarnation. What is that but expression in human life? That is what God wants, expression in human life from first to last. In my life, in your life, Christ came to show us perfectly how it could be done.

How God can find expression in man,—that is one of the glorious elements of the Christmas message. He came to show us how the spirit of man could be controlled by the spirit of God so that he hates what God hates and wills what God wills and can only think and say and do what God wills he should think and say and do. That is the expression of God in humanity. Remember, all truly noble behaviour that this world has ever witnessed evidences man's willingness that God should express himself in him.

No prophet from the days of Elijah to the days of Spurgeon ever uttered a divine message that kindled the highest spirits, no poet from the sweet singers of Israel to the days of Tennyson ever aroused sublime feelings in the human breast; no ordinary man ever forsook popularity and lost monetary gain that he might be loyal to the will of God; no nurse ever cooled the fevered brow or moistened parched lips out of pure Christlike love and pity for suffering humanity; no slum child ever shared his last copper or last crust with a child more unfortunate than himself out of pure Christlike pity and sympathy, without illustrating the eternal law of the incarnation.

God's goodness expressed itself in the life of man. Yes, that is it. Oh, brethren, when you and I really come to recognize that God's spirit is like the sea, beating upon the shores of every human life, yours and mine, invading our hearts and lives—whenever God's spirit invades our personality there is a transformation.

Now, are we opening our hearts to the urgings of the divine spirit? How far is it true of you and of me that the spirit of God is ruling in our thoughts and hearts and lives? How far is it true of you and me that we in some poor measure, by God's infinite redeeming grace, are expressing the light and the love and the character of the will of God in our daily life? You and I will never be fully and completely saved until we are Christ-dominated, Christ-saturated, Christ-controlled.

There is the message for Christmas. Yes, Christ in you; the hope of glory. That is the apostolic message; that is the apostolic gospel. Christ incarnate within me is the phrase the apostle used. He put his finger there on the very centre of the Christian faith. Christ worked in the heart of the unbeliever, imparted his own life to him, finding expression in him; that is Christianity. And the only fitting Christmas prayer for you and me is this simple verse:

Oh, Jesus Christ, grow Thou in me,
And all things else recede.
My heart be daily nearer Thee,
From sin be daily freed.

What is that? A prayer that Christ invade our hearts, that Christ may be incarnate in us, that Christ may find an ever-larger, richer expression in our lives and characters; and going to the Lowliest of the Lowly, He can make our lives sublime if only we are prepared to open our hearts wide to the eternal spirit of Christ.

God sent forth His Son, born of a woman.

SERMON

By Professor L. H. Marshall of McMaster University.

Delivered on the evening of Sunday, December 20, 1925, before the Congregation of Central Baptist Church, Toronto, in the Castle Memorial Chapel, McMaster University.

(Stenographically reported by Berryman, Emerson & Co.)

This evening I want to call your attention to that very well known text in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, Chapter 8, verse 9. For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.

The letters of the Apostle Paul are remarkably uniform in two respects; you will find in almost every one that there is a rather long theological argument, sometimes very difficult to follow, and then it emerges into the more open ground of practical maxims for the Christian conduct of our daily life. That was the Apostle Paul's method. He first of all laid a pure foundation in Christian belief. He was very particular; wisely particular, about his fundamentals. Then on that foundation he based a superstructure of Christian life and thought and character. If you want a profound theology go to the first half of the Apostle Paul's treatment of any subject; if you want practical exhortation, go to the second.

But you will generally find these two halves of the Pauline argument were linked together by the word "therefore". In the Epistle to the Romans we have the earlier chapters devoted to theological thinking, and then in the twelfth chapter the Apostle turns to the practical side of the subject: I beseech you therefore,—in view of all that I have said—by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God. Again, you will find in one chapter in the Epistle to the Corinthians that he devotes some fifty-seven verses to a more or less theological discussion of the problem of immortality, and then in the last verse he comes to the practical conclusion: Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour—in view of immortality—is not in vain in the Lord. When he wanted to encourage the Philippian Christians to unselfishness, to a willingness to think about the needs of other people, he could not content himself with a mere practical exhortation in those terms, he straightaway plunged into a profound Christology and said: What you want is really the mind of Christ, who, being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be on an equality with God, but humbled Himself and was made in the fashion of man and became obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross. What the Apostle means by that, you remember, is this, for he has a practical purpose in view as well as a theological: as humble-mindedness in station and willingness to think of others characterized the mind of the Master, they should characterize the mind of His disciples too.

