

# ANOTHER CLARION CALL

## The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY. TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS DURING 1926 \$1.00 FOR ONE YEAR. RENEWALS \$2.00.

T. T. SHIELDS, *Editor.*

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

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

Vol. 5. No. 31 TORONTO, DECEMBER 9th, 1926 Whole No. 241

## CONTENTS

	Page
Good News From Montreal and London.....	2
Is "Close Communion" Scriptural?.....	3
A Call to a Missionary Convention.....	11
Mrs. Holman Replies to Mrs. Zavitz.....	17
Porter vs. Scarborough.....	20
Baptist Bible Union S.S. Lesson.....	22
Indiana Baptist Bible Union.....	23
An Interesting Stratford Letter.....	24
Editorial .....	26
Another Clarion Call.....	26
Dr. Vincent of the Rockefeller Foundation.....	26
The Canadian Baptist Prevaricator on the "Split".....	27
Mr. W. C. Senior and The Gospel Witness.....	29
The Gospel Witness a True Prophet.....	30
The Western Recorder and Prof. Parker.....	30
The Gospel Witness as a Christmas Present.....	32

### GOOD NEWS FROM MONTREAL.

The following report is taken from *The Montreal Gazette* of December 3rd. It speaks for itself. The reporter, however, has made one mistake; he speaks of the Toronto group headed by the Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields. The Editor of this Paper heads no "group"; he is merely a private in the army:

#### VERDUN BAPTISTS BAN MODERNISM.

Verdun Baptists have adopted the views of the Toronto group headed by the Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields, of that city, who have charged McMaster University with being heterodox in the faith of that church, and have by congregational resolution decided to make no further financial contribution to the upkeep of McMaster University under existing conditions.

Following is the text of the resolution which bears the authority of the clerk of the Verdun Baptist Church, F. Brocklehurst, as having been moved and carried by a large majority of the membership at a recent meeting:

"Whereas the Verdun Baptist Church stands for the full inspiration and authority of the Bible, as the word of God and for the absolute infallibility of Jesus Christ as the Incarnate God; and whereas we believe McMaster University embraces within its faculty those who implicitly deny the full inspiration and authority of the Bible, as the inerrant word of God, and expresses its confidence in and approves such teaching,

"Be it, therefore, resolved: that as this church's first duty is to be loyal to Jesus Christ and His Gospel, it is impossible for it longer to contribute any financial support, however administered, to the said university until existing conditions be reversed. Therefore, all contributions from this church shall cease as from this date, and this resolution shall apply to any and all moneys which may be now in the church treasury.

"And, furthermore, since this church as a regular Baptist church, within the convention of Ontario and Quebec may be deemed to have a vested interest in McMaster University, this action be without prejudice to our status as part of the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec.

### GOOD NEWS FROM LONDON.

The following is taken from a recent issue of a London, Ont., paper:

#### DEACONS INDORSE STAND OF PASTOR.

Support Attitude in Modernism Debate at Wortley Baptist—Approve Conduct of Meet—Action Taken in Answer to Criticism of McMaster Faction.

Indorsation of the stand of the pastor, Rev. T. J. Mitchell, on the question of the break of Wortley Road Baptist Church and McMaster University, was given by the Deacon's Board of that church at a meeting last night. In addition to supporting the stand taken by the minister, the Deacon's Board also gave approval to the conduction of the congregational meeting in which the decision was made to withdraw support of the McMaster University.

The congregational meeting, held a week ago, took this action to refuse further support to the University in view of the so-called "modernist" teachings by members of the McMaster faculty and voted against giving aid to the institution until these alleged "modernist" views were abolished from the University or until the resignation of Professor L. H. Marshall, central figure in the controversy in Baptist church circles, resigns.

McMaster supporters, following the decision of the Wortley Road congregation, charged their forces were discriminated against at the meeting by the pastor and by the chairman, which took over the chair while Rev. Mr. Mitchell was speaking to the subject. They also assert that the attitude of the pastor prior to the meeting was decidedly unfair and that the controversy should have been handled in a manner which would permit the individual member of the congregation to support McMaster or refuse such support as the individual deemed proper.

The action of the Deacon's Board in indorsing the pastor's attitude and the way in which the meeting was conducted is an answer to the criticism of the McMaster supporters of the congregation.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

### HAVE WE SCRIPTURE FOR SO-CALLED CLOSE COMMUNION?

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, December 5th, 1926.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:  
"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—Matthew 28: 19, 20.



FOR our text this evening we shall turn to the passage familiarly known as the Great Commission, the last verse of Matthew's gospel, chapter twenty-eight, verse twenty: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"—or, of the age.

I shall speak of the duty imposed upon us by divine command, to teach all things whatsoever our Lord has commanded. It is not an exaggeration to say, speaking generally,—there are of course exceptions to all rules—that for many years the church has been without a teaching ministry: ministers have concerned themselves with discussing a variety of topics, with discussing subjects in which they cannot possibly be experts, to the neglect of the great matter which the Word of God enjoins them should be taught.

It is popular nowadays in certain quarters to distinguish between "theology" and "religion", and doctrinal preaching is somewhat at a discount. Now by doctrine we simply mean teaching: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine"—or of the teaching—"whether it be of God." And if a minister is not called to teach, what is he for? For what was the Christian church instituted? Why have you come together this evening? Why do you ever come to this, or to any other place, of worship? Is it merely for the purpose of passing an hour or so in an interesting and entertaining way? Is it the business of the minister to entertain? Is it not rather his special function, in the power of the Spirit of God, to expound the Word of God? so that when you go back to your work to-morrow, whatever it may be, whether it be in the household, or in the shop, or in the office, or in school, some word from the Lord will have found a place in your mind, and will have enriched your heart, so that you may feed upon it, and by its direction you may shape your course and conduct. It is a poor compliment to any minister when the members of his congregation have to confess that they have forgotten on Monday all that they were taught on Sunday. In this place it is our endeavour to give "precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little", to expound the great principles of the gospel, that men may know what God has said. And I believe there is nothing so interesting, there is no study in the world so fascinating as the study of the Word of God.

I speak this evening particularly of the two ordinances enjoined upon the church of Christ by the teaching of the New Testament. And I have this to say at the outset, that I have no hope that anyone will be interested or profited by anything I have to say to whom Jesus Christ has not become the supreme authority. There is nothing more vital to Christian faith in our day than the authority of Jesus Christ in all realms. It has a direct relation to the value of the Scripture itself: the roots of the New Testament are in the Old, so that if the Old Testament can be invalidated then the authority of the New is gone. It is folly to say the Old Testament is obsolete; we are compelled to take the Bible as a whole, for it is a glorious unity, and you can no more divide it and retain part of it than you can cut a living body in two and retain part of it: the Bible is a living organism, the very life of God is in it; and to deny any part of it inevitably leads to the denial of all. You must take it as a whole, or, ultimately, you will not take it at all.

The authority of the Old Testament depends inevitably, in the last analysis, upon the authority of Jesus Christ. The Old Testament is fulfilled in Him; even the very ordinances of which I speak this evening are foreshadowed in the Old Testament, because the great truths which they enshrine are there propesied, and these propesies find their fulfilment in the Person and ministry of our Lord. An infallible Christ argues an infallible Bible: a fallible Christ inevitably leads anyone of logical mind to regard the Bible as being fallible. If once you accept the great doctrine, the central doctrine, of both the Old and New Testaments, that Jesus Christ was and is God, that in Him "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge . . . for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily", that to Him belongs all authority in heaven and on earth, then His naked Word will have a greater authority with you, even in the intellectual realm, than the so-called "consensus of scholarship", or than the judgment of church councils. To the believer, Jesus Christ is the Supreme Authority in all realms, I care not what realm of life you survey; and the infallible Christ bears witness to the Old Testament as being a divinely inspired record of the revelation of God.

An infallible Old Testament is absolutely essential to an authoritative New Testament—destroy one, and you destroy both; and my first question to you this evening—I speak particularly to believers to-night—my first question to you is this, Is there any higher authority in your life than Jesus Christ? Are you a Baptist? Have you accepted the teachings of the people called Baptists because of family connection, because your father or your mother was a Baptist? If that be all that you are, then you are not worthy to be called a Baptist at all; for the cardinal principle for which Baptists have stood historically, and for which true Baptists still stand, is the supreme authority of Jesus Christ. And if you are a Baptist for any other reason than that you have bowed to the authority of Christ, then I recommend you to reconsider your position, and re-examine the foundation of your faith, until you have come to put Jesus Christ in the centre of all, and to believe what you believe because all your being is centred in H'm, and because you have yielded whole-hearted surrender to His absolute and sovereign sway.

There are many people called Baptists who are not Baptists at all,—men of the Fostick type who repudiate the Deity of Christ, His authority everywhere except as an ideal in some aspects of His teaching. So I call you back, you members of Jarvis Street Church first of all, to that great central principle, that a Baptist worthy of the name would remain what he is if he had to stand absolutely alone in the world, as one who has put the sceptre in the hand of Jesus Christ, and who has crowned Him Lord of all.

Are you a Methodist, or a United churchman, or an Anglican? I have no quarrel, my dear friends, with such; praise God that in all these bodies He has His elect people who, 'n sincerity and in truth, follow the Lord. But in many respects they have been without teaching.

Whatever you are as a professing Christian, I insist that the consideration of paramount importance is, What is your personal relationship to Jesus Christ? Have you been washed in the blood? Have you been begotten again by the power of the recreative, regenerating, Spirit of God? Are you a new creature in Christ Jesus? If you are that, I do not care whether you call yourself a Baptist, or what you call yourself, I have a word to say to you about the authority of Jesus Christ in respect to these ordinances, and the relation of these ordinances to that great central fact. So I am not going to argue with you about Baptism, or the Lord's Supper, this evening. That is poor business,—

"Convince a man against his will,  
He's of the same opinion still."

When I knew less of the Book, and had less experience of human nature, I did sometimes argue even about Baptism,—and succeeded in making some people very angry; for I found it was not difficult to put them in a position where they had no answer. But I found that many were not seeking the truth, and therefore it was of no profit to bring to them the Word of the Lord. The Apostle Paul—or Saul of Tarsus as he then was, before he was converted—verily thought that he "ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth"; but as soon as he heard that voice out of the open heaven, say—

ing, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest", he asked but one question, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do."

Have you asked that question? If you have not, then I pray that you may learn to ask it to-night, for that is the great question for every blood-bought soul to ask—not, What does my church teach? what would my friends desire? what is the pleasure of my husband, or my wife? Above all human relationships, and above all ecclesiastical affiliations, we are to enthrone Christ, to bow before Him, asking Him, "What wilt Thou have me to do?" And when you get the answer, do as you are told no matter what it costs. And that is the secret, my brethren, of a joyous and fruitful Christian life. Will you ask Him this evening?

### I.

Let me explain as briefly as I can, first of all, THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM. It is not a sacrament, a grace-conferring ceremony: it is an ordinance, it is a divinely-appointed means of confession whereby we put on Christ. We are not saved by being baptized: we must be saved before we are baptized, for baptism has no proper place otherwise.

There are two elements in baptism, in scriptural baptism: first, there is *the subject of baptism*. The person baptized must be a believer; there is not one word in Scripture to justify the baptism of anybody, infant or adult, who is not a believer in Christ; all through the New Testament baptism is restricted to believers. That, of course, in the nature of the case, excludes infant baptism. Now I wonder if there are paedo-Baptist friends here this evening? I am sure you will allow me to say this without offence to you—I know very well the influence of early training, I know how easy it is to take things for granted. One of the most experienced ministers I ever knew, a minister most thoroughly versed in the Word of God, and whose ministry was remarkable for his extended quotations of Scripture; and he used to say that those who believed in verbal inspiration should be at pains in quoting Scripture to be verbally correct. And yet he said to me after a ministry of forty years, "I discovered that for forty years I had been misquoting a passage of Scripture." He said that in the beginning of his Christian experience he had heard it quoted by godly people, and it had found its way into his mind, and he had taken it for granted. He had read the passage itself hundreds and hundreds of times, yet there was a word that he had read into it that was not there. It did not greatly alter the sense of the passage, but still he felt some humiliation when he discovered, with that long experience, that he had been inaccurate in his quotation of Scripture. I cite that only to show you how easy it is for godly people who really desire to do the will of God, to take things for granted, and to assume that things are scriptural when there is not the shadow of scriptural foundation for the things they practise. And, therefore, it is for us to enquire repeatedly of this Book what the Lord's will really is.

