

# The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLE AND  
IN DEFENSE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.

\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c. Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS.

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

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

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

Vol. 7. No. 39.

TORONTO, FEBRUARY 7th, 1929.

Whole No. 353.

## Dr. John MacNeill *versus* Mr. R. E. Knowles

Dr. John MacNeill is Pastor of Walmer Road Baptist Church, Toronto. He is Chairman of the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board. He is a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University—and he is President of the Baptist World Alliance. We have no quarrel with Dr. MacNeill as a man. We long regarded him as a minister of Christ, not only with respect, but with affection. We have no doubt he is a man of many admirable qualities, and we are reluctant to speak any word that would lower Dr. MacNeill in anyone's estimation.

We should much prefer to discuss principles wholly apart from personalities, but in the controversy that has raged so long in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec that seems now to be an impossibility. We are concerned for the truth of the gospel, for the integrity of the Word of God. We endeavoured to oppose wrong principles without involving personalities. When we protested against McMaster's Modernism, no attempt was made to disprove our charge, but the defenders and allies of Modernism answered by shouting, "liar". In a thoroughly systematic way, by public speech, in private conversation, through hundreds of letters, that coward's weapon has been employed. Everybody who has borne witness against McMaster has suffered the same treatment. Apparently anybody and everybody who questions the doctrinal soundness of McMaster University must be a "liar".

### McMaster's Apostasy Proved.

We have piled up the proofs of McMaster's apostasy; we have proved every charge we have made even to a demonstration; we have shown that the

authority of Scripture, the expiatory work of Christ, the scriptural doctrine of man's natural depravity, the literal resurrection, are all openly and flagrantly denied. How, then, are we to convince people of the truth? No matter who may be put in the witness box, no attempt is made to refute his testimony. There may be two or ten or fifty or a hundred—ministers, or laymen, or students—the moment they speak out against McMaster they are forthwith called "Shields-ites", "fanatics", "liars".

### What of Dr. MacNeill's Veracity?

But we have now another matter on hand. We deal with Dr. John MacNeill, not with the intention of injuring him, but only to show that he is a willing worker in a campaign of misrepresentation, and in some quarters, utter falsehood. It has been proved to the hilt, and we will not weary our readers by repetition, that McMaster University has now become utterly apostate and anti-evangelical. We are told that because several Convention votes have registered approval of McMaster, it must be orthodox. We repeat what we have before said, that it were just as reasonable to assume that, because the Sanhedrin adjudged Christ to be guilty of blasphemy and worthy of death, their judgment was true.

But what about Dr. John MacNeill? After his election to the Presidency of the Baptist World Alliance he was interviewed by Mr. R. E. Knowles, a special writer for *The Toronto Daily Star* (We republish elsewhere this interview entire from *The Western Recorder* of January 31st, including the editorial note of *The Recorder*, but for the moment it is sufficient for us here to quote these paragraphs):

(Continued on page 4.)

# Dr. MacNeill's Denial of the Knowles' Interview

(From "The Baptist Advance", September 27th, 1928.)

Walmer Road Baptist Church,  
Toronto 4, September 11, 1928.

Dear Dr. Mullins:

I left Toronto immediately after the Alliance meeting and have just returned to the city. I regret to learn that some of the Baptist brethren, particularly in the South, have taken literally the report of an "alleged interview" in a Toronto daily paper. Regarding its contents as reliable they have had their fears awakened as to the significance attached by the new president to his election. Some of the brethren are good enough to question whether I was correctly reported. They are quite right. Certainly the interview as published does not represent my interpretation of the honour that came to me at that time. Not for a moment do I think it was the intention of the Alliance to pronounce on any local controversy or to vindicate any man in relation to it. That can never be the function of the Alliance, nor need the brethren have any fears that the Alliance under its new leadership will be used to further the interests of any one party. How utterly foreign to my lips is the language of the published interview is seen from such phrases as "The Baptist Church," "My Church." I never think in those terms, and for the better reason that such terms are not in accord with N.T. usage as I understand it.

If I had the ear of these brethren I would ask them to judge my attitude by my own utterances which are duly recorded. I appeared twice on the Alliance platform in Toronto: The first time unexpectedly to respond to the electing vote of the Congress, the second time by previous appointment to deliver the closing address on the programme. Those two addresses are in the records. They are my responsible utterances and may be read by those who wish to know my attitude.

On the first occasion, greatly humbled in heart, I

accepted the honour and responsibility of the presidency, and I quote one sentence: "Let me hasten to say that I do not accept it as a personal tribute—I know what has been in your mind and in your purpose. You are seeking for one thing to honour my beloved country and the great Baptist brotherhood of Canada from coast to coast." There I declared my profound belief in, and loyalty to, our Baptist tradition, our Baptist principles, our Baptist message and mission to the world. It was an attitude best expressed in Dan Crawford's ringing phrase, "Hats off to the past; coats off to the future." My head is uncovered in reverence for the tradition of our past; my coat is off to realize in the future all the far-reaching implications of that noble Baptist heritage.

If any are asking whither the new president will lead the Baptist host in the next five years, they have their answer in my address on the closing night of the Congress. It was not prepared in view of the presidency for the presidency was undreamed of when the address was written. But had I been forecasting a presidential policy I would not wish to strike a different note. It was a call to recover the apostolic type of Christianity in three directions; the apostolic message, which is Christ in all His divine fulness; the apostolic spirit which is love; the apostolic dynamic which is the power of the Holy Ghost. It is in that direction that the new president will lead. If there are those who are not in sympathy with that objective, disappointment will be their portion through the next five years. As for me, I am persuaded that the millions of our Baptist hosts have their faces set in that direction, and I am inspired by the belief that they will welcome, as they have in the past, leadership that seeks that goal and in seeking it will exalt principles above party and service above self-interest.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) JOHN MacNEILL.

THE TORONTO STAR

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT  
TELEPHONE ADELAIDE 2201

Oct. 18 — '28

My dear Dr. Ham

Your letter (which I think it  
wise to return for your own, possible, use) has duly come  
to hand.

Replying, I unhesitatingly assume you that  
your "assumption" (see paragraph 3 of your letter) is  
correct:

Everything I have set down as from the lips of  
Dr. MacNeill came, in substance & essence, from his lips. The  
quotations are substantially correct:

Surely Dr. MacNeill would confirm this? It is  
four months since I made the interview. There has been, here or  
thereabouts, no hint of dissent on his part; either by voice or  
pen. I have, since, met him personally, but there is not the  
faintest evidence that he disavows anything of the  
interview. He can all; and, of course, had he considered anything  
inaccurate or misleading, he would, both privately & publicly, have  
registered his dissent long before this.   
 Yours faithfully R. E. Knowles.

## DR. JOHN MacNEILL Versus MR. R. E. KNOWLES.

(Continued from page 1.)

### From the Knowles' Interview.

"Dr. MacNeill", I began, folding up my notes, "what is your reaction to this sudden thing?"

"What thing?"

"This tremendous bound to one of the topmost pinnacles of the religious world?"

I had plenty of time to arrange my notes. At length John MacNeill began to speak. "My natural sensation is one of chastened pride that this honour has come, not so much to me, as to the Canadian Baptist church and to our whole Canadian citizenship. And a very deep joy springs from the assurance that this action of the Alliance in choosing me is a vindication, a glorious vindication, of our position and our strivings in the great battle we have been through in Toronto and Ontario. I am humbly and solemnly thankful for this—the Baptists of THE WORLD HAVE SPOKEN. THEIR VOICE NONE CAN MISUNDERSTAND OR IGNORE." The emphasis is *The Western Recorder's*).

Here Dr. MacNeill is reported to have claimed that he was elected to the Presidency of the Baptist World Alliance as an expression of the approval of the Baptists of the "world" of his action in championing the cause of McMaster. We published the interview at the time, and expressed the view that the whole matter had been manipulated in the Nominating Committee; and that the man chiefly responsible for Dr. MacNeill's election was Dr. L. R. Scarborough; and that it was a trick of the same Dr. Scarborough to use the Baptist World Alliance to credential him and his crowd.

### Southern Baptists Orthodox.

The interview in *The Toronto Star*, when published in *The Gospel Witness*, was read by a multitude of Southern Baptists, among them of course not a few Southern Baptist editors. In the controversy in which we have here engaged we have been contending for the very things that the majority of Southern Baptists believe and preach and practise; and the things against which we have protested, the doctrines of Marshallism, are really an abomination to most of our Southern Baptist brethren. When Mr. Knowles' interview was published in the South the brethren there naturally protested against the assumption that Southern Baptists, as an integral part of the Baptist World Alliance, had taken sides in the Canadian controversy, and through their representatives had appointed Dr. MacNeill President of the Alliance in expression of their approval of his course.