Now, all these considerations are very essential to the proper understanding of our text, for what is the issue? It is a very simple one, it is a very practical one. It is the old topic, really. Paul was collecting money for the poor saints in Jerusalem from the Gentile Christians in Greece and Asia Minor, and his whole heart was set on this little scheme of his. He knew that the attitude of those Jewish Christians in Jerusalem was none too friendly to the little Gentile churches which he had established in Greece and Asia Minor, and his great hope was by means of this collection not only to relieve the necessities of the Christian saints of Jerusalem but to improve the relations between the two great sections of the Christian church—the Jewish and the Gentile. This collection, which he hoped to take to Jerusalem in person, was not only a love-gift, it was also an olive branch. He wanted to be able to go to those Christian people in Jerusalem and say: See, here is a practical, tangible, silent token of the Christian faith and the Christian love of the Gentile churches whom you are apt so much to distrust; and they ask you in a Christian spirit to accept this offering for the relief of your necessities.

But the Apostle Paul knew full well that which we so often forget, that

men cannot do the very smallest things in a really noble and worthy manner unless they have great thoughts in their minds and big motives in their breasts. Hence the appeal of the text. And remember, the Apostle Paul is writing to a church in which there were men who at one time had been most shockingly abandoned profligates, men who had been drunkards, thieves, extortioners. He reminds them how once they were morally and spiritually poor, ay, desperately, abjectly poor, until they knew Christ, and then Christ had made them wondrously rich. He touches a very tender spot in their hearts, and he wants to remind them what it cost Christ, so he says: (In this matter of the collection just remember the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though He was rich, yet for your sakes became poor, that you through His poverty might become rich. Oh, that was a masterly appeal.

But what about us? I would urge that you and I for a moment or two should do what the Apostle Paul suggested those Corinthians should do—we should remember the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Greek word grace is often very difficult to translate because it has so many meanings in scripture, but happily there is not the slightest doubt of its meaning in this particular text. It simply means graciousness, charity, good will, loving-kindness—I think that gives it as well as anything. Remember, that is the idea of grace here, the beautiful loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And what the Apostle Paul wants us to note is that our Lord's coming into the world was simply an act of graciousness, an act of beautiful loving-kindness. He did not spring into existence in the baby in the manger. Oh, no, He existed through all eternity. But nineteen hundred years ago Christ took pity upon this human race of ours, blundering hopelessly along, involved in sins of all kinds, and false ideas about God, false ideas about life, and He laid aside all His heavenly majesty and glory and became poor that He might make the world rich.

You remember that all our Lord's earthly life was poor. Have you thought enough of that? As I pointed out this morning, He was born poor. The circumstances of His birth were obscure and lowly to an extraordinary degree. We saw this morning that He was born of a humble peasant woman who had just tramped all the way from Galilee. He was born not even in the mean comforts of a country cottage, but in the wretched courtyard of an eastern caravansary, and, as our lesson reminds us, I think we may fairly conclude Mary was so poor that she could not afford a nurse, so with her own hands she wrapped the little mite in swaddles and laid Him in a manger.

As a youth He was poor. He lived as a peasant, He worked at a carpenter's bench, He made yokes for oxen, He made ploughs, and so on; and it is highly probable too that Joseph died early and that our Lord actually delayed the commencement of His public ministry in order that He might stand by that poor widowed mother until the brothers and sisters were old enough to look after themselves.

During His ministry He was so poor that one day He reminded His disciples that the foxes had their holes and the birds their nests, but the Son of Man had not where to lay His head.