Now I say the fact that baptism is everywhere conditioned upon faith, and that the teaching of the whole New Testament is that faith is a pre-requisite to baptism—"If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest"—that principle, in the nature of the case, excludes infant baptism. "Well but, sir," some mother will say here this evening, "do you not think it is a beautiful ordinance? Do you not think it is a lovely thing to bring the little children to Christ, and dedicate them to Him?" Certainly I do—why not bring them to Christ? Why not pray God's blessing upon them? But what right have you to perform a ceremony over that child in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and call it baptism, when there is not one solitary word in Scripture to justify it, but where the whole teaching of Scripture is directly against it? "What harm does it do?" It puts the name of Christian upon people who are unregenerate, that is the harm it does,—as in the Anglican catechism: "What is thy name?" And the answer is given. "Who gave thee that name?" "My godfathers and my godmothers in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven"—the only fault I have to find with that answer is that from the first word to the last it is untrue. Nobody was ever made a member of Christ by baptism, or a child of God, or an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven! The idea that a ceremony performed over an unconscious infant, who never in any particular

participated in it, that that could have any part in determining the destiny of that child's soul—I say it is a libel on God!

The doctrine of infant baptism caricatures God, it dishonours Him, and is utterly, absolutely, unscriptural; that corruption of the primitive ordinance of baptism, has served to corrupt the whole church. I do not believe there is any single doctrine that has been more prolific of evil than the doctrine of infant baptism. It has resulted in churches, so-called, being made up of unregenerate persons; it has resulted in a view of the church that is utterly contrary to the New Testament. Even our Presbyterian friends say that the church is composed of believers and their children. This is not true. The church is composed of individual believers, every one of whom has for himself or herself accepted Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, and nobody else has any right to membership in the church; and if you fill your membership with people who are unconverted, what kind of testimony do you expect from the pulpit? It is bound to react upon the pulpit and to affect the ministry of the whole church.

Baptism requires faith on the part of the subject, and, next, it requires immersion in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I shall not argue that: no man who has any reputation for scholarship to lose will dispute it; there it is in the Book: "Buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Baptism is a confession of faith that has no value unless the subject has been made a new creature in Christ; then, as proclaiming his identification with Him he is buried and raised again in the likeness of His death.

## II.

In the next place, consider THE ORDINANCE OF THE SUPPER. The Roman Catholic Church regards it as one of the seven sacraments. In their view, the sacrifice of the mass is the important thing, as the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago so plainly showed a few months ago. Thus that which was designed as a simple memorial feast, to be of value to believers, has been so corrupted that it is regarded as a soul-saving sacrament.

Now what is the Lord's Supper? The bread is a symbol of His broken body, the wine is a symbol of His shed blood; and that feast, as oft as we observe it, we celebrate in remembrance of Him, "for as often as ye do eat this bread, and drink this cup"—what do you do?—"ye do shew the Lord's death till He come", you proclaim the finality of the Christian revelation, the adequacy of the atoning Sacrifice, you declare to all the world that until He shall come again you need nothing but the blood of Jesus to save the soul. We break the bread, we drink the wine, in remembrance of Him.

Well now, why do we observe these ordinances? Not that we may be saved, but because we are saved. Why do we observe them? In recognition of Christ's authority, in obedience to His command. We do it in remembrance of Him.

## III.

Look now, for a moment or two, at THE RELATION OF THESE ORDINANCES. Baptism precedes the Lord's Supper *in the order of its institution*: the Lord's Supper was first observed "the same night in which He was betrayed"; baptism was instituted from the beginning of Christ's ministry: "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." Baptism was the outward sign of discipleship: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them"—make disciples first, baptize them afterward. But Baptism was the outward sign of discipleship, and was instituted before the Supper.

Then glance for a moment at *the order observed in apostolic practice*. On the day of Pentecost at the inauguration of the Christian church, they said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" And Peter answered, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you." What brought them to that enquiry? It was an assertion of the universal Lordship of Christ: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?—if He is Lord, and we have crucified Him, and put Him in the grave, and God has raised Him from the dead, and exalted Him

to His own right hand, and given Him all authority, if He is Lord, what shall we do?" And Peter said, "Repent, change your mind, be sorry for your sin, accept Him as your Lord"—that was involved in it; and then—"be baptized, every one of you." That is what he said, but he did not say anything about observing the Lord's Supper, he did not say, "Repent, and believe, and come to the Lord's Table". At the beginning of their Christian experience he said, "Be baptized every one of you." "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls."

Go on in the New Testament and you come, for instance, to the case of the Ethiopian. Philip preached Christ, and he said, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" He did not command him to observe the Lord's Supper, but right in the midst of the journey, "he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." Saul of Tarsus was saved, and when Ananias came to him, what did Ananias tell him to do? He said, "Arise and be baptized." "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized."

In the tenth chapter of Acts where Peter goes to Cornelius, and the gospel is carried to the Gentiles, Peter himself is astonished when, as he preaches the Word, the Holy Ghost falls on them as at the beginning, and they receive the Holy Ghost. Somebody here may say, "Well, sir, now you are talking sense; that is what I believe in, I believe in the baptism of the Holy Spirit"—when you know your Bible better you will see that the church received the baptism of the Holy Spirit once and for all at Pentecost, and from then until now it has been the believer's privilege to receive the Holy Spirit, and be filled with the Holy Spirit; we no longer have to tarry for His coming: He is here, and we have but to yield to Him, and instantly we shall receive His fulness. But listen: "Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Even after they had received the Holy Ghost he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Study the sixteenth chapter of Acts—indeed, the whole book through, but I will cite this and pass on. Lydia is converted, and she is baptized with her household. Now you paedo-Baptists, do you say, "Oh, we have got you there—'with her household'!" I think I have baptized dozens of households in this baptistry, but they were all believers—there were no babies among them. And there is nothing to show that Lydia had children. She was a business woman, we do not know that she was even a married woman; and you must be desperately hard up for an argument when you cite her case. The case of the jailor is given in the same chapter: the jailor is converted, "and he took them the same hour of the night . . . and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Do you say, "There you are again, there is another household baptism"? But it is said, if you read the record, he believed "in God with all his house". How men with their heads put on properly ever look on these passages as justifying infant baptism, I never have been able to understand, because the passage itself controverts the very assumption!

Faith first, and after faith baptism. That was the apostolic practice, and you will not find in the New Testament one single instance where believers were exhorted to come to the Table of the Lord until they were baptized, never once—always that necessity met them on the threshold, to acknowledge the Lordship of Christ by submitting to Him in that ordinance. And then "they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." The ordinance of the Lord's Supper followed upon baptism, apostolic practice was to that effect.

Moreover, *all through the history of the Christian church that general principle has been observed.* I do not know of any body of Christians who practise baptism at all—our Salvation Army friends and Quakers do away with the ordinances altogether—but I do not know of any body of Christians anywhere who do not, in their teaching, put Baptism before the Lord's Supper. Certainly the Anglican church does, Presbyterians do, Methodists did—such Methodists as exist in other parts of the world still do—Congregationalists do—

I do not know of any body of Christians who do not put Baptism before the Lord's Supper.

But those who believe in child-baptism, paedo-Baptists, and who practise sprinkling as a form of baptism, argue that *one who has thus been baptized, having been baptized, may now come to the Lord's Table*. I met an Anglican clergyman going along Carlton Street one day. He said, "We have two parties in our church: the high church party are restricted communionists, while the low church party are broader in their interpretation of that ordinance. Now", he said, "I understand that the position of Baptists is akin to that of the high church party, that you too practise restricted Communion?" I said to him—I did not know his name then, I don't know it yet, so I cannot call him by name—I said, "Supposing you were rector of a certain church, and someone came to you and said, 'I desire to come into the membership of your church, and I desire to come to the Communion Table; but I have never been baptized in any form at all, neither in infancy, nor as an adult believer. I have never gone through any form of baptism, but I would like to come into your church, and I want to come to the Lord's Table—what would you do?' He said, "I should insist, according to the teaching of our church, that he must be baptized first." I said, "Why?" He replied, "It is the teaching of our church, and I think it is the teaching of the New Testament too; they were baptized before they came to the Lord's Table." I said, "Certainly, and I think you are absolutely right. Now supposing you believed that nothing but the immersion of a believer in water can constitute baptism?" "Oh", he said, "is that the way you put it?" I said, "Yes, I repeat my question, Supposing you believed that the sprinkling of infants is not baptism at all, that nothing but the immersion of the believer in water on confession of his faith constitutes baptism, what then?" "I should occupy your position absolutely, it is the only logical position." Of course it is. The Open-Communion Baptist is most illogical. In other words, he takes a position which no body of evangelicals will ever take. If there are some Open-Communion Baptists here, let me urge you to study your Book again, and you will find absolutely no scriptural justification for that practice.

Look now at *the relation, doctrinally, of these two ordinances*, at their doctrinal significance. What does baptism mean? It means that we died with Christ, were crucified with Him, buried with Him, and with Him we rose again to walk in newness of life. What does the ordinance of the Supper mean? It means that we feed upon Him; the new life which we derive from Him is now sustained by Him; we are born from the grave, we feed upon Him afterward. Did you know that? Baptism is not only a picture of the burial and resurrection of Christ, but it is a symbol of birth, we are begotten again by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead "to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." We are born from the grave, we came out of death into life; and then life is sustained by our continuously abiding in Christ, and feeding upon Christ. And so in their doctrinal significance Baptism should precede the Lord's Supper: first the resurrection, then the sustenance of the new life.

You remember how Paul puts it when he goes back to that Israelitish experience, saying, "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." First, they went down into the watery grave, they went through the Red Sea, and they emerged triumphantly on the other side; and then they fed upon the heavenly manna—but they got no manna in Egypt, they did not drink of the Spiritual Rock in Egypt: they went through the grave, and out yonder into the wilderness, and then that life which was raised from the depths of the sea by supernatural power, was graciously sustained. And so, dear friends, we are to observe these ordinances in their doctrinal order.

Some of you will say, "But, sir, do you mean to say that those of you who are immersed are superior to those who have not been immersed?" On the ground of human merit, my dear friends, if you have been baptized a thousand



times, you have no right to come to the Lord's Table, any of you. No, no! Baptism gives us no superiority, nor does the practice of Restricted Communion reflect upon the experience of others: IT IS WHOLLY A QUESTION OF WITNESSING TO THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

But someone says, "Why do you exclude me from the Lord's Table?" We do not exclude anyone from the Lord's Table; we give you the teaching of The Word of God, and if you do not obey the Lord's commands in His order, you exclude yourself,—nobody else does. "Oh," but you say, "I would love to come to the Lord's Table." "Why?" "Well, He commands it." Yes! Why do you not love to be baptized, can you tell me? Does He not command that? What right have you to take His two commandments and say, "I will obey that, but I will have nothing to do with this?" The whole question of submission to the authority of the Word of God is involved in this matter.

Now just this word and I have done. Once when I was in London during the war, I arrived one Sunday before my engagement—we had to allow plenty of time in those days to be sure to get over. I had gone over to preach in Spurgeon's Tabernacle, but as I was not expected on that Sunday, I took advantage of the opportunity to hear some men that I wanted very much to hear. In the morning I heard a certain well-known Baptist minister. He was a great man of God, marvellously blessed of God in time past, and still is, I believe. But he said one very strange thing which served to emphasize in my mind the importance of keeping strictly to the Book. He said in effect: "There are a number of young people here this morning who have recently been converted, and we rejoice in that fact, and we are looking forward to having you come into the church: we think you ought to join the church. You ought to join the church because you ought to observe the ordinance of the Lord's Supper; that is a divine command. And now that you have given yourselves to Christ, you must be obedient to Him?" And then he went on for some minutes expatiating upon that, and in a most emphatic way he told those young people that they should obey the Lord by coming to the Lord's Table, and in order to do that they ought to join the church. Then he continued something like this: "Now, about the matter of baptism: some of us believe that the only scriptural baptism is immersion of the believer in water. That is my view, that is what the Scriptures teach, so far as I understand them; but we do not quarrel about that matter here. You young people, if your fathers and mothers are quite satisfied that your baptism when you were children is sufficient, then I do not want to disturb you at all!" I sat in amazement. I said to myself, "Here is a man who in one breath insists as strongly as human language can insist that we must obey—obey—obey, Jesus Christ as Lord—and then in the next breath he says, 'I believe that the Lord commands you to be baptized, but if your father and mother are satisfied that you need not be, well that is all right!'"