### Interview Stirred the South.

The publication of that interview indeed stirred things up in the South, with the result that Dr. MacNeill wrote a letter to Dr. Mullins, which was published in most of the Southern Baptist papers, in which he repudiates what he calls the "alleged interview", and thereby denies having said what Mr. Knowles reported him to have said. Dr. MacNeill's letter to Dr. Mullins will be found in full on page two of this issue. This letter from Dr. MacNeill was never published in any Canadian paper. The interview was first published in *The Toronto Star*, and copied by *The Gospel Witness*. One might have supposed that the proper place to make any correction would have been through the medium of the paper which first published

the interview—and certainly through the columns of *The Canadian Baptist*. Of course *The Gospel Witness* would have been glad to publish any communication Dr. MacNeill cared to send us. But not one word against that interview was heard in Canada.

Nor did Dr. MacNeill write directly to the Southern press, but rather sent a letter to Dr. Mullins, and the letter was broadcast by Dr. Mullins through the South. Once again therefore Dr. MacNeill resorted to the usual trick to which he has been accustomed in our controversy here, by repudiating a few phrases and giving the general impression that the reporter had not told the truth.

The following letter reached us only to-day (Feb. 4) and we print it in full for its discerning quality. We withhold the name for the present because we have not asked the writer's consent to publish it:

To *The Gospel Witness*,  
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Editor:

I have read *The Gospel Witness* regularly for a long time and have rejoiced in the fine way you uncover the hidden designs of men who try to evade and deceive, posing as being "some great one" while they selfishly seek to get glory to themselves, and yet handle truth carelessly trying to escape the results of their own words.

I have in mind the recent exposure of the President of the Baptist World Alliance. Dr. MacNeill is reported to have said that his election to this high office had brought him "high honour not so much to me, as to the Canadian Baptist Church—and to our whole Canadian citizenship. And a very deep joy springs from the assurance that this action of the Alliance in choosing me is a vindication—a glorious vindication of our position and our strivings in the great battle we have been through in Toronto and Ontario. I am humbly and solemnly thankful for this—the Baptists of the world have spoken. Their voice none can misunderstand or ignore."

When *The Gospel Witness* exposed the smug conceit and utter fallacy of this boastful brag, and when as a consequence the claim of Dr. MacNeill was denied publicly by Alliance visitors in Toronto, and repudiated by several denominational newspapers in different parts of the United States, both North and South, Dr. MacNeill comes out several months later to escape the consequence of his own words. But may I say, Mr. Editor, that as I study his reply he does not deny the words that Mr. Knowles reported to have been said on this matter in the interview. You are right when you say he denies the accuracy of the report, but he avoids saying that he did not say the thing that is vital in the reported interview. He calls attention to the fact that terms such as "My Church" and "The Baptist Church" are foreign to his manner of speech, but he does not say that the claim that his election was a vindication of his position in his defence of Modernism was not his claim, and I think he will not dare to deny this, the language was too manifestly his manner of speech, and there is not variety enough in Dr. MacNeill's style for him to escape the truth of Mr. Knowles' reported interview.

It will thus be seen that the interview is *substantially* substantiated, but it is further revealed that Dr. MacNeill is trying to escape the effect of his own expression of vanity by playing with unimportant and unrelated words, while he does not dare to face the language under criticism.

Truth faces facts, and a man who wanted to be true would have said frankly, "I over-spoke myself", but some people who live in the delusion of infallibility, cannot do that thing.

God speed you in your good work of turning light into dark places.

Yours truly,

Toronto, February 2nd.

### The Editor Writes Mr. Knowles.

After reading Dr. MacNeill's letter we wrote Mr. Knowles, care of *The Toronto Star*, under date of December 12th, enclosing a copy of Dr. MacNeill's denial of the interview, and asking Mr. Knowles what he had to say about it. To this we received no reply. We wrote Mr. Knowles again by registered letter on January 9th as follows:

January 9th, 1929.

Rev. R. E. Knowles,  
c/o *The Toronto Daily Star*,  
Toronto, Canada.

My dear Mr. Knowles:

I enclose a copy of a letter I addressed to you in care of *The Toronto Star*, December 12th; also copy of a letter by Dr. John MacNeill, which appeared in *The Baptist Advance*, of Little Rock, Arkansas, of September 27th last.

I have noticed in recent issues of *The Star* communications from you from New York, and it has occurred to me that you may not have received my letter.

I am sure you must see how serious a matter is involved in Dr. MacNeill's repudiation of that which your interview attributed to him. Articles on last summer's meetings of the Baptist World Alliance appeared in *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, London, England; and when the President of the Alliance, over his own signature, charges you with misrepresentation, it seriously reflects upon your honour as a newspaper man, and, of course, upon all communications which have to do with historic fact which may come from your pen.

As Dr. MacNeill's letter has been published in the Southland it will be necessary for me to deal with this whole subject in an early issue of *The Gospel Witness*, and I should be glad to believe that the difference between the statements made by yourself and Dr. MacNeill was susceptible of some explanation on the ground of misunderstanding, rather than be driven to believe the only other alternative, namely, that one or the other was guilty of absolute misrepresentation of fact.

I am sending this letter by registered mail in order to ensure its receipt by yourself. I should esteem it a great favour if you would let me hear from you immediately.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,  
(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

### Mr. Knowles Writes Kentucky.

But to this hour we have received no reply to that. Seeing the letter was registered, and it was not returned to us, we can only conclude that Mr. Knowles received it.

But although Mr Knowles did not reply to us in Toronto, apparently he thought it quite safe to reply to someone in Kentucky. Mr. Knowles' letter to Dr. Ham was dated October 18th. Our first letter to Mr. Knowles was dated December 12th. Because Mr. Knowles' letter to Dr. Ham had not come to light we suppose Mr. Knowles assumed we were ignorant of its having been written. Mr. Knowles has no sympathy with Jarvis Street's evangelical position, and he probably has believed all that Dr. MacNeill and others may have told him about us, and therefore possibly was willing to shield Dr. MacNeill.

We have reproduced Mr. Knowles' letter, not from the fac simile appearing in *The Western Recorder*, but from the original letter which is now in our possession. Our reproduction will be found as part of the article by Dr. Masters which we have copied from *The Western Recorder*, and in order to complete the article we print our fac simile there instead of here. For our present purposes, however, we set out here the text of Mr. Knowles' letter which is as follows:

Jno. W. Ham,  
General Delivery,  
Henderson, Ky.

October 18th, 1928.

My dear Mr. Ham:

Your letter (which I think it wise to return for your own, possible, use) has duly come to hand.

Replying, I unhesitatingly assure you that your "assumption" (see paragraph 3 of your letter) is correct. Everything I have set down as from the lips of Dr. MacNeill came, in substance and essence, from his lips. "The quotations are substantially correct."

Surely Dr. MacNeill will confirm this? It is four months since I wrote the interview. There has been, here or hereabouts, no hint of dissent on his part; either by voice or pen. I have since met him personally, but there is not the faintest evidence that he disavows anything of the interview. He saw all; and, of course, had he considered anything inaccurate or misleading, he would, both privately and publicly, have registered his dissent long before this. Do let me have another line.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) R. E. KNOWLES.

We call attention to two or three matters. In the third paragraph Mr. Knowles says:

"Everything I have set down as from the lips of Dr. MacNeill came, in substance and essence, from his lips. 'The quotations are substantially correct'."

### An "Alleged Interview".

But Dr. MacNeill calls it an "alleged interview". Mr. Knowles declares that what he wrote Dr. MacNeill had said.

Then in the last paragraph he says, "Surely Dr. MacNeill will confirm this." But Mr. Knowles does not know Dr. MacNeill as we do. In this controversy Dr. MacNeill apparently is not even on nodding terms with the truth. Before the Private Bills Committee in Ottawa, at the Conventions, in his speeches throughout the provinces—wherever he has spoken, Dr. MacNeill has been just about as truthful as in his denial of this interview.

Mr. Knowles calls attention to the fact that it is four months since he wrote the interview, and says that "here or hereabouts no hint of dissent" on Dr. MacNeill's part has been uttered. He says that he has since met Dr. MacNeill personally, and has had not the faintest evidence that he disavowed any part of the interview. He calls attention to the fact that Dr. MacNeill saw all. By that we presume that he means he saw it in the papers; or does he mean that Dr. MacNeill saw it before it was printed? At all events he saw it in the papers, and Mr. Knowles rightly assumes that if there were anything in it inaccurate or misleading, Dr. MacNeill would "privately and publicly have registered his dissent long before this".