And remember, our Lord was so poor and so obscure that the world at that time took no notice of Him and never imagined that His coming into the world had the slightest significance. I think it is a remarkable testimony to the obscurity and the lowliness of our Lord that the profane writers of the early years of the Christian era paid no attention to Him. Josephus, for instance, refers to John the Baptist, but in no genuine passage does he refer to Christ. Seneca, the most famous moralist of the age, contemporary with Paul, never refers to the teaching of Christ. Plutarch wrote a great many lives, but he never thought it worth while to write the life of Christ. I suppose to his mind Christ was not important enough. Very strange! Tacitus, the Roman historian, does refer to the crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, though entirely oblivious to the importance of Christ, whom he dismisses as the author of a pestilent superstition. As Leckie, the historian, has said: "The greatest religious change in the history of mankind took place under the eyes of a galaxy of philosophers and historians who failed to see the importance of the movement

and regarded as contemptible the agency which has proved the mightiest moral lever ever applied to human affairs."

Yes, remember the basis of our faith, our Lord Jesus Christ, who laid aside all glory and became poor, who entered on an earthly career of poverty and suffering, culminating eventually in the agony of Gethsemane, in the crown of thorns and in the cross. So He died for us all.

Oh, it is well that we should remember the graciousness of our Lord Jesus Christ. This graciousness is revealed in our Lord's loving service for humanity, His divine loving-kindness. That was the spirit of His life, the beautiful life He lived as Teacher and Doctor—don't forget, as Doctor—and Saviour. That was the spirit of His death, the spirit in which He gave His life for us all. Remember, says the Apostle, the beautiful loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ. I sometimes think the spirit of the incarnation is really summed up in those words—Good will to man. It is that all the way through—Good will to man. Yes, it is well to remember at Christmas time this act of devotion of Christ.

But in the second place, may I ask you to remember that the Apostle Paul had not simply in mind the act of devotion. He had a very practical purpose in view. O daring man! But Paul was always daring. Why did he want these Corinthians to think of the loving-kindness and good will of Jesus Christ? He wanted to see a similar loving-kindness and a similar good will to man in general; that is why he asked them to remember the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. He wanted to see those Corinthian Christians simply imbued with Christ-like good will to man—to those poor saints in Jerusalem in particular, but to man in general as well.

And after all, brethren, is not that the testimony of the Christian spirit, of the Christ-like spirit, that when you and I truly get near to the heart of Jesus Christ He does breathe into us something of His own graciousness and loving-kindness and boundless good will to man. You must never separate the two; no, that is always involved. I think Christianity that does not bring that in its train is suspect.

Do you remember that poem of Masfield's about King Cole? There is something very charming in it. He says, you know, that once upon a time there lived a man called King Cole, who was so well-beloved that when he died it was a bereavement to the countryside. He was offered anything he might choose either in heaven or on earth, but instead of choosing any of the delights of heaven he asked for the privilege of wandering about the earth as the friend of man—

So, since that time, he wanders shore and shire
An old, poor, wandering man, with glittering eyes,
Helping distressful folk to their desire
By power of spirit that within him lies.
Gentle he is, and quiet, and most wise,
He wears a ragged grey, he sings sweet words,
And where he walks there flutter little birds.

Oh, you say, that is a poet's idle fancy. It may be so. But don't worry about the form, get the spirit. Is not that exactly the spirit of Jesus Christ? That is the Loving-kindness of Jesus Christ, and that is the spirit that Paul wanted to see in the Corinthians. He wanted to see them just like that. I rather imagine that Masfield was thinking of Christ's spirit when he wrote those words.

It is a spirit like that that Christ breathes into the hearts of those who love Him. Get near to Christ, and Christ somehow or other communicates something of His own graciousness and loving-kindness to you. Oh, I think Christ makes us all the friends of man. Can you be Christians without being the friends of man? I do not think you can be at all. That is why Paul said: "Remember the beautiful loving-kindness of Jesus Christ, and ask Christ to give it to you that you, so far as ordinary mortals can, may show the spirit that Jesus himself shows."

I sometimes think that Dickens' Christmas Carol is one of the most Christian novels ever written, and once again I hazard the thought that in the

Spirit of Christmas Dickens is thinking of the spirit of Jesus Christ. You remember when the Christmas Spirit had done his work on savage old Ebenezer Scrooge what a great change came over him. He instantly became alive to human values; he was full of graciousness and loving-kindness; he began to see something lovely in errand boys, in common servants, in folks in general; he began to find delight in watching the simple pleasures of the people; he began to pat all the little children on the cheek, trying to make them happy; he began to feel joy in relieving the necessities of the poor—he became the friend of man.