That is the kind of thing that our new professor would give us. Do you know what that means? I will tell you what it means: Open Communion inevitably, ultimately, leads to open membership. There are people who come to this church every Sunday who have never been baptized. Supposing I do not teach them the Word of the Lord in this respect? They say, "We come here because we get the gospel"—some people are kind enough to say that—"and our souls are fed, that is why we come. We stay to the Lord's Supper, and we enjoy all the privileges of the church"! After a while there will be no conscience about the Lord's ordinances, and someone will come along and say, "May I not come into the membership of the church? I have not been baptized, but I should like to come into the membership of the church." And supposing I had in this church half the members immersed and half not immersed, and I were to talk to you as I have been talking to-night—what would be likely to happen? Then after a while I might have two or three deacons who had not been baptized, and these might say, "Pastor, I wish—I wish—I wish you would not say so much about baptism!" "Well, but it is there in the Scripture. I am bound to teach what is there." "But you know there are a lot of people in the church who do not believe that"! What would happen? It would mean that there would be a great body of teaching that would be never mentioned from the pulpit. And what would follow? The baptistries

would be dry, and the Baptist churches, as I fear they are doing in England, would decline.

That is what is going to happen in this Convention if that kind of teaching prevails. Let us get back to the simple order of Scripture.

I must tell you of a man who attended my church when I was in London. One Sunday morning I spoke about the importance of the Lord's Supper, and he came to me at the evening service and said, "I will not be here next Sunday, and I want to explain my absence. I was much touched by what you said this morning about the duty of coming to the Lord's Table, and in a neighbouring paedo-Baptist church, they are going to have what is called the sacrament. I think I will go there." "Well," I said, "why are you leaving us? Are you not getting blessing here?" "Oh yes; I shall leave only for that service. I shall be back again. I have been greatly blessed." "Well," I said, "what do you want to go for?" "I must observe the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. I felt that the Lord spoke to me during your address on that subject this morning, and I feel I must be obedient." "Well," I said, "why don't you observe the Lord's Supper here?" "Because I know your practice here, you always put baptism first." Then I enquired, "Why do you put the Lord's Supper first? What right have you to say that you will obey the Lord in one respect and will not obey Him in the other?" "Why", he replied, "I never thought of it like that. I have read the Scripture, and have seen that the believer should be baptized, and I have often thought I should like to be baptized." Then I said, "Do you not think you had better observe the Scriptural order?" "Certainly I will", he said, and I baptized him that week, and he is a deacon of that church now.

There never was a day since the Lord ascended to glory when it was more incumbent upon God's believing people to stand like a rock for the absolute authority of Jesus Christ. That is our position. We are not saved by being baptized, we are no better for being baptized, we have no merit before God for being baptized, we are unprofitable servants; and as we come to the Lord's Table the only worthiness we have is the worthiness which His abounding grace confers upon us. May God help us to put Jesus Christ first in everything; and as we do, we shall have the power of the Holy Ghost, and we shall find that by apostolic practice we shall receive apostolic power, and with apostolic power will come the apostolic results; and God will be glorified.

Let us pray: O Lord, we pray Thee to bless our meditation this evening. Help us all to be willing to do Thy will. Remove all prejudices, all pride, all self-will from us; and grant, we beseech Thee, that Thine own people may this evening anew resolve that Jesus Christ shall be Lord in their lives. Bless us as we come to Thy table. Manifest Thyself to us in a peculiar way. We ask it in Jesus' name, Amen.

## DOES YOUR SUBSCRIPTION EXPIRE IN DECEMBER?

Our Circulation Department informs us that they have sent out approximately fifteen hundred notices to subscribers whose subscriptions expire during December. Fifteen hundred is no insignificant number even to a paper with a very large circulation. There has been a most gratifying response to the notices sent out, and we have found that many are not only renewing their subscriptions, but have put an estimate upon the value of the paper equal to that of our Italian pastor, and instead of sending \$2.00 for renewal, they have sent \$10.00, others \$5.00, and smaller amounts. This is to say that it would give the Editor a very merry Christmas if the office could report all these subscriptions renewed before Christmas. If you have not already sent in your renewal, will you not please do it at once?

## A CALL TO A GREAT MISSIONARY CONVENTION.

The Committee appointed at the meeting of Regular Baptists held in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Thursday, October 21st, 1926, to consider the following resolution—

"In view of the present situation in the Convention and the necessity of establishing a fellowship of brethren who hold and practice the doctrines, principles and policy of the Regular Baptists as individuals and churches, it is resolved that a Committee hereinafter named, be appointed to take steps towards the organization of an Association of Regular Baptists within the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec to make possible the co-operation of such Regular Baptists in missionary and educational work and with authority to call a meeting for the formation of such an Association at such time and place as the Committee shall determine, it being understood that it is intended that such organization is to be without prejudice to the churches' status as parts of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec."

beg to recommend that an organization or Society be formed of Regular Baptist Churches and Regular Baptists under the name, "The Regular Baptist Missionary and Educational Society of Canada", for the objects and purposes set out in the proposed Constitution published herewith; and acting under the authority of the said resolution THE COMMITTEE HEREBY CALLS A GENERAL MEETING OF ALL REGULAR BAPTISTS WHO ARE IN ACCORD WITH THE SAID CONSTITUTION TO MEET IN JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 11TH, 1927, AT THE HOUR OF TWO O'CLOCK IN THE AFTERNOON, TO CONSIDER THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE, AND FORM A NEW SOCIETY OF REGULAR BAPTISTS TO CARRY ON MISSIONARY, EVANGELISTIC, AND EDUCATIONAL WORK; THE MEETING TO CONTINUE ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12TH, 1927. All who declare themselves in accord with the principles and purpose of the proposed Constitution will be allowed the full privileges of the meeting.

W. J. H. BROWN, Chairman,  
ALEX THOMSON, Secretary,  
G. W. ALLEN,  
W. C. BOADWAY,  
W. GORDON BROWN,  
D. N. CAMERON,  
C. M. CAREW,  
WM. FRASER,  
R. K. GONDER,

C. J. LONEY,  
F. MESLEY,  
JAMES MCGINLAY,  
D. McLAULICH,  
J. H. PEER,  
T. T. SHEELDS,  
W. J. THOMSON,  
THOS. URQUHART,  
ALF. WHITCOMBE,  
Members of the Committee.

### THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION OF THE PROJECTED "REGULAR BAPTIST MISSIONARY AND EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY OF CANADA".

The Committee appointed to consider the following resolution:

"In view of the present situation in the Convention and the necessity of establishing a fellowship of brethren who hold and practise the doctrines, principles, and policy of the Regular Baptists as individuals and churches, it is resolved that a Committee hereinafter named, be appointed to take steps towards the organization of an Association of Regular Baptists within the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec to make possible the co-operation of such Baptists in missionary and educational work and with authority to call a meeting for the formation of such an Association at such time and place as the Committee shall determine, it being understood that it is intended that such organization is to be without prejudice to the churches' status as parts of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec."

passed at a meeting of Regular Baptists held in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, on Thursday, October 21st, 1926, beg to report and recommend as follows:

1. That an organization or Society of Regular Baptist Churches, and Regu-

lar Baptists be formed under the name "The Regular Baptist Missionary and Educational Society of Canada."

2. The design and object of the Society shall be: To promote the preaching of the Gospel, the prosecution of Missionary, Evangelistic and Educational work, and to co-operate with all Regular Baptists in the dissemination of the principles and doctrines held by Regular Baptist churches, which said principles and doctrines are set out in the Trust Deeds of the Churches usually in the following form:

"The being and unity of God; the existence of three equal persons in the Godhead; the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments; the total depravity of man; election according to the foreknowledge of God; the Divinity of Christ and the all-sufficiency of His atonement; Justification by faith alone in the righteousness of Christ; the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration; perseverance of the saints; the resurrection of the dead; the final judgment; the punishment of the wicked, and the blessedness of the righteous, both eternal; the immersion of believers in water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the only baptism; the Lord's Supper, a privilege peculiar to baptized believers; a Church, a company of baptized believers, voluntarily associated and meeting in one place on the first day of the week for mutual edification and the maintenance and propagation of these doctrines; the word of God a complete and infallible rule of faith and practice; the religious observance of the first day of the week; and the obligation of every intelligent creature to believe the record which God has given of His Son."

or in words similar thereto, and which said principles and doctrines are also set out in the Trust deed of McMaster University as follows:

"The Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice, the existence of one living and true God, sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the same in essence and equal in attributes, the total depravity of mankind, the election and effectual calling of all God's people, the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, the free justification of believers in Him by His imputed righteousness, the preservation unto eternal life of the Saints, the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust, the general judgment, the everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting misery of the wicked, immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the only gospel baptism, that parties so baptized are alone entitled to Communion at the Lord's Table and that a Gospel Church is a body of baptized believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God."

and further in elaboration thereof and in agreement therewith and as meeting the exigencies of the time, the principles and doctrines of the said Society are further explained and more fully set out in the articles of faith set forth in Schedule "A" attached hereto.

3. That Regular Baptist Churches, which by resolution of the said Churches have accepted the declaration of faith herein set forth and who declare their desire to become members of the Society, shall each be entitled to appoint two delegates from among the members of such church to the annual meeting for the first hundred or portion of one hundred, and one for each additional one hundred members or portion of one hundred over fifty, and each year every delegate on enrolment shall subscribe to the declaration of faith of the Society before he takes his seat in the annual meeting.

4. (a) Any member of a Baptist Church who is not a member of a Church which has by accepting the declaration of faith herein set forth, become a member of the Society, may become a member of the Society upon his accepting and subscribing to the declaration of faith herein set forth, and those members who have become members of the Society in this way, may attend the annual meeting of the Society but shall not be entitled to vote thereat, but such members upon attending the annual meeting, may meet together and choose delegates from their number on the same basis as a Church appoints delegates and those delegates so appointed shall have all

the privileges of the annual meeting. (b) If in any Regular Baptist Church there are ten or more members up to fifty who have become members of the Society, these said members may appoint one delegate to represent them at the Annual Meeting and for an additional fifty members up to one hundred members an additional delegate, and thereafter on the same basis as set forth in Clause 3.

5. Branches for local districts may be formed for considering, advising and co-operating in carrying on the work of the Society, but all such branches shall accept and adopt the declaration of faith.

6. (a) The officers of the Society shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer and fifteen other members elected by ballot at the annual meeting as hereinafter provided. These shall form the Executive Board of the Society. (b) Any Regular Baptist Church which has become a member of the Society by the acceptance of the declaration of faith herein set out may nominate for all these offices or for any one or more of them and if any Church which has become a member of the Society fails to make a nomination then any ten members of such Church or any ten members of this Society who are members of a non-subscribing Church may nominate for these offices. (c) Any Church nominating or any ten members nominating for these offices shall secure the consent of the nominee before making the nominations and each nominee, before the election shall subscribe to the declaration of faith herein set out and if he does not so subscribe his name shall not be placed upon the ballot. (d) All these nominations shall be made to the Secretary at least fifteen days before the annual meeting and a printed ballot shall be prepared and handed to the delegates on registration, and the vote shall be taken at such time as may be arranged by the Committee on Arrangements, a majority of the votes cast to be necessary for an election. (e) If there should be a failure to nominate for any office or if an insufficient number is nominated at the date mentioned in this rule, then such office shall be filled after nomination in open meeting, the election to be by ballot. (f) Any nominee may withdraw his nomination as follows: In the case of a Church nominating by a resolution of the Church or in the case of individual nominators with the consent of a majority of the nominators. (It is desirable in the election of officers and committees that no church should be permitted to secure a preponderance of representatives and in making nominations the nominators should be careful to secure as widespread a representation as possible.)

7. It shall be the duty of the Secretary to send forms to each Church containing the declaration of faith upon which their nominations shall be made and these same forms shall be sent to any ten members who may request them and in these forms provision shall be made so as to show the name of the church of which each nominee is a member.