### Sympathy For Mr. Knowles.

We sympathize with Mr. Knowles in the present situation. He will know now the kind of men whom we have had to deal with in this controversy. Dr. MacNeill broadcast his disavowal in the South, and in such a way that it would likely escape Mr. Knowles' attention. Why did he not in a manly fashion write to *The Toronto Star*? Why did he not register his objection here at home among his fellow-Canadian Baptists? Because he wanted Canadian Baptists to believe that he had been honoured by the Baptists of the world for his part in the controversy, and because he knew that he

had said the things that Mr. Knowles reported him as having said.

What value can be attached to the word of a man who will play this game? The whole interview breathed the spirit of Dr. John MacNeill which has been so conspicuously displayed at several Conventions.

We quote from the editorial in *The Western Recorder* of January 31st:

"We wrote Doctor MacNeill personally on the matter. His reply was a denial, after a fashion, similar to the article which had been published in a number of our Baptist papers (others did not publish it). His published denial turned upon such minor questions as whether the reporter had correctly represented him in using the term 'Baptist Church' instead of 'Baptist churches', rather than upon the more significant revelations of the interview.

"In his letter to the Editor of *The Western Recorder*, Doctor MacNeill rather cavalierly suggested that we should watch our step and do him justice. Substantially the same suggestion was also made to us from another quarter; we were admonished that certain Baptist brethren (names not given) were saying that the Editor of *The Western Recorder* was evidently in secret alliance with certain outstanding Baptist brethren who contend for fundamentals of Baptist faith, even to the disregard of organization comity. Whether this was intended by way of pressure to embarrass us to the end that we would be unwilling to risk uttering any further word concerning the pitiful case of Doctor MacNeill, on pain of being accused of lack of "fellowship" to organized Baptist work, is, of course, a matter of opinion. It was suggested that we had departed from proper newspaper usage in quoting an "unconfirmed newspaper report" and the hope expressed that we would wash our hands of the interview and wipe away any implications as to the MacNeill fitness."

#### Dr. MacNeill's Threat.

The threat implied in Dr. MacNeill's letter is worthy of the man. We suppose that the President of the Baptist World Alliance wanted to make the Editor of *The Western Recorder* fear that his position was in danger! After a while Dr. MacNeill and his associates will be advocating some sort of *lese majesty* measure for the punishment of those who dare to suggest that perfection does not necessarily reside in our denominational "leaders"!

But we leave the case with this question: Supposing the situation were reversed? Supposing the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* had given an interview to the press, and had then denied its accuracy? And supposing the reporter—being perhaps the same Mr. R. E. Knowles—had written such a letter as is here published, declaring that every word he has attributed to us he had reported from "our lips in substance and essence"? What would Dr. MacNeill have said? What would *The Canadian Baptist* have said? What a tremendous ado would have been made over "another of Shields' lies"! We have repeatedly challenged the whole Convention to disprove one single charge that we have ever printed in *The Gospel Witness*, for we have proved everything we have stated over and over again.

#### Dr. Masters' Article.

We ask our readers to read the article by Dr. Victor I. Masters of *The Western Recorder*, and see what a sorry figure the President of the Baptist World Alliance makes before our Southern brethren.

It should be borne in mind also that *The Western Recorder* is the official organ of the Baptists of Kentucky. It is published in Louisville, the seat of the great Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and is looked upon as one of the most influential Baptist papers, not only on the American continent, but of the world.

Before closing this article we call attention to the fact that Mr. Knowles reported the Baptist World Alliance for *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, London, England, and if Mr. Knowles is guilty of such misrepresentation as Dr. MacNeill implicitly charges, what value had his reports to our English brethren? These words will be read by many friends in England. We shall send several copies of this issue of *The Witness* to every one of our English subscribers, with the request that they distribute them freely among their friends. Our English brethren ought to know something of the President of the Baptist World Alliance, and we say to all, in Canada and the United States, in Great Britain—and, indeed, in the forty-three countries to which this paper goes—that the principle of conduct illustrated in Dr. MacNeill's denial of Dr. Knowles' report is the principle with which we have had to do battle in this whole controversy.

#### Modernism and Truth.

Our Modernistic opponents are so utterly careless of the truth, and so frequently represent us as having said the very opposite of what we have said, that we have been compelled to refuse to talk in their presence without having a double stenographic report taken of the conversation. On one occasion our utterances at a meeting of the Board of Governors of McMaster University were taken down stenographically, and at the next meeting of the Board in the minutes of the meeting preceding there was contained what purported to be a verbatim report of our short speech. There was first of all an attempt made to hold us to what was written down as a verbatim report, but we compelled the stenographer to acknowledge that it had been edited, and that that which first of all claimed to be a verbatim report was a report of what he considered the salient facts. The truth was, he was not responsible for the change, but another sinister hand had deleted every qualifying clause, and every qualifying adjective; and while using our actual words, made us say the very opposite of what we had said.

The same has been done on the floor of the Convention, and men have read from manuscripts with apparent authority, quotations from this writer or the other, and when we have examined the author quoted, and compared it with the stenographic report of the word spoken on the Convention floor, we have found that while the actual words of the author were employed, they were so edited and twisted as to make the author say the very opposite of what he said in his book.

The fact is, Modernism is of the devil, and it may be said of Modernism as of the devil, "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." We leave Dr. MacNeill to square himself with his own conscience and with his public, and to offer some explanation to a reporter who at least sought to promote his interests by putting in print what Dr. MacNeill had said.

# Is the Baptist World Alliance an "Entangling Alliance"?

An Editorial by Dr. Victor I. Masters, in the "Western Recorder"

Up until about ten years ago not a voice was heard among Southern Baptist leaders in favor of any alliance with other religious bodies that might carry with it the danger of compromising the testimony of our people to revealed truth.

Our people took what pains Christian fellowship and proper self-respect suggested to make known to other Christians and to the public that this position was not negative but positive—not of schismatic or insular temperament but of conscience. It was the response of their consciences to the authority of the Word of God as they have been led to understand it. They believed they could contribute more to the bringing of the Kingdom of Christ, likewise precious to their brethren of other folds, by following the Word of God as their authority and attending to those concerns of internal fellowship which are related to it, rather than in eye-filling efforts to participate in novel organization schemes further afield.

Hatcher, Broadus, Eaton, Gambrell, Frost, Carroll—each of these outstanding leaders, as well as a far larger group of others of like spirit and precious memory, may be quoted in definite utterances which constitute a united testimony to the position we have stated.

And the beloved James F. Love, who has only recently laid down the burden of a heavy responsibility in the service of Baptists, though he was deeply reluctant to utter anything that might be divisive, lest it should imperil the interest of the great work which he led, declined to the end to conserve any supposed interests of his official position at the cost of withholding his testimony concerning such grave dangers as we have mentioned. Dr. Love knew as few among us do what are the subtle forces that are diligently at work at home and on the foreign fields to break down the testimony and liberty of vital faith to the end that faith may be betrayed into the hands of an ambitious scheme for a world-wide religious combination. And he knew that to the accomplishment of this staggering proposal, it is actually intended to make no less sacrifice than that of the redemptive Gospel of Christ and the authority of the Holy Bible. By tongue and pen and official statement Dr. Love resisted this movement to the end; some of his friends believe even to the sapping of his health and to the hastening of his untimely death.

We have named these leaders rather than quoted the Word of God on the point at issue not that their authority stands before that of the Bible. We have named them because we know that tens of thousands of their brethren yet living remember from their personal association with these leaders that it was their glad bondage to the authority of the truth of the Book alone which constrained them to stand in the position they assumed with granitic patience and conviction.

## I.

Personally the Editor would gladly let the Baptist World Alliance take its course without assuming any responsibility of word or act that might shake the confidence of our people in the trustworthiness of that

organization. But as the Editor of a paper which is responsible to Bible-believing Baptists we feel under constraint to bear testimony to certain facts in regard to the Baptist World Alliance. These facts constitute a danger signal we are persuaded Baptists will not ignore, unless indeed it is ignored by some who may have been so influenced by the radical religious novelties of the times that they are ready to turn their backs upon the counsels of trusted and revered Baptist leaders whose voices are now silenced by death.

The Alliance organization is only a loosely articulated conference. By definition it has no authority to bind any local church or co-operating Baptist body. But in actual fact this organization has, from the eye-filling prestige of its ecumenical nature, tremendous moral influence among Baptists. We are warranted in believing that it is because it has such influence that its friends most desire its continuance.