Oh, yes, don't you see, God is good, and wherever the Christian spirit is, there also is love. When the good God gives us the highest boon that He Himself can give us, when He gives us the Christian spirit in our hearts, then we show something of the beautiful loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ.

You know, friends, I sometimes think that so far as our members are concerned, the chief function of a Christian church is to diffuse amongst her people Christ's spirit, to make her members the friends of man, to inspire them with a love of Christ-like service to all their fellows. I think the most searching test as to the vitality of any church is not in the size of its congregation, but—Is the church producing Christ-like friends of man? Our Bible teaching, our preaching and our communion service must fail abjectly and utterly unless they prove to be the means whereby men and women, youths and maidens are led into that fellowship with Jesus Christ which inflames them with a passionate love of God and a Christ-like love of their fellow creatures.

You cannot get into personal fellowship with Jesus Christ without going to show, as far as it is possible for us to show, that His work on earth is a work of loving-kindness amongst men, interpreting that in the very widest sense. I think the work of every minister succeeds or fails as the minister succeeds or fails in inspiring his people to be the friends of man. Oh, you may say, I may not be much of a friend of man, but I am one of the friends of God. But you cannot separate those two. You know what the apostolic teaching on the matter is. We may as well face it. You know we are told by one of the apostles that if we say we love God, and do not love our fellow creatures, we are liars. That is very straight, but we must know it. We can never isolate Christianity from the love of man, never, for God has put the two together. Remember the loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ. Just as it is the very nature of the sun to shine, just as it is the very nature of the lily to be fragrant, so I would say, brethren, it is the very nature of the true disciple of Jesus Christ to reveal him in his daily life and daily intercourse—to reveal something of the graciousness, of the loving-kindness, of the enthusiasm for humanity that Jesus Himself displayed.

Sometimes I think we get the clearest expression of the characteristically Christian spirit in the missionary. Some people go abroad for the delights and educational value of travel; others go abroad in the interests of empire; the merchant goes abroad in the interest of commerce, to enlarge his wealth; but the missionary goes abroad with one idea, and one idea only. He is not seeking his own advantage, his own gain in any shape or form; his sole motive is the desire to go and help people in heathen lands in a truly Christ-like fashion, to take to them the blessings of Christian culture, of Christian civilization, and above all of Christian salvation. Yes, that is the loving-kindness of Jesus Christ, that is the Christian spirit.

I wonder, brethren, how far we have got this spirit in our own hearts. Do you and I share anything at all in this Christ-like enthusiasm for humanity, this Christ-like passion for the highest well being, aye, the salvation of man? If we have, well, let us remember the loving-kindness of Christ. Are we keen on social justice? Are we keen on the spiritual welfare of others? Are we anxious to live our lives to the glory of God and to the good of our fellowmen? It seems to me that such a question forces its way to the very heart of the true nature of our ambition, our sympathies, our ideas and our aims in life.

What are we living for? Are we living just for ourselves; are we living just to get on? Do we think at all of service? Are we anywhere at all in the

neighbourhood of William Booth, the father of the Salvation Army, when he said that he felt within himself the impulses and the urgings of an undying ambition to help the down-trodden of humanity, to go to the assistance of the down-and-outs, yes, of the blackguards and drunkards? Fancy a man feeling the impulses and the urgings of an undying ambition to love people like that and to help them out of the mire. That is the spirit of the Salvation Army. Is not that something like the loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was rich, but who for your sakes became poor? Yes, there is a close parallel, there is a kinship of spirit. Is there really burning in our hearts a desire to help the world in some direction? We cannot all do the same kind of work, but we are given a diversity of gifts, and we can all have the same spirit and the same desire to serve, to be the friends of man.

What is our outlook upon life? Oh, I love that story which Tennyson tells about Merlin and the young knight. It is especially a story, I think, for young people, although it is just as good for the old ones. According to Tennyson, Merlin one day found a young knight painting his coat of arms. He had chosen as his symbol an eagle in flight—oh, yes, that was his symbol, he was going to soar high—and then on the scroll he had written the words "I follow fame." That is how this young knight was facing life. And Merlin adds:

And speaking not, but leaning over him,
I took his brush and blotted out the bird,
And made a Gardener putting in a graft,
With this for motto, 'Rather use than fame.'