8. The Secretary of the Society shall issue to each member on joining a certificate of membership.

9. The Society shall meet annually for the transaction of business and the election of officers on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ in each year at such place as the Society may see fit to appoint, and in default of appointing any such place, as the Executive Board of the Society may by resolution appoint. The annual meeting shall be opened with proper religious exercises and thereafter shall proceed to business by the appointing of a Committee of Arrangements consisting of five members, whose duty it shall be to arrange the order of business to come before the annual meeting, and a Committee on Nominations and Elections composed of four members and the Secretary, and a Committee of Scrutineers who shall count the ballots whenever a vote is taken. The number of scrutineers shall be determined and they shall be appointed by the annual meeting. A Committee of Enrolment consisting of five members shall be appointed to pass upon all credentials and certify that all delegates and nominees have subscribed to the declaration of faith as required by this Constitution. The Committee on Enrolment for the first meeting shall be \_\_\_\_\_ and hereafter they shall be appointed at the annual meeting a year in advance. All elected officers, including members of any Boards or Committees shall annually sign the declaration of faith herein set out.

10. Special general meetings of the Society may be called by the Executive Board and all the provisions applying to the conduct of the annual meeting shall apply to a special meeting, excepting the election of officers which shall be held at the annual meeting only.

11. The Executive Board shall meet quarterly. Special meetings may be held at the call of the chair or any five members of the Executive Board. It shall have full power and the sole right to appoint missionaries, receive their reports, grant cheques on the Treasury for their monthly allowances, fix the rate of their remuneration, appoint special committees and deputations, fill any vacancy that may occur among its officers during the year, and transact any business legitimately belonging or in any wise pertaining to it; but it shall in no wise appoint any brother as a missionary, or pastor or evangelist, who has not subscribed to the declaration of faith, and the special Board shall have authority to do all other acts and transact all business necessary for carrying out the aims and objects of the Society.

12. The Secretary shall make and preserve a faithful record of the proceedings of the Convention and of the Executive Board, receive all applications for aid, and all reports and letters pertaining to the business of the Board, which we shall lay before the Board, and afterwards file and preserve them in his office for the future use of the Board if necessary. He shall conduct the correspondence of the Board according to its instructions and the exercise of his best judgment, and hand over to his successor all property in his possession pertaining to the office.

13. The Treasurer shall deposit all monies in a Bank selected by the Society and shall keep an accurate account of all funds entrusted to him by or in behalf of the Society and shall disburse such funds only by order of the Board. He shall report to the Board quarterly or oftener if required and give a full report at the end of each financial year. The annual report, when presented by the Board to the annual convention shall be audited by a competent auditor appointed by the Society in annual meeting assembled, whose duty it shall be to examine the Treasurer's accounts and vouchers for the payments of moneys, and to certify to their correctness. The Treasurer shall at the expense of the Society give the usual bond, and all cheques shall be countersigned by either the President, a Vice-President, or the Secretary.

14. For the financial support of the work the Society will rely upon its members giving as the Lord has prospered them.

15. This Constitution may be altered or amended at any annual meeting by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present, provided one year's notice has been given of the proposed alteration, except Articles I and II, which shall require a unanimous vote.

#### SCHEDULE "A"

### ARTICLES OF FAITH.

#### I. OF THE SCRIPTURES.

We believe that the Holy Bible was (a) written by men supernaturally inspired; (b) that it has truth without any admixture of error for its matter; and (c) therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the age, the only complete and final revelation of the will of God to men; the true centre of Christian union and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions should be tried.

#### (Explanatory)

1. By "THE HOLY BIBLE" we mean that collection of sixty-six books, from Genesis to Revelation, which, as originally written, does not only contain and convey the word of God, but IS the very Word of God.

2. By "INSPIRATION" we mean that the books of the Bible were written by holy men of old, as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, in such a definite way that their writings were supernaturally inspired and free from error, as no other writings have ever been or ever will be inspired.

#### II. OF THE TRINITY.

(1) We believe that there is (a) one, and only one, living and true God, an infinite, intelligent Spirit, the maker and supreme ruler of heaven and

earth; (b) inexpressibly glorious in holiness, and worthy of all possible honor, confidence and love; (c) that in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, equal in every divine perfection, and executing distinct but harmonious offices in the great work of redemption.

(2) We believe (a) that Jesus Christ was begotten of the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner (b) born of Mary, a virgin, as no other man was ever born or can ever be born of woman and (c) and that He is both the Son of God and God the Son.

(3) That the Holy Spirit is a divine person; (a) equal with God the Father and (b) God the Son and (c) of the same nature; (d) that He was active in the creation; (e) that in His relation to the unbelieving world He restrains the Evil one until God's purpose is fulfilled; (f) that He convicts of sin, of judgment and of righteousness; (g) that He bears witness to the Truth of the Gospel in preaching and testimony; (h) that He is the agent in the New Birth; (i) that He seals, baptizes, endues, guides, teaches, witnesses, sanctifies and helps the believer.

### III. OF THE DEVIL, OR SATAN.

We believe that Satan is a person and was once (a) holy, and enjoyed heavenly honors; but through pride and ambition to be as the Almighty, fell and (b) drew after him a host of angels; that he is now (c) the malignant prince of the power of the air, and the unholy god of this world. (d) We hold him to be man's great tempter, (e) the enemy of God and His Christ, (f) the accuser of the saints, (g) the author of all false religions, the chief power back of all apostasy; (h) the Lord of the anti-Christ, and (i) the author of all the powers of darkness—destined however (j) to final defeat at the hands of God's Son, and (k) to suffer eternal punishment in a place prepared for him and his angels.

### IV. OF THE CREATION.

We believe in the Genesis account of creation, and (a) that it is to be accepted literally, and not allegorically or figuratively; (b) that man was created directly in God's own image and after his own likeness; (c) that man's creation was not by evolution or evolutionary change of species or development through interminable periods of time from lower to higher forms; (d) that all animal and vegetable life was effected by special creation, and God's established law was they should bring forth only "after their kind."

### V. OF THE FALL OF MAN.

We believe (a) that man was created in innocence under the law of his Maker, but (b) by voluntary transgression fell from his sinless and happy state, (c) in consequence of which all mankind are now sinners, not by constraint, but of choice; and (d) therefore under just condemnation without defense or excuse, resulting in a condition of total depravity, by which we mean his natural utter incapacity to receive the things of the spirit of God apart from the quickening grace of the Holy Spirit.

### VI. OF THE ATONEMENT FOR SIN.

We believe (a) that the salvation of sinners is wholly of grace; (b) through the mediatorial offices of the Son of God, who by the appointment of the Father, freely took upon Him our nature, yet without sin, honored the divine law by His personal obedience, and by His death made a full and vicarious atonement for our sins; (c) that His atonement consisted not in setting us an example by His death as a martyr, but was the voluntary substitution of Himself in the sinner's place, bearing the penalty of God's Holy Law, the Just dying for the unjust, Christ, the Lord, bearing our sins in His own body on the tree; (d) that having risen from the dead, He is now enthroned in heaven and uniting in His wonderful person the tenderest sympathies with divine perfection, He is every way qualified to be a suitable, a compassionate and an all-sufficient Saviour.

### VII. OF GRACE IN THE NEW CREATION.

We believe (a) that in order to be saved, sinners must be born again; (b) that the new birth is a new creation in Christ Jesus; (c) that it is instant-

aneous and not a process; (d) that in the new birth the one dead in trespasses and in sins is made a partaker of the divine nature and receives eternal life, the free gift of God; (e) that such are kept by the power of God through faith unto eternal salvation and shall never perish; (f) that the new creation is brought about in a manner above our comprehension, not by culture, not by character, nor by the will of man, but wholly and solely by the power of the Holy Spirit in connection with divine truth, so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the gospel; (g) that its proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance and faith and newness of life.

#### VIII. OF JUSTIFICATION.

We believe that the great gospel blessing which Christ secures to such as believe in Him is Justification; (a) that Justification includes the pardon of sin, and the gift of eternal life on principles of righteousness; (b) that it is bestowed not in consideration of any works of righteousness which we have done; but solely through faith in the Redeemer's blood, His righteousness is imputed unto us.

#### IX. OF THE CHURCH.

We believe that a church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers (a) associated by a covenant of faith and fellowship of the gospel; (b) observing the ordinances of Christ; (c) governed by His laws; and (d) exercising the gifts, rights and privileges invested in them by His word; (e) that its officers are pastors or elders and deacons, whose qualifications, claims and duties are clearly defined in the Scriptures; (f) we believe the true mission of the church is found in the great commission: First, to make individual disciples; Second, to build up the church; Third, to teach and instruct, as He has commanded. We do not believe in the reversal of this order; (g) we hold that the local church has the absolute right of self-government free from the interference of any hierarchy of individuals or organizations; and that the one and only superintendent is Christ, through the Holy Spirit; (h) that it is scriptural for true churches to co-operate with each other in contending for the faith and for the furtherance of the gospel that every church is the sole and only judge of the measure and method of its co-operation; (i) on all matters of membership, of polity, of government, of discipline, of benevolence, the will of the local church is final.

#### X. OF BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

We believe that Christian baptism is (a) the immersion in water of a believer; (b) into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; (c) to show forth in a solemn and beatiful emblem our faith in the crucified, buried and risen Saviour, with its effect in our death to sin and resurrection to a new life; (d) that it is pre-requisite to the privileges of a church relation and to the Lord's Supper; (e) in which the members of the church, by the sacred use of bread and wine are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ; (f) preceded always by solemn self-examination.

#### XI. OF THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED.

We believe that (a) there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked; (b) that such only as through faith are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and sanctified by the Spirit of our God, are truly righteous in His esteem; (c) while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are in His sight wicked, and under the curse; (d) and this distinction holds among men both in and after death, in the everlasting felicity of the saved and the everlasting suffering of the lost.

#### XII. OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

We believe that civil government is (a) of divine appointment, for the interests and good order of human society; (b) that magistrates are to be prayed for, conscientiously honoured and obeyed; (c) except only in things opposed to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ; (d) who is the only Lord of the conscience, and the coming Prince of the Kings of the earth.



### XIII. OF THE RESURRECTION, RETURN OF CHRIST AND RELATED EVENTS.

We believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ, that He arose again the third day according to the Scriptures, that after manifesting Himself for forty days to His disciples, He ascended to His Father's right hand, where, as our Great High Priest, He ever liveth to make intercession for His own. We believe that according to His promise He will come again without sin unto salvation, that this coming shall be personal, visible and glorious, as it is written Titus 2: 13-14:

"Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;  
Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

#### MRS. HOLMAN REPLIES TO MRS. ZAVITZ.

We are grateful to *The Canadian Baptist* and Mrs. Zavitz, President of the Women's Home Mission Board of Ontario, for giving publicity to the "Call" to organize a new Women's Missionary Society, published in *The Gospel Witness* of November 18th. We had been wishing there were hope of reaching the constituency of *The Canadian Baptist* with our "Call", but supposed it would be impossible. Now, however, without our instance, this has been accomplished.

On reading Mrs. Zavitz' article on page six of *The Canadian Baptist* of December 9th purporting to be a rebuttal of the reasons given in our "Call" for organization, we asked the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* for equal space in next week's issue for reply. This he said he could not grant, nor would he promise the publication at all, unless its subject matter was pleasing to him. We have therefore turned again to our good friend, *The Gospel Witness*, for a few remarks on salient points in Mrs. Zavitz' letter. We wish we might answer it all in detail, but this would be impossible in the space at our disposal. We can only say at the outset that the reasons given in the "Call" were not hastily put together without consideration; they were carefully and prayerfully considered by a committee of sorrow-stricken women, who weighed their every word, and its implications. We believe there are many that will declare true what we said, even though it be declared untrue by Mrs. Zavitz; and those also who will declare untrue some of the statements and implications in her reply. We can but say we had a reason for everything said in our "Call", reasons largely substantiated at the meeting on November 22nd of the Women's Home Mission Board, when the resignations of a number of members were presented, each in turn giving her own point of view without having had consultation with others. At that Board meeting where Mrs. Zavitz, in referring to this "Call", declared its implications and statements to be false, and said that until the writers could prove to her the truth of their statements she would not forgive them, I rose and intimated I would be glad then and there before the Board to prove the truth of our every statement, but was told there was no time, as the Board had much business to transact. I then requested a private interview with Mrs. Zavitz herself, that I might prove to her the truth of my statements. Her reply was that she would not grant it unless I came in the spirit of repentance: without that she would not listen to me. Thereupon we who had resigned withdrew. It is easy to see from this that there was no desire to ascertain the truth of the statements made in the "Call", but only a desire to prevent the logical effect of that "Call" upon the minds of those who should hear or read it.