Now if there were adequate grounds for belief that the prestige and influence of this world-wide Baptist conference would be exerted to strengthen the testimony of Baptists to the revealed faith of the Word of God, and not to weaken and misrepresent that testimony, it would be at once appropriate and desirable that such testimony should be borne and the world conference itself encouraged. But if there are elements in the conference that play down and compromise the revealed truth of God, participation in it by our Baptist people in the South would mean that they are now willing to lend themselves to giving power and prestige to an organization that compromises truth that has been committed to them by the Lord, and which therefore they have no right to compromise. The purpose of this utterance is to present evidence of such elements.

## II.

When we returned from the Baptist World Alliance in Toronto in June, 1928, we wrote an editorial in our issue of July 5th, uttering words of cheer and hopefulness in regard to the Alliance. We particularly expressed satisfaction at the splendid utterances there by President E. Y. Mullins (whose paper was read) and Dr. Z. T. Cody. Toward the conclusion of the editorial we wrote as follows: "The general tone and dominant spiritual quality were instructive and inspiring. The dominant quality was of blessed loyalty to our Lord Jesus Christ."

It should be remembered that when we wrote that the Modernistic English-speaking sectional meeting of the Alliance had not been reported, and the facts the recital of which follows below had not become known to us.

It was our hope that Southern Baptists might be able in the World Alliance to have a fellowship with Baptist bodies throughout the world that would not compromise the integrity of the testimony borne to revealed truth by true Baptists in the South and elsewhere, an inspirational fellowship with others in which our own internal peace and faith might not be violated. Not that the writer had ever been an enthusiast for the Baptist World Alliance.

But we held in high esteem and confidence many brethren who desired to foster this great ecumenical conference and regarded it a privilege, along with many other Baptists who share our feeling, to give place by preference to the desires of those brethren who believed they saw good in the organization.

Immediately following our editorial of cheer and hopefulness, information was received of the raw modernistic attitude developed in the English-speaking group-meeting of the conference and of the election of Dr. John MacNeill, a local Toronto pastor, as president of the Alliance.

The record of Dr. MacNeill, though of course it was not at that time generally known to Southerners present, was that of an outspoken divisive partizanship for liberal views. On top of this, immediately following his election he gave an interview to a staff correspondent of the *Toronto Star* under date of June 29, the publication of which caused to crumble any hopes we might have had concerning his fitness for that exalted position. He has since—but only after publication in the South of his interview—issued a statement which has been sent to all the Baptist papers in the South (and not elsewhere) in an effort to repudiate that interview—in which interview he exultingly declared that his election as president of the Baptist World Alliance was a placing upon him the stamp of approval of the Baptists of the whole world for the bitter fight which he had led before the Toronto and Quebec Baptist Convention in October, 1927, in defense of McMaster University in keeping in its professorship the rankly modernistic Prof. L. H. Marshall.

Himself professing to be an orthodox Baptist, Dr. MacNeill has a prominent record of fondness for those fellowships and positions that always and everywhere tend to weaken and to jeopardize and even, as in the case of Marshall, openly to flout and betray beliefs that have everywhere been held sacred by all real Baptists in every generation.

### III.

Elsewhere we are again reproducing the *Toronto Star* interview which was given by Dr. MacNeill immediately after his election as president of the Alliance. It was given to Mr. R. E. Knowles, himself a minister, and a special writer and reporter of the *Toronto Star*. While there are in the interview other obvious indications of the liberal sympathies of Doctor MacNeill, the particular point to which we would direct attention is the paragraph in which he speaks of his election to the Alliance presidency as "a glorious vindication of the great positions and strivings through which we have been in Toronto and Ontario."

As we have intimated, Doctor MacNeill later tried to get out from under the weight of this amazing confession. Apparently he considered it rather too obvious an exhibition of his position to be given publicity. Edged tools must be kept out of the hands of children. Baptists in remote nooks and regions, unhappily without requisite "broadmindedness", might stumble over the meritoriousness of such motives. They might even doubt the fitness of a man of the type revealed in the *Toronto Star* interview to be president of the Baptist World Alliance. But Doctor MacNeill in his statement was unable to show that he meant or could have meant anything else than buoyant joy at the personal victory he and his liberal Baptist collaborators had had in their bitterly partisan fight to thrust the Modernistic L. H. Marshall down the

throats of Canadian Baptists by keeping him in the McMaster professorship. "The Baptists of the world have now spoken", exclaims the newly elevated official in the intoxication of the amazing honor placed upon him.

More than two months after the *Toronto Star* publication of the interview and of the *Western Recorder* editorial of July 23, a multiform letter bearing the name of Doctor MacNeill was sent to our Baptist papers in every section of the South but not published in Canada or elsewhere. In the letter in rather indirect terms Doctor MacNeill sought to convey the impression that the interview was false. Evidently it was either false or else considered too damaging and revealing for Doctor MacNeill to ignore it. Something must be said, he may have reasoned, to lessen its probable effect among Baptists who might on the basis of its revelation question the fitness of Doctor MacNeill for the conspicuous office to which he had been elevated.

We wrote Doctor MacNeill personally on the matter. His reply was a denial, after a fashion, similar to the article which had been published in a number of our Baptist papers (others did not publish it). His published denial turned upon such minor questions as whether the reporter had correctly represented him in using the term "Baptist Church" instead of "Baptist churches", rather than upon the more significant revelations of the interview.

### IV.

Along in October our friend, Doctor J. W. Ham, the well-known Baptist evangelist, wrote to Mr. R. E. Knowles, who had made the report of the interview with Doctor MacNeill in the *Toronto Star*. We are publishing on page three a photographic copy of the reply of Mr. Knowles under date of October 18th.

It will be seen that Mr. Knowles unhesitatingly assures Dr. Ham that his quotations from Dr. MacNeill in the interview "are substantially correct." And Mr. Knowles adds:

"Surely Dr. MacNeill will confirm this. It is four months since I wrote the interview. There has been, here or hereabouts, no hint of dissent on his part; either by voice or pen. I have since met him personally, but there is not the faintest evidence that he disavows anything of the interview. He saw all [the published interview], and, of course, had he considered anything inaccurate or misleading he would, both privately and publicly, have registered his dissent long before this."

We need not make any comment. The reader is asked to form his own conclusions. In his letter to the Editor of the *Western Recorder*, Doctor MacNeill rather cavalierly suggested that we should watch our step and do him justice. Substantially the same suggestion was also made to us from another quarter; we were admonished that certain Baptist brethren (names not given) were saying that the Editor of the *Western Recorder* was evidently in secret alliance with certain outstanding Baptist brethren who contend for fundamentals of Baptist faith, even to the disregard of organization comity. Whether this was intended by way of pressure to embarrass us to the end that we would be unwilling to risk uttering any further word concerning the pitiful case of Doctor MacNeill, on pain of being accused of lack of "fellowship" to organized Baptist work, is of course a matter of opinion. It was suggested that we had departed from proper newspaper usage in quoting an "unconfirmed newspaper report" and the hope expressed that we would wash our



hands of the interview and wipe away any implications as to the MacNeill fitness.

## V.

We have no more concern as to Dr. MacNeill personally than we have for any other Baptist preacher anywhere in the world. If he is preaching the truth of Christ, we would desire to strengthen his hands and would bid him Godspeed. If he is compromising the truth of Christ, we would not bid him Godspeed in his work, though we would treat him with personal kindness as a man who is answerable to God and not to us.

But, when such a man is elevated to a position of prestige and of vast potential influence among Baptists, carry with it the implication of confidence and applause on the part of all persons—especially editors—who are in various places trusted by Baptists to voice responsible opinion, for our part we are unable either to remain silent or to utter the word of okey and applause.

It is broadly rumored among Canadian Baptists that Doctor MacNeill is an open communionist. Before the lamented death of that honored man of God, Dr. C. J. Holman, of Toronto, he sent us enclosed in a letter a typewritten statement signed by William Gadride (Garside, Ed. G.W.) of 46 Lowther Avenue, Toronto, Ont. The statement is reproduced below. At its close is the photographic reproduction of the signature of Mr. Gadride (Garside, Ed. G.W.) who tells of the invitation extended to the Lord's Supper by Pastor MacNeill on three separate occasions:

1. "There are present a number of friends from other churches. If you love Christ and desire to dedicate your lives to the furtherance of His Church in the world, we invite you to remain."

2. "There are present members of other Baptist churches, and warm-hearted friends from other Christian churches, and you are cordially invited to join with us in observing the Lord's Supper."

3. "If there are those present, whose hearts are warm toward Christ, we would be pleased to have you join with us in this service."

"The foregoing invitations for the communion were given by the Rev. John MacNeill in his church, Walmer Road Baptist Church, Toronto, on occasions when I was present. The wording of the above invitations is substantially correct, having been taken down by me at the times the same were given."