The young knight blushed crimson, he was so ashamed of his utterly selfish and un-Christlike ambition in life; and he took the hint, for we are told that he became a very stalwart knight.

I think, brethren, that the world's bitterest need to-day is for Christ-like men and Christ-like women, whose main desire in life is not to live for themselves, but to serve their fellow men in the spirit of Jesus Christ. We want ambition in that direction. We want the spirit to be made alive, for we want business men who regard business as service, as an opportunity to glorify God and serve man: we want professional men who regard their professions in just the same way; we want men in public life, men in Parliament, men in our councils and other public bodies who will dare, not because they have some axe of their own to grind, some selfish desire to gratify, but simply because they want to serve their fellow men in Christ-like fashion, in sacrificial service for the public good—because they want to be the friends of man.

If ever the angel's song of Peace on Earth can be realized, it can only be through the increasing number of men and women who have Christ's loving-kindness, Christ's good will to man—a good will that rises above all the limits that nation and race impose. Are we cultivating good will towards our fellow citizens in Egypt and in India? Have we got a Christ-like good will toward them? Are we learning to sympathize with the growing tide of their national self-consciousness and their desire for self-government? Have we got a Christ-like good will to-day towards all the negroes of Africa? Are we learning to sympathize with their demands for good government and education and fair play? Have we got a Christ-like good will towards men of different colour because we realize we have learned at the foot of Jesus Christ that they are children of the one great Heavenly Father of us all, fellow creatures for whom Christ died? Are we cultivating a Christ-like good will towards all the people of Europe, desiring earnestly that God's blessing may rest upon all the efforts that are being made to-day in the work of reconciliation and brotherhood and peace?

Oh, yes, remember religion concerns our whole life, every bit of it. You and I lead Christ's life when the spirit of Jesus Christ pervades all our thinking, all our feelings, all our desires, and when at the root of our being there is the graciousness, the good will, the loving-kindness of Jesus Christ. Yes, we feel like that at Christmas time often enough, if we do not ordinarily. But if we remember the grace of Jesus Christ that will become the type of our life. Let us pray that we may live in the spirit which brought our Lord, the spirit in

which He lived while He was here on earth, the spirit in which He died on the cross. Ay, it is the same spirit which He intended to be the inspiration of all who love Him. Remember, therefore, the beautiful loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ.

W. GORDON BROWN LIFTS THE LID!

The following article is reprinted from *The Prophet*, a paper which is published in the joint interests of the Annette Street Baptist Church, Toronto, and the Orangeville Baptist Church. The Editor is Mr. W. Gordon Brown, B.A., son of the Rev. W. J. H. Brown, of Annette Street Church, and himself Pastor of the Orangeville Church. Mr. Brown replies to a pamphlet which certain McMaster students attempted to distribute in Jarvis Street Church, and to an article which appeared in *The McMaster Monthly*.

The impression conveyed by the article in *The Monthly* was that it was speaking for the Student Body, and any stranger reading it would assume this to be an expression of the students in general. This article was later published in a pamphlet with an introduction written by Robert Murray Simmons; and in that introduction these words occur: "The presentation of one side of the question only is not the policy of McMaster University. It has been thought that the time has come for the students of the institution to express themselves, and to publish the truth of the matter as it appears to those who are in closest touch with the teaching of McMaster University." In view of the issuance by students of McMaster of these two articles one could reach only one of two conclusions: either that the Student Body as a whole had expressed itself, or else, as it is not the policy of the University to present only one side, those disagreeing with the article referred to, would be given an opportunity in *The Monthly* to express their view.

Mr. Brown's article is just what might be expected of one of his manly and independent spirit. Our American readers will remember that Mr. Brown was the colleague of Mr. James McGinlay in the Alton revival; and it was, indeed, by Mr. Brown the meetings which issued in that great movement, were projected. McMaster may now learn that no true man can be cudgelled into silence.

We are not surprised at the action of Dean McLay in refusing publication to the article written by Mr. Brown and another student. Dean McLay is a member of the Publication Board responsible for the publication of *The Canadian Baptist*, and we are not surprised that the policy so long applied to *The Canadian Baptist* should now be applied to the University magazine.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY AND THE "UNFORTUNATE NECESSITY."