While lack of space prevents our answering all that Mrs. Zavitz said, we have to reiterate our statement that every nominee was challenged to accept the policy laid down by the President; and that that policy was so laid down as to require any who desired to act upon the Board, to submit to the requirements set forth. It is not true, as Mrs. Zavitz said, that "only two persons were actually challenged regarding their stand on any question"; or that the challenge to the President "was not ignored"; or that the ex-President merely challenged the President "as to whether she was a Regular Baptist and a member of a Regular Baptist Church". Those present know well that Miss

Walker in her speech, before nominations were made, called upon every one on the Board who would not subscribe to the President's policy to resign, and declared that she then and there issued a challenge to every officer nominated and every nominee for the Board, to state before the vote was taken whether she would follow the policy laid down by the President. It was this challenge, calling us to follow a human rather than a Divine Leader, and denying that age-old principle of Baptists, the right of the individual conscience before God, that brought me to my feet. I issued a counter challenge to every nominee for office as to whether she stood upon the Word of God as infallible, upon the principles *laid down in the constitution* which she was supposed to uphold, and to propagate, the atonement through the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, the administration of the Holy Spirit, and the observance of the ordinances according to the definition laid down in eighteen hundred and fifty-three (which definition was followed in the incorporation of the General Convention) to the effect that "churches restricting their communion to baptized believers, and administering the ordinances through ordained elders should be considered Regular". When balloting for President was proceeded with without this challenge to the President being answered by her, I called the attention of the presiding officer to the omission, requesting her to call upon Mrs. Zavitz for her statement. This was not done; so again from the floor I challenged the President to state where she stood on the Word of God, on the principles laid down in the constitution, and whether she belonged to a Regular Baptist Church. This also was unheeded, save that the presiding officer calmly ruled that everyone present was a Regular Baptist, which many of us knew to be contrary to fact. Following this, when one was nominated for Vice-President without statement being made that she would follow the President, the President of the Foreign Board, Mrs. Matthews, asked to know whether this nominee would follow the President's policy. When the answer was made that the nominee would try to do right and follow the will of God, scrutineers can vouch that a murmur ran over the audience, people exclaiming, "That is not enough; we want more than that". We submit that the facts bear out our statement that the right of individual conscience was at that time denied the Holy Spirit's administration repudiated; and loyalty to a human leader put before loyalty to Jesus Christ.

We cannot take the time, nor would it be appropriate, to review the occurrences of the past year in the meetings of the Women's Home Mission Board which bear out our claims. We can only say our "Call" spoke the truth.

Mrs. Zavitz' article serves one good purpose; she has stated where she stands,—definitely on the side of Professor Marshall, as years ago she stood on the side of Professor Matthews in the great controversy of nineteen hundred and ten. We have felt that our women should know where she stood: she has now proclaimed it over her own signature. In her stand, she proves the truth of our second "Whereas", namely, "that these modernistic tendencies began many years ago in our schools and churches, and have culminated in the present situation where they have become dominant in all our Boards"—a statement which she assumes to say is a figment of the imagination.

We now take up two most important matters. First, Mrs. Zavitz' statement that "Professor Marshall at the Jubilee Convention hushed the great Convention into a spirit of devotion and reverence as he spoke of 'prayer'. This message was one of the mountain peaks of the splendid Jubilee programme of the Foreign Missionary Society." In reply to this we have only to quote from the letter of resignation from the Women's Home Mission Board penned by Mrs. W. L. Kingdon and read to the Board on November 22nd. The extracts are as follows:

"It is with great regret that I feel compelled to sever my connection with the Home Mission Board. The years that I have been a member of the Board have been years of happy fellowship and glad co-operation in the work of the kingdom of God. But this fellowship and co-operation are no longer possible because of the standards which the Board has set up, and the new relationships into which it has entered.

"This Board through its President, and Vice-Presidents, has declared its intention of working toward closer co-operation with the Boards of

the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, and the Women's Foreign Mission Board, all of which Boards have officially endorsed the teaching of Professor Marshall; and as I believe this teaching to be contrary to the Word of God in the most vital matters of faith, I could not continue to be a member of a Board which took such action. The most recent example of this teaching, and the one which I heard for myself, was given in Professor Marshall's address at the recent (Women's) Convention. In that he said that even the prayers of Jesus were sometimes not answered, and gave as an instance that after continuing all night in prayer before choosing the twelve apostles, He yet chose Judas; thereby implying that the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ was limited, or, in other words, that He was not God.

"Further the determined attempt made by the Board to endorse the C.G.I.T. as it is at present constituted, and affiliated, (even though that affiliation with the Religious Education Association is still remote) I regard as extremely dangerous, and I could not possibly be a party to any such further attempts in the future."

Mrs. Kingdon's letter speaks for itself. But we have a word more to say regarding the C.G.I.T. and its endorsement by the Women's Foreign Mission Board at Convention.

Readers of *The Missionary Link* will look in vain in the Jubilee number for any account of the protest that was made after Mrs. R. J. Marshall had given her report, which report is published in the Jubilee paper. Let me supply the omission: At the close of Mrs. Marshall's report Mrs. Nathaniel Mills of London rose and presented the following motion:

"I move that whereas there is a strong tendency to modernistic teaching in the organization known as the Religious Education Council, of which Council, the Canadian Girls in Training, is a method of expression, which teaching in some instances amounts to positive radicalism, and

Whereas we desire that our young people should be so trained as to perceive and reject such teaching, and also be equipped to become leaders in our denomination, along the right lines, and

Whereas any affiliation with the Canadian Girls in Training movement would seem to countenance or approve such teaching,

Therefore this Convention requests the Board of the Women's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of Ontario West, to re-consider their endorsement, and to withdraw from any official relationship with the said movement."

In explaining why she made this motion, Mrs. Mills read extracts from a letter from a young girl who had attended the C.G.I.T. Camp at Beausoleil in Nineteen hundred and twenty-one and twenty-two (this camp is listed among those named in the Annual Report of the Sunday School Board at the recent General Convention). This young girl said:

"The physical culture, camp craft, first aid, etc., are splendid. But they (the leaders) absolutely ignore the true meaning of salvation. It is all a religion of casting sin aside by self-culture and development, doing and serving, works, works, work. By my personal knowledge I have discovered it to be just an infant modernistic study, hundreds of girls being gradually misled. Some of the teaching was rank heresy disguised in a beautiful form. What I had been taught, and what I had understood from God speaking to me through His Word, was denied."

"We were told the Bible intellectually was the greatest of all books. It was a wonderful study, geographically and historically, but some of its contents were not practical to the modern mind. The parables were mere fairy tales or myths, used as illustrations to teach the common people. Christ's temptation in the desert was only a temptation such as would come to us. He was the only perfect Man, but was only a perfect man; He had caught the vision, and God gave Him the great inspiration, and we must try to develop a life that will in time reach a perfection

similar to His. He was an exceptionally unselfish man and a noble being; He was the greatest martyr the world has ever known."

"Even though I rebelled at the teaching, after I came home the Bible had lost its sacred fellowship for me; and as the days and months sped on I could not pray. I had lost my faith."

Mrs. Zavitz says that "the Religious Education Council of Canada which is affiliated with the International Council of Religious Education has absolutely no relation to the Religious Education Association. Moreover, the Council as an organization holds to Christian faith as we Baptists understand it."

In reply may I call her attention to the wording in our "Call" which said, "is influenced by the Religious Education Association," and remind her of the announcement that appeared in *The Canadian Baptist* this Fall to the effect that Professor J. M. Artman of the Religious Education Department of Chicago University, and General Secretary of the Religious Educational Association, was to be the chief speaker at the Convention of the Ontario Religious Education Council held in London, Ontario, October 27th to 29th, 1926, and also at similar meetings of the Religious Education Council held in the Murray Street Baptist Church, Peterboro, just preceding the London Convention.

In addition let me call her attention to the fact that representatives of the Religious Education Association and of the International Council of Religious Education on more than one occasion have been members of a joint committee. Also to the following in the official journal of the Religious Education Association: "It (the R.E.A.) could not wisely undertake the publishing of Sunday School courses, because it would surely cut it off from the much larger task of suggestion of guidance, and of co-operation concerning all their varied agencies and interests."

And again, quoting from the official year book of the International Council of Religious Education, "The Religious Education Association has decided to maintain advisory relations *only with the (lesson) Committee of the Council*, in view of the fact that it comprehends within its scope religions other than Christian religions." (See *Leaven of the Sadducees*, page 105).

Mrs. Zavitz also states in regard to summer camps, "There has been no criticism of teaching in our Baptist camps". This we deny. There has been.

We believe we have said enough to show that there was dire need for a Call to form a Society that should endeavour to stem the tide of Modernism sweeping over our Denomination. It is true, as Mrs. Zavitz says, that the work of our Women's Mission Boards was established under God's guidance by "your mothers and your grandmothers". It is the future for which we fear, and therefore have acted.

Dec. 9th, 1926.

CARRIE H. HOLMAN.

### PORTER VS. SCARBOROUGH.

The following article is reprinted from *The Sling and Stone*, of Lexington, Dr. George Ragland, Editor, in the issue of November 20th. It speaks for itself. Following the article from *The Sling and Stone*, we print a letter from Rev. W. E. Atkinson. The letter needs no comment.

When brethren disagree on small and unessential matters their disagreement needs no comment. Leave them alone and like two lovers the joy of reconciliation will compensate for the pain of disagreement. But when they disagree on vital matters their disagreement is noteworthy and compels us to take sides. Such a disagreement has just taken place between two prominent preachers and leaders, Dr. L. R. Scarborough, President of the Southwestern Baptist Seminary, and Pastor-Editor J. W. Porter.

We hasten to take sides and rejoice that we can conscientiously cast our lot this time with Dr. Porter. We trust our readers will help us to make it unanimous for him. The matter over which they disagree is a certain modernist professor, Dr. L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, Toronto, Canada, against whose false teaching Dr. T. T. Shields has made such a brave fight. Of this fight Dr. Porter has the following to say:

"248 Hanover Avenue, Lexington, Ky.  
September 23/26

"My Dear Brother Shields:

"I have just read article, 'Prof. L. H. Marshall's Position Summarized to Date'.

"Please permit me to say, that if any given proposition can be proved, beyond the scintilla of a doubt, it has been proven that Prof. Marshall is a destructive critic of the rankest variety. Whatever comes of the fight, you have rendered a valuable service in 'smoking out' this unbeliever.

"Sincerely yours,  
(Sgd.) "J. W. PORTER."

*The Ashland Avenue Baptist* of November 14th contains an interesting letter from Brother Judd who is a student in the Seminary at Louisville. This letter contains the following paragraph:

"There has only been one discordant note struck and that by an outside man. Dr. Scarborough came by here on his way back from Toronto, and spoke in chapel of the 'Unwarranted attack of Dr. Shields on McMaster University'. The response of the students to this particular part of his talk was scant. I overheard several of the Canadians in a heated discussion over it after chapel."

We are greatly grieved that Dr. Scarborough, the President of one of our Seminaries, should use the occasion of his visit to another of our Seminaries to make attack on a defender of the Bible and give comfort to modernistic professors in our institutions of learning. But we are equally rejoiced that Dr. J. W. Porter has been brave enough to write to Dr. Shields and in unmistakable language commend Dr. Shields for the fight he has made. Dr. Scarborough characterizes Dr. Shields' fight as "Unwarranted attack". Dr. Porter commends it as "A valuable service in smoking out a destructive critic of the rankest variety."

The rank and file of Southern Baptists will praise Dr. Porter and condemn Dr. Scarborough. And this is as it should be, for in this particular instance Dr. Scarborough has been untrue to the faith for which Southern Baptists have so long contended, while Dr. Porter has revealed what a real war horse he can be when he is right.

A fair reading of the stenographic report of the Canadian Convention will prove that Dr. Porter is right and Dr. Scarborough is wrong.

LETTER FROM REV. W. E. ATKINSON.