"Nov. 3rd, 1928.

(Signed)

*William Gadride*  
*46 Lowther Ave.*

## VI.

Now the great mass of our Southern Baptist people are offended by the practice of open communion. They believe that the Lord's Supper is an ordinance committed to each church and that it is dominantly that of a memorial ordinance for our Lord rather than a means whereby

Christians may express social or even Christian urbanity toward each other. Aside from consistent doctrinal considerations, they reason that any organization has an inherent right, unless its course should take away rights from some other person or institution, to determine its own rules and regulations. And they believe the open communion practice to be mainly an amiable gesture of conformity under the urge of pleasing men rather than God. Unprejudiced and thoughtful theologians, therefore, whether Baptists or not, must and do respect the consistency of their position. But men who would make a fair show before the world may hardly be expected to do so.

We do not question the right of Dr. MacNeill to foster a practice so obnoxious to the great mass of Southern Baptists. But we question the propriety of placing a man at the head of a great ecumenical alliance to which Southern Baptists are asked to give their fellowship and both moral and financial support, who is known to be addicted to ideals and teachings that are deeply objectionable to Southern Baptists. And we deplore the fact that a Southern Baptist leader—after he had been present at the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec in October, 1927, and there heard the impassioned defense of the liberal Dr. Marshall by Dr. MacNeill, and who could not fail to know that no such man would be satisfactory to Southern Baptists, if they should learn the facts—should allow himself to be placed in the position of nominating this man as President of the Alliance.

## VII.

The Editor is accountable to God and his Baptist brethren. We deeply prefer to seek peace and follow after it, but there are some things more precious. We habitually seek to see eye to eye with brethren in the South—particularly official leaders, who are presumed to voice the conscience of Baptists. Year in and year out we co-operate heartily with them, and seek to safeguard their good name and the success of endeavors committed to them. But, relieving the brethren of any responsibility whatever for the course we pursue, we now express our growing conviction that the Baptist World Alliance is not an instrumentality which Southern Baptists may wisely hope to use to the end of a larger expression of their testimony to the Gospel of God which is committed to them, whether in America or at the ends of the earth.

There are other indications that the spirit of compromise and of comfort and prominence for the exponents of liberalism and mediation is in the saddle in the Baptist World Alliance. We will not go into them now; should it become necessary we will do so. But we ask our readers to give the deep and prayerful consideration which they merit to the things we have here set forth in much sadness of heart and with pain.

May such facts be hidden away from the attention of Bible-believing Baptists? Have we the right to do so? Dare we wink at such things and then have the assurance and complacency to suppose that we may depend upon the blessing and favor of Almighty God? If so, may God pity and rebuke us for having become a pitiful mediating fellowship of faint-hearted, ease-loving, world-conforming backsliders! But we are persuaded better things of our Baptist churches and pastors, though we thus speak.

## MacNeill Hails his High Office as Vindication for Splitting Canadian Baptists

From "The Western Recorder" of January 31st, 1929.

*Following is an interview given by Dr. John MacNeill to Mr. R. E. Knowles, of The Toronto Star, and published in that paper June 29, 1929. The interview took place immediately after his election as Baptist World Alliance President. We reproduced it in The Western Recorder of July 26, 1928. Dr. MacNeill took steps some months later to repudiate the interview. This he did, however, only among Southern Baptists. We publish in our editorial utterance elsewhere the declaration of Mr. Knowles that the interview was correctly reported. In confirmation of this he declares that Dr. MacNeill has among his own people in Canada taken no steps whatever to deny its correctness.—Editorial Note.*

"Dr. MacNeill, will this elevation to your high office involve any detachment from your work in Toronto?"

"Well, to a degree. It probably will involve a good deal of travelling—probably to the Orient, in the course of my office."

"You are considered, generally, an enthusiastic denominationalist. Is that correct?"

"That's far too violent a definition. I am a loyal son of my church—but not so as to interfere with the broadest fellowship. Probably one thing that has prompted the opinion you quote is that for seven or eight years I have been in the forefront of the fight for the very life of our denomination—you know what I mean—and of McMaster University. I regard our triumph now as complete, however."

"Are you a Fundamentalist or a Modernist?"

"Neither. I dislike the terms. I'm a progressive conservative."

"Don't you think the alliance convention has rather over-claimed the glories of the Baptist system, its liberty, freedom from this and that, and so on?" The new president smiled charitably. "Oh, no, you must remember our church was cradled in that fight. It was always on the defensive. That is, naturally, its out-breathing of a precious tradition—that's all."

"Will you throw the great influence of your new office on the side of actual union with other evangelical churches?"

A ponderous pause ensued. Then: "At present I

honestly believe the Baptist Church can best fulfil its function by retaining its individuality."

"But what is your ultimate ideal?" "A form, some form, the best form, whatever it may be, of united power. But there is great peril—we have had proof of it in Canada lately—OF FORCING UNION TOO RAPIDLY."

"This, however, I will say, that I deplore and discourage all this 'we are the people' spirit and talk. Our brotherhood should be complete. My own best clerical friend in this world is a United Church of Canada Minister."

"Who is he?"

"George Pigeon. And Davies, Pigeon and I are a trinity of congenial spirits."

"Dr. MacNeill", I began, folding up my notes, "what is your reaction to this sudden thing?"

"What thing?"

"This tremendous bound to one of the topmost pinnacles of the religious world?"

I had plenty of time to arrange my notes. At length John MacNeill began to speak. "My natural sensation is one of chastened pride that this honour has come, not so much to me, as to the Canadian Baptist church and to our whole Canadian citizenship. And a very deep joy springs from the assurance that *this action of the Alliance in choosing me is a vindication, a glorious vindication, of our position and our strivings in the great battle we have been through in Toronto and Ontario. I am humbly and solemnly thankful for this—the Baptists of the WORLD HAVE SPOKEN. THEIR VOICE NONE CAN MISUNDERSTAND OR IGNORE.*"

"Give me one message, one comprehensive word, for the Canadian church—for the churches of every name from coast to coast," I requested. "That word shall be brief," said the new president, a minute or two later. "Tell them this. *That I shall count myself happy and blessed if I can lead or can help my fellow Christians to recover the mystic secret of the apostolic days. Thus, and thus alone, shall the church repeat her unforgotten triumphs.*" (That is, the triumph is to be sought in the "mystic secret" of formal union—"united power" is his word above—rather than the "mystic secret" of power through the Holy Spirit.)

## Great Campaign Meeting Tuesday February 5th, in Jarvis Street

Although the meeting was advertised only in the Saturday papers about twelve hundred people assembled in Jarvis Street Church at the call of the Executive of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec for the first meeting in a great forward movement campaign. Ex-Mayor Thomas Urquhart, the greatly beloved Chairman of the Executive Board, presided. The platform was crowded with pastors, while many other ministers sat in the audience. Two rows of seats were occupied by students from the Seminary.

Addresses were delivered by Rev. J. F. Holliday, B.A., of Fairbank Baptist Church, and Rev. C. L. Rumball, B.A., of Oakwood Church, both graduates of McMaster University. They covered the ground, very largely, covered in their joint

article which appeared in last week's *Witness*. Rev. Arthur St. James, of Montreal, who is speaking at several churches in Toronto during the week and Sunday, gave a brief address.

A collection for campaign purposes, to be used chiefly in the publication of literature, was taken, which amounted to \$1,500.60.

The Editor of *The Gospel Witness* spoke, and copies of a special edition of this paper, containing the pages relating to the MacNeill-Knowles matter were distributed. Five thousand copies of the paper were supplied, and practically the entire stock was exhausted.

The Board of the Union held sessions morning, afternoon, and evening, on Wednesday; and plans were laid to conduct

(Continued on page 14.)

# The Jarvis Street Pulpit

## "In Remembrance of Me"

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, December 2nd, 1928.

(Stenographically Reported).

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which He was betrayed took bread:

"And when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is My body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me.

"After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me."—I Cor. 11:23-25.

### Prayer Before the Sermon.

O Lord, we thank Thee for the revelation of Thy Word which tells us of a life that is not subject to the limitations of earth. We bless Thee for the prospect of the day when our Lord shall come from heaven, when He shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto His glorious body according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself. We rejoice in the promise that some day redemption will be completed in the sense that the whole creation shall be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God, and we lift our hearts to Thee this evening with praise and adoration for Thy redeeming grace. Thou hast made us, and not we ourselves. Thou art the King of kings, and Lord of lords. All authority belongeth unto Thee, our sovereign Lord and King. We worship Thee, we rejoice to be able to say,

"The King of love my Shepherd is,  
Whose goodness faileth never;  
For I am His, and He is mine,  
For ever and for ever."