A Statement by the Editor of "The Prophet," W. G. Brown.

The Baptists of Ontario and Quebec have in McMaster University one of their greatest assets. In her halls the majority of their leaders are trained, and from them they come forth to guide the helm of affairs. Baptists are a democratic people and the University is the property of the Convention and so of the members of our churches. If those members are to cast an intelligent vote in the affairs of the University, they ought to keep themselves in closest touch with the work of the University—its opportunities, its difficulties, and its teaching.

At the present time McMaster is more than ever before the minds of our Baptist people. Recent actions of the University, criticism of her policy which these have called forth, and the discussion which is ensuing, make it necessary for every true Baptist to come to a decision on matters which are of the greatest importance for the future of the institution and of the denomination.

The editor of this paper has spent four full years in McMaster to receive his Bachelor of Arts, and is now in course in Theology. Hence he cannot be said to be ignorant of the spirit or the teaching of the University. Indeed he owes a great debt of gratitude to his Alma Mater, which he is quite ready to acknowledge. Life within her class-rooms and halls has given him a larger grasp of life with its complicated facts and experiences. It has inspired him to deeper thinking and he trusts, higher living. One cannot express in words what the help of such an Alma Mater as McMaster means to him: it must be experienced. The writer feels, however, that in view of the present situation and of recent happenings, he ought to add a word to the present discussion. Let no one accuse him of acting the part of a Philadelphia lawyer and merely being out to make a case. **His concern is the facts and the truth.**

A pamphlet entitled "McMaster Advertises the Gospel Witness" has been circulated far and wide by certain students and by the Educational Secretary. It contains an introductory article by Mr. R. M. Simmons; an article entitled "An Unfortunate Necessity" by Mr. F. F. Macnab, reprinted from the October number of the McMaster Monthly, which is the organ of the student body of the University; and a statement by the President of the Southern Baptist Convention, which is said to be "a general opinion of orthodox Southern Baptists upon the Editor of the Gospel Witness." These together form what is called "an exposé of Dr. Shields' methods, his fallacious reasoning, and his policy of consistent misrepresentation."

Personal Opinions.

As far as we can see, the only thing in this pamphlet which may help the people to arrive at the truth of the matter is Mr. Simmons' personal opinion, when, "as an undergraduate in the final year of Theology," he says: "I desire to voice my hearty appreciation of the evangelical tone and deeply spiritual note already sounded by Prof. Marshall in his introductory lectures." But Mr. Simmons adds: "I should like to express, also, the very general high regard in which the teaching of Prof. Marshall is held by the men in the B.Th. courses at McMaster University." Thereby Mr. Simmons makes a "blanket" statement regarding the B.Th. men, though no doubt he means that there may be among the B.Th. men some who have not the same opinion of the teaching of Prof. Marshall as he himself has. If he refers to Prof. Marshall as a teacher apart from the theology involved, I should like to add that the Professor's method of lecturing is to me almost ideal, and most of the ideas he gives are excellent. But if he have reference to the theology involved in his teaching, there are among the men some who do not regard it as above suspicion, and, I may say, of late that number has been increasing.

Now in regard to Mr. Macnab's article, while it might express the opinion of the majority of the McMaster student body, it certainly did not represent that of a considerable minority. Two representatives of this minority, then, the present writer being one of the two, went to the editor of the Monthly, Mr. Macnab, and contended that it was not fair to let one side have all the say. The editor then granted space for an article in the December issue. After talking with Dean Farmer and securing a statement from Rev. John Linton, the two men wrote their article with a good deal of care to stick to the facts as they saw them. When it was handed in, however, the editor resigned rather than fulfill his promise of publication. The resignation came before the executive of the student body, where the editor was asked to reconsider his resignation, and where, after a discussion of an hour and a half, it was unanimously decided to recommend to the editor that in the interests of fair play to both sides, the article in question be published, preceded by a statement from the head of the student body to the effect that the opinion expressed did not meet with the approval of the executive of the student body.

Promised Article Refused.

A little later the article was read to Prof. Marshall and on the ground that a statement made by Mr. Marshall had not been interpreted in its strict sense, one paragraph was removed from it. But before the corrected copy could be handed in, the editor brought the word that he had been to the consulting

editor, Dean McLay (though he did not go to him with his own article) who said that it could not be published. A request made to Mr. Macnab that he should give a written statement of his reasons for refusing publication, was answered by a written refusal to do so.