Chicago, Ill.,  
December 7, 1926.

Dear Dr. Shields:

In view of the statements appearing in the religious press about the utterances of Dr. L. R. Scarborough since his return South, I think it only fair that you should know of a conversation which I had with him during the sessions of our Ontario and Quebec Convention.

It was not my intention to make this public, but since it is evident that Dr. Scarborough has, by implication, led the Southern audiences which he has addressed to believe that he fellowshiped the action taken at our recent Convention, I must now give publicity to my conversation with him.

On the Wednesday following that eventful Tuesday, I saw Dr. Scarborough alone and disengaged. I approached him and warned him that I was one of those terrible Baptist Bible Unionists, and that I did not wish him to be under any misapprehension as to who I was. I asked him two questions, which follow:

1st: "Dr. Scarborough, I would like to ask you, Would Professor Marshall's statement on total depravity be satisfactory to Southern Baptists?" He replied, "No, we go all the way."

2nd: "Would Professor Marshall's statement on the Atonement be acceptable in the South?" I remember he answered rather emphatically, "NO", and remarked, "We accept the statement read by Dr. Shields from Spurgeon."

I did not seek to corner Dr. Scarborough, and as I have already indicated, did not intend to give this publication; but how can Dr. Scarborough, or anyone for that matter, reconcile this with his utterances since leaving our Convention? I have no intention of misrepresenting the guest of our recent Convention, but

for him to have gone out of his way, as indicated in the letter appearing in the last issue of *The Gospel Witness*, to state that the denomination had voted by a large majority to give Professor Marshall a clean bill of health and an orthodox standing, when he himself admitted that Professor Marshall's teaching would be rejected in the Southern Baptist Constituency, is almost unbelievable, and is certainly deserving of correction or a proper explanation.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) W. E. ATKINSON.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 2.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 1.

Lesson 2.

First Quarter.

January 9th, 1926.

### PENTECOSTAL EXPERIENCES.

Lesson Text: Acts, chapter 2: 1-21.

The Feast of Pentecost (fiftieth) the Feast of Weeks, (Lev. 23: 15, 16) was observed seven sabbaths after the Passover. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." He showed Himself alive for forty days. The disciples waited in the upper room ten days, and then the day of Pentecost was fully come. Thus the account of the coming of the Holy Spirit honours the Old Testament Scriptures, and records His advent as fulfilling the Old Testament types.

#### I. HOW THE HOLY SPIRIT CAME.

1. From heaven. 'All good gifts are from above. 2. As a mighty wind. In the third chapter of John the work of the Spirit is likened to the wind. In Ezekiel, chapter thirty-seven, the prophet was instructed to prophesy unto the wind. Wind is invisible, but mighty. It may, however, be heard and felt, yielded to, or resisted. Thus the Holy Spirit. 3. It filled the house. The Spirit of God should be the atmosphere the Christian breathes. Our proper dwelling place is in the heavenlies (Eph. 1: 1-6). 4. The Spirit is likened to fire. He purges; He illuminates; He consumes. 5. He is like unto tongues for He comes to interpret the Word of God and to organize the church that she may be the mouthpiece of God. 6. He is God's gift to every believer; His ministry is not restricted to an official class. 7. They were filled with the Holy Ghost. We must be filled with something. It is our privilege to yield ourselves with every capacity dominated by the Spirit. 8. They spake with other tongues. This must be distinguished from unknown tongues. These men spoke so that the assembled people could understand them in their own language. Thus the church's ministry is stamped as designedly supernatural from the beginning. We shall later in our studies see that the Holy Spirit's coming is not necessarily associated with a miraculous gift of tongues. 9. The presence of the Holy Spirit attracted the multitude. So He makes the gospel magnetic still. 10. The Spirit speaks only of the wonderful works of God. Only as we deliver the message of God to the world through Christ may we expect the Spirit's ministry. 11. There are always some who are without spiritual discernment, and who will mock at divine things.

#### II. HOW THE SPIRIT WROUGHT.

1. Through Peter. Peter had played a cowardly act at the trial of Christ, but now he stands up as a giant. The Holy Ghost can convert cowards into conquerors. 2. Speaking by the Holy Ghost, Peter quoted Scripture. Holy Ghost preachers and teachers always use the Word of God. 3. Peter found in the fact of Pentecost a fulfilment of prophecy, (vs. 17-21). 4. Wherever men are filled with the Holy Ghost they will be able to describe their experiences as a fulfilment of God's Word. 5. It would appear that both men and women had their part in the testimony of Pentecost. Beyond doubt there is a place for the testimony of women as well as of men.

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 680.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

## INDIANA BAPTIST BIBLE UNION.

It was the privilege of the Editor of this paper to give a number of addresses at a Bible Conference held in the Y.M.C.A. auditorium, Indianapolis, Indiana, under the auspices of the Baptist Bible Union of that State, on November 30th and December 1st and 2nd. We have seldom attended a more useful Conference. It was especially remarkable for the number of ministers present. Not all were members of the Baptist Bible Union to begin with, but we believe everybody joined before the Conference was over.

So far as we were able to learn, the State of Indiana has a much larger proportion of sound, wise, and courageous, Baptist ministers than have some of the states. It is probable that many of these splendid men have imbibed some of the poison which has everywhere been spread abroad against the Baptist Bible Union; but when they discover that Baptist Bible Unionists have no horns, and no fads, and are nothing more than old-fashioned Baptists who are still old-fashioned enough to believe the Bible to be the Word of God, they will be with us.

The resolution which we print below indicates, however, that Indiana is not wholly free from the ecclesiastical over-lordship from which Baptists everywhere are now suffering. We sometimes wonder that free men tolerate such a condition for a moment. The churches provide the money to keep the various Boards going. The Conventions appoint certain Secretaries to care for the work, which, of course, is perfectly legitimate and necessary; but when we see these same Secretaries, who are really servants of the Boards supported by the churches, undertaking to exercise lordship over the churches, we frankly wonder that the churches do not send them about their business! We have no quarrel with denominational secretaries—some of the noblest men we have ever known have been thus employed. They occupy a very difficult position, and do a very necessary work. The President of the Indiana Baptist Bible Union told us a story: a Methodist Episcopal lady asked the wife of a certain Baptist Secretary to define her husband's position, and explain what his duties were; to which she replied that her husband's office in the Baptist denomination was equivalent to that of a Bishop among ordinary Episcopalians!

The resolution passed at the Indianapolis Conference suggests that the "Baptist bishop" of Indiana, whoever he may be, will be likely to find some of his "clergy" not wholly obedient to his rule. We believe great things will be accomplished by the Baptist Bible Union of Indiana.

Dr. J. F. Rake, of Evansville, gave a magnificent address on the need of revival. We are not surprised that such abundant blessing should attend the ministry of a man like Dr. Rake. Rev. W. E. Atkinson, the new Field Secretary, was present, and seemed to fit into his position "as to the manner born".

Following is the resolution above referred to:

The Baptist Bible Union of Indiana, believing in the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible as the Word of God, and therefore of the New Testament as the only standard by which all the interests of the church must be measured; and believing as Baptists have always believed, in the independence and autonomy of the local church, and of the absolute freedom of the pastor of the local church to declare the whole counsel of God; we, therefore, repudiate all extra-church authority, and particularly register our objection to the practice of denominational officials, secretaries and others, of interfering with the freedom of the local church in the exercise of its ministry, and especially to the too common practice of denominational secretaries endeavouring to unsettle fundamentalist pastors, and to influence pastorless churches against the calling of pastors who are known as uncompromising opponents of modernism;

And, further, we reaffirm our determination by every legitimate means to oppose any and every form of hierarchical dictation and control, and resolve to bring the subject of this statement to the associations and state convention for discussion.

Meanwhile, we, the members of the Baptist Bible Union of Indiana, on the principle of "to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his

servants ye are to whom ye obey", hereby declare that while ready to co-operate in all Baptist evangelical movements and enterprises, we refuse to recognize secretaries and other denominational officials as having any legitimate authority over the local church.

And still further, since the freedom of our Baptist papers within the limits of New Testament principles held by Baptists is an essential to their usefulness as the freedom of the pulpit is necessary to the usefulness of the preacher, we protest against the increasing tendency to make our Baptist papers the tools of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, so wrongly called Baptist; and declare our determination to secure for our Baptist editors the priceless boon of Baptist liberty.

### AN INTERESTING STRATFORD LETTER.

*The Gospel Witness* gladly publishes the following letter. It is a fine revelation of the "methods" and "spirit" of McMaster and its defenders. The writer of this letter is told that nothing appearing in *The Gospel Witness* or *The Prophet* can be relied upon. She reads *The Canadian Baptist*, and finds that it occupies its space in abusing the Editor of this paper, while entirely evading the point at issue. She comes to Toronto in an endeavour to get first-hand information from Prof. Marshall himself, and he refuses to be interviewed, and she is asked to accept the statement either of Professor Farmer or Chancellor Whidden. Wisely, she insists on hearing from the Professor himself. When this is denied her, she is driven, as multitudes of others will yet be driven, to the conclusion that they dare not discuss the issue.

Following is the letter:

303 Brunswick St.,  
Stratford, Ont., Nov. 30, 1926.

To The Clerk of the Ontario St. Baptist Church,  
Stratford, Ont.

Dear Sir:—

I hereby respectfully request that my membership be transferred from the Ontario St. Church to the Memorial Baptist Church, Stratford, at once. As it is the expressed wish of the pastor, Rev. H. McDiarmid, that the reasons be included for so doing, I most gladly comply and set them forth as follows:—

Firstly: I have enjoyed fellowship with the pastor and all the members of the church and congregation with whom I have become acquainted since being connected with the Ontario St. Church and desire to state that there is absolutely no personal element in this matter whatsoever but that it is wholly and solely a matter of my convictions with respect to Prof. Marshall's theology.

Secondly: My convictions are that Prof. Marshall of McMaster University is by far too unsound in his theology to be worthy of support in any way and that the present denominational controversy is not a Dr. Shields issue but the theology of Prof. Marshall.

Thirdly: The approval of Rev. Mr. McDiarmid of my suggestion that as long as my present convictions with respect to the unsoundness of the theology of Prof. Marshall are retained, that I owe it to the Ontario St. Baptist Church to withdraw my membership.

Fourthly: The absolute and utter failure of the effort put forth during the last month to secure satisfactory information concerning this issue from the McMaster side of the controversy. I had an interview with Mr. McDiarmid one month ago which lasted from 11.40 a.m. to 3.15 p.m. in which he expressed himself as feeling that my view was a prejudiced one because the information had been gleaned from *The Gospel Witness* and *The Prophet* which misrepresented the facts and therefore were unreliable. He felt that one should read *The Canadian Baptist* and requested that I should go down to Toronto and personally interview Prof. Marshall and get his theological views direct from him and not take second-hand information.

The matter was thought over and the decision made to request Mr. McDiarmid to select all the editions of *The Canadian Baptist* published since this controversy arose which most directly bear upon this matter. Within a



couple of weeks all had been read which he selected and I could not fail to notice that most of the matter published therein largely ignores the main issue. His theology is given in general statements about the fundamentals, but in order to get to the heart of the matter those general statements must be qualified. For example: Prof. Marshall says he believes in the glorious resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ and the empty grave. That is perfectly all right in so far as it goes. But ask him to qualify the resurrection body of Christ. Paul says in I Cor. 15: 44: "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body". Mark—a spiritual "body". The New Testament describes that resurrection "body" of Christ's. Matt. 28: 9; "Feet" by which the disciples "held Him". Luke 24: 36-45: "Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself, handle me and see, for a spirit hath not 'flesh' and 'bones' as *ye see me have*". He took the broiled fish and did eat before them. John 20: 24-28: Christ said to doubting Thomas: "Reach thither thy finger and behold my hands and reach thither thy hand and thrust it into my side and be not faithless but believing". Paul says in I Cor. 15: 4: "That He rose again . . . according to the Scriptures", and in I Cor. 15: 17: "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins".

The fact was also noticed in reading *The Canadian Baptist* that most of the space given to this matter is used to denounce Dr. Shields—his methods and spirit. As this is not a "Shields" issue with me, this literature had to be set aside as containing no essential matter which would aid one in reaching a Scriptural decision. Of course, after this, there was nothing left but the personal interview with Prof. Marshall.