Into Thy presence we have come with all our need. We have no plea this evening but the Saviour's blood, no argument with which to come but this, that He is our righteousness, that He lives Who once did die, and maketh intercession for us with God. Help us all to come with our burdens, especially with our burden of sin, with all our cares and anxieties, with all our infirmities. How sinful we are! How weak! How unworthy! But how gracious Thou art, O God, that Thou dost receive us everyone! No beggar was ever turned away from Thy gate, no supplicant was ever denied his plea when in the name of Jesus Christ he sought the mercy of the Lord. And Thou wilt not deny us to-night. We hear Him saying Who is our High Priest, at the grave of Lazarus, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." So we come in the name of Him Whose petitions are never denied, Who is in covenant with Thee, and Whose promises are covenant-bound and sealed with the precious blood. What a standing place for faith Thou hast given us! Help us, O Lord, each with our peculiar need and our special difficulty, whatever it may be, to come to Thee and find help of the Lord.

Then we bring especially to Thee some who are sick. Bless Thy dear servant, Mr. Brown. We thank Thee for his consecrated life; we thank Thee that the great powers Thou hast given him, the talents with which Thou hast endowed him, have all been laid at the Saviour's feet, and with arms of faith we bring him to Thee and pray that Thou wilt be gracious to him. Direct the surgeon, and bring him through this illness speedily. May complete restoration of health and strength again be his!

Once more, O Lord, we bow with deep thankfulness as we invoke Thine aid for him who is our earthly king. We thank thee that in the midst of storm and stress, when thrones have been shaken and crowns have fallen, Thou hast given us one before whose eyes has ever been the fear of God. We thank Thee for him, and we beseech Thee to grant that his life may be spared, and his health completely restored. How often have Thy people prayed in similar circumstances for those in humble positions, of whose danger the world was unaware, yet Thou didst hear, and Thou didst heal and save. We believe Thou canst do it still, and so as those who have been purchased with the blood, who know that there is no prevailing plea but the merit of our Lord Jesus, we pray that for His sake, it may please Thee to grant perfect and speedy recovery to our gracious Sovereign. May the improvement begin to-night if it be Thy will. Bless all who attend him; even though some may not know Thee, yet Thou canst sovereignly use their skill and direct them to a proper treatment. Or if it be Thy will, over and above it all, without means, Thou canst heal.

Now as we come to Thy Word to think once again for a little while of the infinite debt we owe, O Spirit of truth, give us eyes to see the Saviour; give us hearts to respond to His call; make us to sit in heavenly places with Him. Prepare us, by Thy grace, that we may come to Thy table in a way that is pleasing to Thee. Brood over this assembly, and now for these quiet moments may we be conscious of the presence of God, for Jesus Christ's sake, Amen.

We shall turn this evening to a text that has often engaged our attention, the eleventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, verses twenty-three to twenty-five: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

"This do in remembrance of me." We are all prone to spoil, to mar, the handiwork of God; and the simplicity of the Scripture is often an occasion of stumbling to our human pride. Only as we come to God's Word as little children, to be taught of His Spirit, can we enter really into its spiritual significance.

You remember the story of the little Israelitish maid who waited upon Naaman's wife yonder in Damascus? Naaman "was a great man with his master, and honour-

able, because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria: he was also a mighty man of valour." He was captain of the hosts of the king of Syria. But notwithstanding all his greatness, he was a leper. The little captive girl, an Israelite, moved with sympathy for her great master, said to Naaman's wife, "Would God my lord were with the prophet that is in Samaria! for he would recover him of his leprosy." That was a simple statement. If only the great man could go and see the prophet he would invoke divine aid, and her master might be made whole again.

It was reported to the king of Syria, and he argued something like this: "If the prophet in Samaria be a great man, then how much greater must be the king!" So he sent Naaman with a letter, not to the prophet as the little girl had said, but to the king. When Naaman came to the king of Israel with his credentials from the king of Syria, asking the aid of Israel's king to recover him from his leprosy, the king said, "Am I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy? wherefore consider, I pray you, and see how he seeketh a quarrel against me." Then you remember Naaman came at last to the prophet's house, and the prophet did not even come out to see him, but sent a messenger and said, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." Naaman was angry, and went away in a rage and said, "Behold, I thought, He will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper." Then a servant—another simple-minded soul—said to him, "My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? how much rather then, when he saith to thee, Wash, and be clean?"

Why cumber the simple gospel message with all sorts of human inventions? Why do you not take it as it reads, and do exactly as God tells you, and get the blessing? Read the story of this memorial feast which we are to observe to-night, and then think of the controversy that has been raging in England about the Reservation of the Sacrament: the "consecration" of the elements, and putting away of part of the bread for use in the sick chamber, and that the people who come to church may bow down and worship the bread as though it were God. How men persist in spoiling the beauty and simplicity of what our Lord said! What did He say? He said in effect, "I am going away. I shall be gone for some time, but I am coming back again. While I am away, I do not want you to forget me; I want you to remember the thing that is most important, that I died for you. Here is some bread and some wine, and when you come together, take the bread and see in the bread a symbol of my broken body, and see in the wine a picture of my out-poured blood. Eat the bread and drink the wine, and keep me in remembrance. Do not forget me until I come back again. And when I come back again, you will understand more than you do now all that my death meant in your behalf."

How beautiful, how suggestive, it is when we observe the Scriptural simplicity, instead of spoiling it by associating with it the things that are really the fruits of our own imaginings.

I have spoken to you from that text many, many times, and yet perhaps we may look at it from a slightly different angle this evening, for we shall never exhaust the wonder of the death of Christ. Some day we shall get to heaven; some day the New Jerusalem will come down from God out of heaven. What that means I do not know, except that it will surpass everything that mortal has ever seen. And it will last for ever. There will be no sickness there; we shall not have to pray for anyone's recovery from sickness. There will be no want there, no infirmity, no imperfection of any sort. There will be no evening shadows there, no hospitals, no cemeteries. There will be no pain there, there will be no night. It will be one long eternal day. There will be no sun there, and no stars or moon, because Jesus will be there, and the Lamb is all the glory in Immanuel's land. When we have been there a million years—yes, a million million years—we shall never become so familiar with the glory of the land that it will lose its wonder.

In the long future we shall have plenty of time to explore the universe. The astronomers' distances which so stagger the imagination suggest the need of time, but when we have explored all things that are now mysteries, we shall be filled with praise as we see the glory of the works of the Lord. But over and above it all, we shall be speaking every day, and all the time, of the glory of the Lamb. It will never end. And the centre of it all will be this wonder that He died for us. Somebody has said that there will be at least three surprises in heaven. He said, "I shall meet many there whom I never expected to see in heaven; and I shall be surprised to note the absence of some whose presence I confidently expected; but the biggest wonder of all will be to be there myself." And so it will.

We are to remember the Lord's death. What does the feast mean?

### I.

Will you think a moment of the people who are excluded from this feast by the very nature of the feast itself? If we understand its spiritual character, its spiritual purpose, we shall see that, in the nature of the case, some people cannot come, for when thus we gather, we gather to remember Him, to celebrate His death in our behalf. There are some people who cannot do that. The impenitent have no right at the Table of the Lord; the man who has sinned and is not sorry for his sin, the man who takes pleasure in unrighteousness, the man who nurses and hugs to himself the very thing that slew the Lord, the man who takes pleasure in that which produced the thorns of which we spoke last Sunday evening, the man who does that which fashions the nails that pierced His hands, who is responsible for the spear that is thrust into His side—that man cannot want to remember the death of Christ. It can bring no joy to him. There is no blessing in a feast like that for the man who abides in his sin, and who will not repent.

Is there a man or woman here like that this evening, who, hearing this word, "This do in remembrance of me", will have to confess, "I cannot go to the Table. I do not want to remember Him. I am filled with consternation every time I think of Him. Nothing

would terrify me so much as to look into His face this evening?" I think it will be part of the punishment of Judas Iscariot, and those whom he represented, that they will never be able to forget their part in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. The man whose hands are red with blood, the murderer smitten of conscience because of his bloody deed, does not want to look at a photograph of his victim. He does not want to be kept in remembrance of his crime: he desires to forget it if he can. Did the sons of Jacob when they had sold their brother into Egypt, and for twenty years maintained a silence, I think forbidding each other that they should ever mention his name—did they do anything in remembrance of Joseph? No; they said, "Forget him, blot him out of our memory. He is the one man whom we wronged above all others. Do not torment us by reminding us of what we did." The man who bears the responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, and who has never repented of his sin, does not belong at the Table of the Lord.