Interviews were held with Dean McLay. He explained that the action of the executive of the student body was ultra vires, and also that it had not been the custom of the Monthly to publish, for instance, any personal joke at the expense of one of the students, and that the precedent would apply to anything against one of the professors. The consulting editor showed the article to the Chancellor and the Dean of Theology, and gave a final reply that, inasmuch as it had something in it against a professor, it should not be published in the Monthly as it stood written. We recall that Mr. McGinlay is a second year student, and he suffered severe criticism from the Monthly; and also that Dr. Shields himself is a member of the Board of Governors. These two men are, then, integral parts of the University, which the Monthly is to represent.

The above are the facts about the promised, but refused, publication of an article which would represent the opinion of a not insignificant minority of the student body. We leave our readers to come to their own conclusion on the matter.

"Where is the Fire?"

But the way-faring man will ask: "What is all the trouble about anyway? There is a good deal of smoke, but where is the fire?"

Let us say here that the question at issue is not Dr. Shields. We regard him as a mighty man of God, but even he himself would not lay claim to infallibility. Some of his methods may be faulty, but Dr. Shields' "spirit" or his methods are not the issue. Let both sides earnestly endeavour to avoid personalities, and we shall all get along faster and more easily.

The question really is the theological position of Rev. L. H. Marshall, now Professor of Practical Theology and Arts Bible in McMaster University. There is the point of discussion, and let us stick to the point.

Now at the Hamilton Convention it was frankly admitted that Prof. Marshall does not hold "the strong view" of the inspiration of Scripture, which is that it is infallibly inspired from cover to cover; but his is "what some would call the freer, looser view," which is that it is merely "the religious content of Scripture" which is "infallibly sure." This second view carries more implications with it than meet the eye. Yet Dr. Farmer plead for toleration toward it. Those who have followed events in the Convention for a number of years past will recall that in 1919 the Convention passed a resolution discountenancing "some new vague view of the Scriptures."

To illustrate to our readers what this loose view of inspiration means, let us take an instance from Prof. Marshall himself in personal conversation. In regard to the Synoptic problem he feels that the different Gospels contradict each other in details. For example one Gospel has it that when the rich young ruler came to Jesus, he said: "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" while another reaffirms that he said: "Master, what good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Prof. Marshall does not attempt to reconcile the two (see context of the second), but passing by these details he seeks to get at the religious message conveyed by the words. The Conservative view, and the position which Dr. Farmer expounds in class, is that the Synoptists do not contradict each other, and that all the seeming discrepancies are only apparent and not real.

Jonas an Allegory.

Another incident might come in here. Prof. Marshall mentioned incidentally in the conversation from which the above illustration is taken, that Jonah was an allegory. At the Convention, Rev. Linton pointed out that this was what Prof. Matthews taught when he was at McMaster. Jesus said: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." If it be argued that He meant no more than we would if we should say that, "As Hercules cleaned the Augean stables, so we will do so-and-so"; we reply that Jesus went on to say:

"The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: because they repented at the teaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." (Matt. 12: 40, 41). Just as truly as the Son of man spent three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, so did Jonah spend three days and three nights in the sea-monster. **Shall we not put the word of Christ before men's opinions?**

In conclusion we say that this article expresses the case as we see it. If we are wrong, we are open to correction; but if, as we believe, we are right, we beg our readers to ask themselves: What will the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec, who at heart are loyal to the Word of God and the Christ of God, say when all the facts are placed before them? Will they not continue to stand for "the whole Christ in the whole Bible for the whole world," no matter what the cost may be?

We ask you readers to weigh the evidence of the case as it comes from all sources and to come to "a carefully reasoned judgment of your own in the matter." Above all we beg you to earnestly pray that the Great Head of the Church may by His Holy Spirit guide His people into the pathway of His Divine will.

Circulate
This Issue
Among All
Canadian
Baptists

The
Gospel Witness

will be sent for

One Year

for

One Dollar

to New Subscribers Only

Subscribing before March 1st

\$1.50 in Toronto

This is to introduce The Witness.
Regular subscription price
\$2.00 per year.