Later, being in Toronto on business, I sought an interview with Prof. Marshall through Dr. Farmer as Prof. Marshall had left the University. I had to wait at McMaster for an hour before seeing Dr. Farmer and then was engaged with him in conversation for nearly one hour in which Mr. McDiarmid's request and the possibility of having to leave the Ontario St. Church was related to him, and then the next day we had nearly another hour's conversation over the phone, but with all this I was not able to secure an interview with Prof. Marshall. Dr. Farmer himself appeared to be perfectly willing from the first, but apparently failed to prevail upon Prof. Marshall. Prof. Marshall refused to see me on the plea of lack of time together with his feeling that if what had already been stated in public did not satisfy one, an interview would result in no further enlightenment and that he was in receipt of several requests for personal interviews and if he saw one he would have to see all and he could not get his work done in such case.

Dr. Farmer also argued that the limitations of Prof. Marshall's time should be considered as he needed some time for rest, etc., and as he lived away out in West Toronto it would take the whole of the Saturday afternoon to come in to the University to see me. This was met by offering to use my time—though greatly pressed for time but feeling that no sacrifice was too great—and go up to West Toronto to Prof. Marshall's home and see him there and thus save his time, stating that he could tell me all I needed to get in fifteen or twenty minutes. But I remained unsuccessful in securing an appointment to interview him.

I informed Dr. Farmer that this refusal closed my consideration of the matter and that my letter would be asked for upon my return to Stratford and that I would be forced to report back to Mr. McDiarmid that his request could not be carried out. To this Dr. Farmer agreed. He suggested that I ring up the Chancellor and speak with him, but I had to reply that it was necessary to see Prof. Marshall, not the Chancellor. Several times he urged me to discuss the matter with himself, but as I had been asked not to accept Dr. Shields' view of Prof. Marshall's theology, I felt that it was unfair to be asked to accept Dr. Farmer's—I must needs see Prof. Marshall.

I hereby respectfully request that the Ontario Street Baptist Church please accept of this letter as my final and definite decision in this matter.

Sincerely yours in Him,

(Signed) EDITH M. MCINTYRE.

## Editorial

### ANOTHER CLARION CALL.

Elsewhere in this issue we publish a call to a great Missionary Convention to be held in Toronto, January 11th and 12th. In this editorial note we speak unofficially; notwithstanding, we express the hope that a great multitude of Baptists will respond to this Call.

Arrangements will be made to entertain visiting delegates on the usual plan, and we hope also it may be possible to provide daily meals in the church, but of this we shall make announcement later. Meanwhile, we suggest three things. First, that all lovers of the Lord, and of His Word, should make this Missionary Convention a subject of very earnest prayer. Secondly, that every Baptist church member in Canada who reads this Call and the proposed Constitution who finds himself or herself in agreement therewith, should send either a letter or a postcard to the Secretary of the Committee, Rev. Alex. Thomson, 325 Soudan Avenue, Toronto, 12, stating that fact. No names will be published; but we suggest this as affording some means of knowing how many persons are interested. And in the third place, we suggest that all interested persons in every church where the Pastor is also in agreement, will see to it that it is made possible for the Pastor to attend this Convention. Of course, it is desirable that as many as possible, men and women, should come; but everyone will recognize the special importance of having the Pastors present. And if there should be individual members in churches that, as organizations, are not in full sympathy with the movement they might perhaps be willing to contribute to the fund that would help to pay the expenses of pastors of small churches too far removed, and whose salaries are too small for them to be able to afford to come themselves. In short, let everyone who agrees with the Call do his or her utmost by prayer and effort, to secure the largest possible attendance.

### DR. VINCENT OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION.

In one of the Toronto papers a few days ago we saw a notice to the effect that Mr. Albert Matthews had entertained at luncheon at the York Club, Dr. Vincent of the Rockefeller Foundation. Mr. Matthews is Chairman of the Board of Governors of McMaster. We know, as a member of the Board of Governors, that efforts have been repeatedly made to secure funds from the Rockefeller Foundation for McMaster. Dr. Vincent had other business in the city than McMaster, but we are reasonably certain that advantage was taken of his presence in Toronto to discover what prospects McMaster had of receiving help from the Rockefeller interests.

We know a little about how the funds of that great Foundation are used. It is seldom that a gift is given outright: if a hundred thousand dollars is given, it would be on condition that forty thousand dollars be raised; or perhaps two hundred thousand is given on condition that eighty thousand be raised—but the amount given by the Rockefeller Foundation controls the lesser amount raised by the people.

We have believed for a long time that certain interests in McMaster have been defiling the Baptist conscience with a view to putting themselves in a position where they can gain the Convention's consent to the violation of the McMaster trust. If that could be done with impunity, there would be some hope of securing the modernizing money of Rockefeller. Is that day come? We would remind all who are interested in this matter that the McMaster estate was not left to a majority vote in a Convention; but it was left to people holding certain principles, and the McMaster estate, legally, is still the property of those who hold those principles. Many precedents, both in British and American practice, show that the courts will not interpret such a Trust in the light of the will of the majority, but in the light of the declared purpose of the document. It may be of interest therefore to all intended contributors to McMaster University to know that in the Baptist denomination there is a

body of determined men who are resolved to carry the matter to the foot of the throne, but who will, on no account, surrender that which was solemnly dedicated to the propagation of the principles of the gospel of Christ, to be used for the destruction of the faith of men.

### "THE CANADIAN BAPTIST" PREVARICATOR ON THE "SPLIT".

The standard dictionary defines the word prevaricate as follows: "To use ambiguous or evasive language for the purpose of deceiving or diverting attention; misrepresentation by shape or turn of statement; giving a wrong colour to facts in speech or answer; quibble, shuffle." No one can read that definition, who is acquainted with the facts, without instantly recognizing that it is a true description of the editorial activities of *The Canadian Baptist*.

*The Canadian Baptist* in its issue of December 9th says that at the last Convention "Dr. Bowley Green was brave enough to put in words the inner thought of many a delegate and of many a member of the churches." Apparently referring to those who absolutely refuse to acquiesce in McMaster's modernism, *The Canadian Baptist* says:

For months it had been apparent that in some Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec there were a few who could not be called Baptists. True, they believed in immersion, but in almost everything else they were much more in sympathy with two or three other peoples than with the Baptists. Into their churches interdenominational and undenominational workers had easy entrance and large amounts of cash—cash so much needed for the recognized boards and missions of the Convention—was being sent into other channels. Some of these people gave far more generously annually to these missions than they did to the Convention enterprises. This was due to the fact that they had never been real Baptists and apparently cared little or nothing about loyalty to the things for which they voted at Convention, and for the enterprises to which they committed the officers of the Boards.

To this we reply that the people who "cannot be called Baptists" are the people who at present support McMaster University. There is not a word in *The Canadian Baptist* editorial to suggest that the people called Baptists are distinguished for loyalty to Christ as the Son of God, or to the Bible as the Word of God. Yet this is the very heart of the whole Baptist position. And we insist that men who deny the authority of Scripture—as Professor Marshall does, who reject the penal substitutionary work of Christ—as Professor Marshall does, who speak ambiguously about the great central fact of the resurrection of Christ, and who say that even baptism should not be made a term of church membership, and the people who, like Dr. J. H. Farmer, and Dr. John MacNeill, and Chancellor Whidden, who defend these utterly unbaptistic principles—that these are the people who cannot rightly "be called Baptists".

The sermon appearing in this issue was preached from Jarvis Street pulpit last Sunday evening. In principle, it is that which this Pastor has believed and preached from the beginning of his ministry; and so far as we are able to judge, all those who have offered strenuous opposition to McMaster's apostacy take substantially the same position. The fact is, those who would rather die than surrender that body of evangelical truth which is the peculiar heritage of the people called Baptists, are determined to oppose with all their might McMaster's modernism, because McMaster has surrendered practically everything for which Baptists stand.

It is charged against those of us who have unsheathed our swords against this modernistic movement that we are more favourable to interdenominational and undenominational movements and representatives than we are to such organizations and representatives as are Baptists. The charge is utterly untrue! The Stanley Avenue Church, of Hamilton, has for some years been supporting a missionary and his wife in India, as well as loyally supporting the other interests of the Denomination. Counting only three churches, Stan-

ley Avenue, Annette Street, and Jarvis Street, the present movement which *The Canadian Baptist* calls a "split", will involve an annual loss, according to the last Year Book, to the Denominational treasury of nearly \$9,000.00; nor does this amount represent all that has been given to distinctively Baptist missions.

So far as Jarvis Street Church is concerned, if we have not received into our pulpit Rev. H. E. Stillwell, Foreign Mission Secretary, it is only because for the past five years and over he has been supporting McMaster University from one end of Canada to the other, and has been spreading his poison against Jarvis Street Church, in public and in private, wherever he has gone. We have not invited him to Jarvis Street pulpit because were he to appear on the platform we believe the entire congregation would walk out of the building in protest. No bitterer enemy of Fundamentalism, if we are to judge by his attitude, can be found. But while we did not want Mr. Stillwell, we did especially invite Mr. S. J. Moore, the then President of the Foreign Mission Board, to come to us and speak in the interests of Foreign Missions. Mr. Moore was unable to come, but very kindly sent us Rev. John McLaurin, of India, who was then on furlough. Mr. McLaurin's visit to Jarvis Street was a great blessing to the church and congregation.

While protesting against the action of the Home Mission Board last spring, the Jarvis Street Church continued its Home Mission contributions right up to Convention time. It is true we have not contributed to the so-called "Religious Education Board", because so far as we can see, the only thing it does is to provide positions for a few people—except when it disseminates poison.

But surely Baptists still have some liberty, and a man does not forfeit his right to be called a Baptist because he protests against others departing from the Baptist faith.

The Jarvis Street Church books are open to inspection, and they will show that Jarvis Street is a "Baptist" church, and has been supporting "Baptist" interests. When *The Canadian Baptist* has falsely charged us with failing to support Convention enterprises, it continues: "This was due to the fact that they had never been real Baptists and apparently cared little or nothing about loyalty to the things for which they voted at Convention." This Editor has never held a pastorate outside this Convention. He served for years on the Home Mission Board, and for some years gave more time to the work of Home Missions than to the work of his own pastorate. Mr. James Ryrie, the Chairman of the Board, and Mr. Albert Matthews, Chairman of the Finance Committee, we venture to believe, would not dare to say that the Pastor of Jarvis Street has failed to support Baptist enterprises. When the Home Mission Board was staggering under a tremendous debt, who was it that put his shoulder to the wheel and spent days and nights struggling with the problem? When the Forward Movement was launched, who was it was asked to join with the President? And who was it, we ask again, who organized the entire Movement from end to end of the Convention?

On this part of the editorial we have written at length only because we desire to be polite! We could answer all that *The Canadian Baptist* says on the subject as effectively and comprehensively with one little word of three letters!

It is positively amusing to hear *The Canadian Baptist* use the word "ethical"! As it has long since dismissed the moral content of that word from its editorial furniture, we respectfully suggest that they give the empty shell a long vacation. *The Canadian Baptist* abounds with falsehoods, but it has not the fairness to permit anyone to correct its misrepresentations.

If there is a "split" in the Denomination, we are not responsible for it. We have stood, and still stand, for the simple principles which Baptists have always held; and McMaster University has sold out to Modernism. *The Canadian Baptist* welcomes what it calls a "split". So far as we are concerned, we have no intention whatever of withdrawing from the Baptist denomination: we are more determined to fight than ever. We shall give the rest of our life, if need be, to tearing the mask from the faces of those who have betrayed the Denomination to the enemy.

As for McMaster University: it is the property of Regular Baptists, and we hereby serve notice that a band of men is rising up who will be prepared to carry the battle to the Privy Council of the Empire.

*The Canadian Baptist* says "membership obligates"—we agree! So do principles!—and our principles put us under a perpetual obligation to contend against the blight of McMasterism in the Baptist denomination.

The concluding paragraphs of the editorial may be taken as an indication of what the Baptist ecclesiastics propose to try to do with Home Mission pastors and others. There is a veiled suggestion that men who do not own a dollar of the Church Edifice Board's money any more than we do, should yet use that fund as an instrument of persecution against loyal men whose building may labour under a mortgage.

If *The Canadian Baptist* calls the formation of the Women's Society a "split", what will it say of the further Call contained in this issue of *The Gospel Witness*!