Some day in the golden city we shall meet, and we shall sit down at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb; and unless you repent of your sin you would be just as much out of place there as you would be at the Table here. It is a terrible thought that when they come from the east and from the west, from the north, and from the south, that some should be shut out. But that is what the Scripture says. There are many people whose lives make it abundantly evident that they have no affinity for these spiritual things, and that to them they do not belong. God grant that the miracle may be wrought, that repentance may be given, that tears may flow, and that men may turn to God before it is too late, so that the remembrance of Christ may be an unspeakable joy.

Surely the unbelieving have no place at the Table of the Lord. Have you believed on Jesus Christ? Is He to you your Substitute and Saviour? Can you say,—

"My faith would lay her hand  
On that dear head of Thine,  
While like a penitent I stand,  
And there confess my sin.

"My soul looks back to see  
The burdens Thou didst bear,  
While hanging on the accursed tree,  
And knows her guilt was there"—

Can you say that? Are you sure of that, that "he was wounded for your transgressions, he was bruised for your iniquities: the chastisement of your peace was upon him; and with his stripes you were healed?" What! You do not believe that He was God manifest in the flesh? You do not believe that He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world? You do not believe that the eternities met in Him, and that He was made after the power of an indissoluble life, that He was and is God? You do not believe that He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself? Then you had better not come to the Table of the Lord. "In remembrance of me", said Jesus.

The very recognition of the fact excludes the mere formalist. How terrible it is that of this spiritual ban-

quet men should have made a formal ceremony, that people should impute a certain merit to this observance, and imagine that by "going to sacrament", as they call it, they are fitting themselves for heaven; that by going to Mass, by coming to the Communion in some church or other, God will take account of you and forgive your sins because of that? No! No! This is not a mere ceremony: it is a feast of love for those who love the Lord; and unless your heart is His altogether, do not come; it is not for you. We are to remember Him—not the church, not the priest, not the preacher, or the requirements of the church: we are to remember the Person of Jesus Christ.

## II.

For whom is the feast? It is not for the man to whom Jesus Christ is nothing more than a historical figure, a mere ideal, a mere theory, somebody who lived in the distant past, but has no direct and personal and present relationship to me. If that is all Jesus Christ is, we have no right to come to the Table of the Lord.

Whom does it invite to remember the Lord? Who are they whom the Lord would have remember Him in His death? Surely it must be the people who have reason to cherish the memory of His death, people who know they have profited by His death, people who can say, "All I have, all I am, all I hope for, for time and eternity, have come to me because Jesus Christ died for me, really died instead of me." It is just as though He said, "Do not forget, My beloved, how much you owe to the fact that I died for you. Keep me in remembrance."

What aspect of His character and life are we to remember? How wonderful He was everywhere! How wonderful He was when He wrought that beginning of miracles and turned the water into wine! What a wonderful day that was when, as some youthful poet said,

"The conscious water saw its Lord and blushed"! He thus manifested His glory, but He did not say to us, "I want you to remember me as I appeared at the wedding in Cana of Galilee."

How wonderful He was when He stood up in the boat when the winds were roaring and the waves were rolling, and He sovereignly said, "Peace; be still", and there was a great calm! They said, "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and waves obey him?" But he did not say, "I want you to remember me as the Sovereign of the sea."

How kind He was! I love to think of His going into the sick room, going to the house of Peter, and finding his mother-in-law ill, simply taking her by the hand, lifting her up, and making her whole.

His many deeds of kindness will come to your mind; the feeding of the multitudes, the opening of the eyes of the blind. Here was somebody who had been all his life in darkness, who had never seen the sun or the flowers or the beauty of the earth, and suddenly our Lord touched his eyes, and the universe of beauty burst upon him. That blind man perhaps would say, "I shall always love to think of Jesus as the One Who opened my eyes." And yet He did not say, "Remember Me as the Man Who opened the eyes of the blind."

And He raised the dead. I suppose earth never saw a more wonderful scene than that when He stood outside the rocky sepulchre of Lazarus, and with a loud voice cried, "Lazarus, come forth", and he that was dead came forth. Mary and Martha dried their tears, and they all went home to Bethany singing. Then think of that scene when they made Him a supper, and Lazarus was there. I wish I were an artist—I know I could paint that scene. But our Lord Jesus did not tell us to remember Him in that character.

When He stood among the unnumbered multitude, and they heard Him talk, they marvelled at the gracious words that proceeded out of His lips. When the sermon was over, they said, "Never man spake like this man." But he did not say, "Remember Me as a Teacher."

He takes us to a place called Calvary, where the thorns are pressed about His brow, where five bleeding wounds He bears; and He says, "Until I come back again, hold Me in your hearts, cherish the memory of One Who died for you." That is the central truth, my brethren and sisters. Does it mean anything to you? Do you know that you have been purchased by precious blood? that your sins have been washed away by that crimson tide? If you do, this memorial feast will have significance for you,—“This do in remembrance of me.”

### III.

I should like to nurse that idea for a little while, but I must pass on to tell you of some of the benefits which flow from this remembrance.

I think if we properly observe this feast it will determine our attitude toward sin. If we can remember what sin did to our Lord Jesus, how it crucified Him; if we remember that it was a thing which God could not forgive without its being punished; if we remember that in the sight of a Holy God it was so heinous a thing that nothing but the blood of His own heart could hide it from His omnivident gaze, then we shall come to hate that thing.

If I were to read a list of certain diseases before this audience to-night, consumption, cancer, diphtheria, and all the horrible things that have cut human life short, somebody's heart would respond to each. Here is a mother that shudders at the mention of diphtheria and says, "It left me childless." Somebody else would say, "Do not say 'cancer'. It blotted out the light of life for me. I hate it." Or of that other thing that wrapped its tentacles around some loved one, and that precious form went down to the grave by disease. Some would say, "The very mention of it fills me with horror. I hate it." If we could remember that our sins nailed Him to the cross, every day we live we should say, "Lord, save me from this cursed thing, that I may not grieve Thee further." How it will help us to walk humbly with God! The cross of Christ will take all the pride out of you. If you understand the meaning of this feast, and look at that cross and say, "That is where He died", it will keep you at His feet. You remember how John Bradford used to say, as he saw the cart go past his house taking the criminal to the executioner's block or to the scaffold, "There goes John Bradford but for the grace of God."

Sometimes I have imagined that scene on Calvary when the people stood beholding, crowds of them

gazing at that central Figure as the life-blood ebbed away. I can fancy I see some of them trying to get a closer view. And I think I see one man with the marks of sin about him, haggard in appearance, and with a hard face made tender; I see him pushing his way through the crowds, getting as near as possible to the cross, standing and looking up at Him, great tears rolling down his face, sobbing as though his heart would break, and saying, "It was all for me; it was instead of me." Somebody says, "Who is he?" And another answers, "Do you not know him? That is Barabbas." The cross was his, and Jesus took it in his place. "Not this man, but Barabbas", the mob cried; and Barabbas went free while Jesus died.

As thus we gaze upon Him, and keep Him in remembrance, we shall never forget that there our sins were washed away. It ought to be the inspiration of our lives. Our Lord Jesus said, "Take the bread and wine in remembrance of Me; never forget Me. When you are weary remember Me; when you are tempted, remember Me; get your inspiration from the Cross, and because of what I did for you by My grace, and by the power of the Spirit, live the life I have planned for you."

We are a poor lot, my friends, considering what Jesus Christ has done for us. Do you not think those of us who are Christians ought to be better than we are? And those who are not, what can you mean by turning your backs upon such a Saviour? Will you not yield to Him to-night? May the Lord bless you, and help you to come to Him!

### GREAT CAMPAIGN MEETING TUESDAY NIGHT, FEBRUARY 5th, IN JARVIS STREET.

(Continued from page 10.)

a campaign to give information throughout the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec. An endeavour will be made to hold a meeting in every city and town, village and hamlet, where there is a Baptist church, and in many other places beside, with the twofold object of giving information respecting the present apostate condition of McMaster, and the compromising spirit and course of all the Boards of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. This week's *Witness* is in some respects a sample of what is yet to come.

The Executive Board of the Union is convinced that literally thousands of the members of the churches of the Ontario and Quebec Convention, if informed of the facts, will repudiate McMaster's teaching; while thousands of others are already convinced of her heresies, and are only perplexed to know what course they should take. The contacts we have with Baptist sentiment throughout the two provinces encourage us to believe that great movements are just ahead of us.

The sessions of the Union held to-day in Toronto were characterized by the greatest possible enthusiasm, and the Executive adjourned with the determination to press the battle to the gate as never before.