### MR. W. C. SENIOR AND "THE GOSPEL WITNESS".

In *The Canadian Baptist* of December 9th, Mr. Senior comments upon our editorial of December 2nd, respecting the withholding of moneys given through the Budget plan to the work of the Boards. We should prefer to answer Mr. Senior through the columns of *The Canadian Baptist*, but we have no time to write letters for Editor Kipp's waste paper basket. *The Canadian Baptist* is the only paper we know of where the courtesy of a reply is denied. If the Board's supplies are cut off the Boards have themselves to blame.

What about our home missionaries? We would not have one of them suffer. We have given years of effort to Canadian Baptist Home Missions, and we are acting in the interests of home missionaries who are truly Baptist, when we insist that the present muzzle-making Board of Home Missions is not deserving of any free man's confidence. We do not propose to cease from our Home Mission efforts. If we know the spirit of the men and women who are rising up, like a great army, in opposition to McMaster, they are determined to do more home mission work than ever; and the missionaries who have conviction enough to stand like Peter and John, and say, "We ought to obey God rather than men", will have nothing to fear. The Lord will raise up friends for them, and their work will not suffer. If there are home missionaries who are willing to be muzzled by the Home Mission Board, and forbidden to discuss principles which are absolutely vital to evangelical faith, they will, by their submission, prove themselves to be no worthier than the Board which muzzled them. We are only surprised that there should be found one man in the Baptist ministry who would submit to the Home Mission Board's action without protest. We had strong hope that Superintendent Schutt would be true to his professed convictions and stand like a man against the blight of Marshallism; but it does seem as if the Superintendent has put his convictions away somewhere for safe-keeping.

While our name is attached to the Call appearing elsewhere in this issue, we are happy to say the great document containing the Constitution and Articles of Faith for the proposed new Missionary Society was drawn by other and abler hands than ours; but we subscribe to it with all our hearts, and believe that it will lay the foundation for a great Home Mission enterprise.

As to our Foreign Mission interests, the same principle applies: we do not believe that missionaries on the foreign field, who are themselves true to the faith, will long consent to the denial of the faith at home; missionaries who make their convictions known on the foreign field will not want for support.

The only Board in the Convention to which our suggestion of the withdrawal of funds, as we see it, ought not to apply is the Superannuated Ministers' Board. We believe that every beneficiary of the Superannuated Ministers' Board is a sound man. We don't like its administration; unless it is an exception to the rule, Prof. New, who has been appointed to the chairmanship in order that that Board, like all the other Boards, may be used as a tool by McMaster; but this we should think would be the peak of ecclesiastical wickedness. We do not propose to penalize any of our aged ministers, and we do propose at an early date to submit a resolution to Jarvis Street Church asking

that church to make an exception to its rule in respect to the support of Convention Boards in favour of the Superannuated Ministers' Board; and we respectfully suggest that others might do the same. But as for the other Boards of the Convention, there is not one of them, in our judgment, that has not forfeited all claim upon Baptists of conviction.

## "THE GOSPEL WITNESS" PROVES TO BE A TRUE PROPHET.

In the Ichabod issue of this paper we wrote as follows:

### "THE GOSPEL WITNESS" NOMINATES A PROFESSOR.

We would especially recommend our readers to study the performance of the Rev. J. M. Warner as given in this issue. His utter disregard for facts entitle him to special consideration! Professor Curr once made a remark to the effect that a man must wreck one or two churches in order to qualify for a professor's chair; and it has seemed to us that when a man has shown ability to reduce his congregations to the proportions of a comparatively small class, and has shown himself unable to lead a church to any large degree of spiritual success, he frequently retires to a professor's chair, from which comfortable corner he spends the rest of his life teaching young men to do what he was never able to do himself! With all these things in mind, *The Gospel Witness* nominates the Rev. J. M. Warner, B.A., B.D., for a Chair of some sort—we are not particular what—in McMaster University.

We have just learned to-day that a notice was posted in McMaster to the effect that Mr. Warner would take the class in Systematic Theology, December 8th, and regularly hereafter. On the grounds above mentioned, we believe Mr. Warner eminently fitted for the position. Although a member of the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University, this is the first time on record in which the Senate has accepted the nomination of the Editor of *The Gospel Witness!*

## "THE WESTERN RECORDER" STANDS LIKE GIBRALTAR.

The reading of *The Western Recorder* is always a spiritual tonic, it is so refreshing to read the writings of an editor who believes something—and is not afraid to say what he believes. We reprint the article entitled, "Correcting an Error", from *The Western Recorder* of December 2nd.

Professor Parker, we believe, is a graduate of Louisville Seminary. He came to McMaster University at the same time as Professor Marshall, in the fall of 1925. Coming from the South, we had some hope that Professor Parker would bring a little Southern soundness and sense with him, but we wonder what Southern Baptists will think of Professor Parker's position now?

The charter of McMaster University provides that every instructor in Theology shall be a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church; the instructors, or masters, or professors, who teach in the Arts Department must be members of some evangelical church, not necessarily Baptist. The Chancellor and the Dean in Theology arranged for a course to be given by a Campbellite minister. This minister—or professor, as we suppose he is—is now in the second year of his work in a Baptist university, teaching the doctrines of the Disciples' body. Beside this, we are informed that the gentleman referred to is distinctly modernistic; and as the charter requires that instructors in Theology be members of a Regular Baptist Church, the Chancellor and Dean, never at a loss to find a way to evade the provisions of the charter, have put this course in the fourth year of Arts. Thus Professor Parker is now associated with a Campbellite in the same faculty. What do Southern Baptists think of such a partnership?

We are not greatly disturbed by the presence of Professor Parker in McMaster University. (Coming from the South, we supposed he was thoroughly orthodox.) We have met him and heard him but once. The fall Rally of the B.Y.P.U. Societies in Toronto was held in Jarvis Street Church a few weeks ago, and Professor Parker was the "inspirational" speaker. Since that night

we have had no fear for Professor Parker's influence one way or the other. We suppose Professor Parker's address was intended to be a "carefully written and scholarly (address) on Old Testament Criticism". We saw several people enjoying a sound sleep during the deliverance of the address, and we believe those who slept soundly understood about as much of what the young professor said as those who heroically kept awake. We have had a fairly wide opportunity for observation, but we have never heard an address more out of place, nor more utterly useless for such an occasion, than that which Professor Parker gave that evening.

*The Gospel Witness*, however, has no time to waste on Professor Parker. Whatever his views, we imagine he is an entirely inoffensive young man who will never have much influence with men of strength. We publish the article below from *The Western Recorder* as illustrating the littleness of some men. If Professor Cross corrupted Rochester Theological Seminary as a professor, what would he have done had he been President!

### CORRECTING AN ERROR.

(From "The Western Recorder" of December 2nd.)

Professor N. H. Parker, of McMaster University, has written us a letter calling our attention to an error in an editorial which we had about Dr. Augustus H. Strong. The editorial vindicated beyond all cavil Dr. Strong's open and full-length stand for the fundamentals of Christian faith as always held by Baptists, before the recent down-grade movement misled some Baptists into a position which exalts scholastic powers and dignities but rejects the substitutionary work of Christ and the inerrancy of the Bible.

Our error was in referring to Dr. Cross, whom Dr. Strong charged with bringing Modernism into the Rochester Seminary, as president of the seminary. He was not president but a professor. We gladly correct the error, but it had no essential bearing upon the question at issue. We were somewhat surprised that the McMaster professor, though we are told he is one of the youngest, should centre objection to our editorial on so small a matter. Professor Parker seems to be piqued. He goes out of his way to say in his letter that "I have never seen a carefully written and scholarly article on Old Testament Criticism in *The Recorder*." That is entirely possible. *The Western Recorder*, while its writers deal with ability and scholarship with the deep things of the faith, does not aspire to be a theological quarterly. Such is not its function.

Professor Parker of McMaster in his letter assures us at some length of his own loyalty to the cardinal doctrines. But as nobody had questioned his orthodoxy we fail to see the relevancy of his words. However, we make this general remark: An orthodox Baptist who is quick to come to the defense of Liberals, is in a mighty sorry business, involving the confusion and weakness of his witness to the most sacred truths ever committed to man.

Professor Parker says that he has not read that monumental work, *The Leaven of the Sadducees*, by Ernest Gordon, from which we made the quotation in the editorial. We hope the professor may remedy this lack. Being an orthodox Baptist we feel sure that he will wish to see what a brilliant and invincible exposition Mr. Ernest Gordon has made of the unspeakably vile betrayal of Christian faith which has been taking place for many years in America, first at the hands of Unitarians and later chiefly by their spiritual children, the Modernists. Unhappily the average Liberal or Pacifist gets and reads such books as the recent sophisticated work of that brilliant Modernist, Dr. Fosdick, on *The Modern Use of the Bible*, but ignores even the ablest and most invincible utterances of conservative scholars—utterances which neither the brilliant Fosdick nor his satellites can shake or answer. They affect to ignore them, which is the safest course for their self-assurance. But not even that will save them in the end from the confusion and disgrace which their betrayal of the oracles of God for worldly advantage will rightly bring upon them.

Professor Parker not being of that school, we venture to express the hope that he shall not fail to include the Gordon book in his reading. At the same

time we commend the book most highly to every preacher and intelligent layman in North America. It is published by the Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843 North Wells Street, Chicago, and may be had for \$1.00. This is the publishing house of Moody Bible Institute, an institution held in deep disapproval and attempted contempt by the Modernists of all denominations, but one with whose able stand for and exposition of Bible Christianity, Modernism will yet have to reckon. Orthodox Christians, such as Prof. Parker says he is, should thank God for Moody Institute.

### "THE GOSPEL WITNESS" AS A CHRISTMAS PRESENT.

At great loss we have been offering *The Gospel Witness* throughout this year to new subscribers for \$1.00. Where we have to pay full postage rate of 1c per copy, without allowing one cent for overhead expenses, or for the work actually done on *The Witness*, and counting only what it costs us for printing and wrapping and mailing, to send *The Gospel Witness* to one address for fifty-two weeks, costs \$1.60. Thus on every dollar subscription, we have lost in actual cash 60c. After the 31st of December this offer will be positively withdrawn, for were we to continue it, we should be bankrupt. We have taken this means, however, to advertise *The Witness*, and while we have lost 60c per copy, we believe the advertising value has been inestimable. Our promise to hold this offer open to the end of December will, of course, be kept.

As an indication of the value some of our readers put upon *The Witness* we print below a letter received from an Italian pastor. This brother, we believe, heard of *The Gospel Witness* through an American paper and subscribed for it a year ago. He now renews his subscription, and tells us that if necessary he will pay the full subscription of \$2.00, which would, in his money, be equivalent to \$10.00. Here is a Baptist minister then in far away Italy who tells us that he thinks *The Gospel Witness* is worth \$10.00 a year. We are so grateful to him for his testimony that we are writing him to say that we have renewed his subscription for two years instead of one. We believe his letter is worth much more than the extra dollar.

Following is the letter:

Florence, Italy,  
November 14th, 1926.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I have been greatly benefited in many ways by *The Gospel Witness*, and I am anxious to continue to receive it. I know that the regular subscription is \$2.00 per year. But one dollar costs me five dollars, through adverse exchange, and so I enclose only one dollar as my subscription to "The Gospel Witness" during 1927, in the hope that I may be allowed to receive it at this reduced rate of subscription, till our change will be bettered.

I hope you may be able to grant me this favour.

In any case, if necessary, I am ready to make the sacrifice, and to pay the full subscription of two dollars, which will cost me ten dollars.

With most heartfelt gratitude, and with kindest regards,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) IGNAZIO RIVERA.

We now offer *The Gospel Witness* to all new subscribers whose subscriptions are received at this office on or before the 31st of December for one year for \$1.00. On the first of January our regular subscription price will be \$2.00.

A very large number of subscriptions are sent us as Christmas presents. What better gift could you give to your friend as a Christmas present than the promise of a weekly visit from *The Gospel Witness* for one year? By adding 25c you may receive *The Gospel Witness* and a volume of ten sermons in paper covers by the Editor, entitled, "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man"—a volume of sermons and *The Gospel Witness* for a year for \$1.25. Send us your order for yourself and friends. A card will be sent to each person for whom *The Gospel Witness* is ordered, sending Christmas greetings from the donor and *The Gospel Witness* together.