The Secretary of the Union, Rev. W. E. Atkinson, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto, will be glad to hear from Baptists, individuals or groups, from any part of Ontario or Quebec, who will be ready to co-operate in preparing for and holding a meeting in connection with this campaign.

### A CORRECTION.

In our leading article, "Uncovering McMaster's Heresy", last week, referring to Messrs. Holliday and Rumball, we said, "Both of these men are graduates of McMaster University, and have sat in Professor Marshall's classes nearly ever since he came to McMaster." This was our understanding of the case from a conversation we had with these brethren. Mr. Rumball informs us that it was true they had sat in Professor Parker's classes for such a period, but that they had sat in Professor Marshall's classes for only one full term.

# The Union Baptist Witness

This page is the Authorized Official Organ of The Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec.  
W. GORDON BROWN, Editor.

## "ONCE MORE."

Once again we resume the rather grave responsibility of editing the two pages of *The Gospel Witness*, which are devoted to the interests of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec. We desire publicly to thank the Editor-in-chief for the very kind remarks he made about us in announcing our recent illness to our readers; and also to voice our appreciation for the sincere interest and earnest prayers on our behalf from many who have become our friends through these pages. The Union office has kindly looked after this department in addition to other heavy duties week by week.

The experience of the past ten weeks has certainly confirmed our belief in miracles as a part of God's programme even in this page. We trust that our ministry may be enriching by the experiences which have been ours.

And now

"Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more".

We again ask Union pastors and clerks to be prompt in sending us items of interest for publication. Such accounts of blessing are of vital interest to sister churches, and they are not without encouragement for readers in other parts than those covered by our new Convention.

\* \* \* \*

## WHEATLEY REGULARS.

The Immanuel Regular Baptist Church of Wheatley, Ontario, (Rev. John Dodds pastor), held their Annual Business Meeting on January 23rd. The meeting had been postponed from the 9th on account of the sickness of a number of the members. There was a touch of sadness, moreover, for one of the oldest members had, since the last meeting, passed on.

Under the pastorate of Rev. Mr. Dodds the work continues to enjoy the divine favour. All departments reported an increase, which was particularly noticeable along missionary lines.

\* \* \* \*

## OTTERVILLE, ONTARIO.

"The annual meeting of the Regular Baptist Church of Otterville was held in the church Thursday afternoon, Jan. 24th, with a large number of the members present. The reports showed increases by baptism, 15, by experience, 22, by letter, 4. The present membership is 88, with five to be received by letter in the immediate future, bringing the membership to 93.

"Something over \$2,100 was raised by all departments, and of this amount \$234.34 was for missions.

"A spirit of unity and co-operation prevails and we look forward with great hopefulness to another year of soul-winning effort. Our prayer is for revival."  
—Rev. H. S. Bennett.

## SCOTLAND, ONTARIO.

"Scotland Union Regular Baptist Church held its first annual meeting on Wednesday, Jan. 23rd. The morning session was spent in prayer and hearing reports. About sixty members and friends sat down to a bounteous dinner. After dinner the meeting was again called to order and the officers for the coming year were elected.

"The treasurer's report showed that \$3,243.59 had been received for all purposes, of which \$1,930.31 was for the building fund. Baptisms for the year numbered eight, and the total increase was fourteen.

"The prevailing note was one of wonder and praise, as we heard of the great things that the Lord our God has done for us; and we go into the new year with every confidence in Him, and with the prayer that He will keep us continually in His will, using us to the salvation of many souls."—Rev. T. L. White.

\* \* \* \*

## GRACE CHURCH.

The third annual meeting of the Grace Regular Baptist Church was held on January 23rd at the West End Y.M.C.A., with Pastor G. W. Allen in the chair and a large representation of the membership in attendance. The membership of this church now stands at 221, of which 7% are Jewish. During the year 9 were baptized, 6 of whom united with the church, while 7 were received by letter and 6 by experience. Grace church is blessed with a number of members engaged fully in Christian work. Rev. F. Kendal is their Jewish Missionary in Toronto; two other members are conducting a Jewish Mission in Ottawa, another in Chicago, another in Buffalo; 13 of the young people are studying for Christian service; 2 others left on February 4th for China. Three have been ordained to the Gospel ministry, (2 of whom are Hebrews); two more have been licensed to preach; one unordained preacher is to be brought before the sister churches shortly; while another is in the Central Y.M.C.A. of Montreal.

Extensive open-air work was carried on last summer, with an average of four services each week. One large motor truck was used, but this summer the church hopes to have three such trucks, for these have been secured already, and are being fitted up as funds permit. During the year \$3,778 was raised for local work, \$1,779 for missions, of which \$860 was for the local Jewish work. From outside sources \$1,903 was also received for Jewish work.

\* \* \* \*

## ATTENTION, TREASURERS.

Our office expresses the earnest hope that our church treasurers may undertake to send in their contributions monthly. We understand that our women's board have this monthly forward-

ing system in full operation, and that its a very satisfactory one. Let all the church treasurers try to follow their good example.

\* \* \* \*

## THIS SECTION.

One of our friends recently donated \$25 toward the expense of *The Union Baptist Witness* section of *The Gospel Witness*. We believe he is setting a very good example which others might follow. Personally we hope for the time when our Union will fully pay its own expense in connection with *The Witness*, as it does not do now, having to depend upon the general funds of *The Gospel Witness*.

\* \* \* \*

## WINGHAM, ONTARIO.

Mrs. Davey visited Wingham recently. "In spite of the deep snow and stormy night, there was a fair representation of our membership at the meeting and to me it will be a night long remembered. Mrs. Davey came to us a stranger, but she has left us as a friend; that will insure to her the hearty co-operation of prayer as she goes forth to the pioneer mission work. Her personal touch with the Women's Auxiliary will be of great value, for though they are small in number, yet they meet every Wednesday afternoon to pray for Missions."—Rev. Edgar Ferns.

\* \* \* \*

## MRS. DAVEY AT STOUFFVILLE.

To hear our out-going Missionary to Liberia, Mrs. Horace Davey, the four churches of Baker Hill, First Markham, Second Markham and Stouffville united for meeting on the afternoon and evening of January 25th. The weather was very inclement and it was impossible for many to attend. Yet about eighty gathered in the afternoon. Rev. Harry Peer, of Willowdale, Ontario, brought a timely and searching message on the Ephesian church. Then Mrs. Davey followed with another message, which brought tears to the eyes of many and conversion regarding the need and value of missions to others. A season of prayer followed. About one hundred sat down for supper. This was followed by informal addresses from Deacon Abner (Baker Hill Church); Rev. W. S. Whitcombe (Second Markham and Baker Hill Churches), and Deacon Maurice Gillion (Stouffville Church), while Mr. Lorne Hisey spoke on behalf of our Toronto Baptist Seminary. To about 130 people assembled for the evening service, Mrs. Davey presented vividly the need of Africa, while Rev. Mr. Peer brought a strong message on that glorious theme, "The Atoning Blood".

The following Sunday Mrs. Davey spoke at Second Markham Church in the morning, Stouffville Mission Band in the afternoon, and to a large congregation at Stouffville in the evening.

**BAPTIST BIBLE UNION LESSON LEAF**

Vol. IV.

No. 1

REV. ALEX. THOMSON, Editor.

Lesson 9. First Quarter. March 3, 1929

**PUBLIC PRAYER.**

Lesson Text: 1 Timothy, chapter 2.

Golden Text: "For there is one God; and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." (1 Timothy, 2:5,6).

**I. THE NATURE AND SUBJECTS OF PRAYER, (v. 1).****(A) The Nature of prayer, (v. 1).**

1. The apostle having reminded Timothy of the charge entrusted to him proceeds to give direction concerning church order, dealing first with public prayer. The nature of such prayer is to be found in the terms used in relation to it, applicable also to private prayer. There is expressed the suppliant's sense of need in the term "supplications" which portrays the right attitude of the one approaching the throne of grace. He comes into the presence of the King not as one demanding a right, but as a needy individual granted a gracious privilege. 2. In the term "prayer" there is expressed in a general way the devotional aspect of this exercise, and in that of "intercessions" the aspect of appeal on behalf of others, while in the "giving of thanks" there is the expression of gratitude for blessing received. In these terms there is implied prayer in its every aspect, and each part requires due emphasis.

**B. The subjects of prayer, (vs. 1, 2).**

1. The subjects of prayer are to be "all men". This is a general term implying that prayer is to be all inclusive, and not exclusive. God loves the whole world and our prayers are to be as broad as His love. Special mention is made, however, of particular persons such as kings, and all those in authority, and this no doubt with the local situation in view. In praying for those persons they were praying many of them for their persecutors, for those against whom they might be expected to show disaffection, and such public prayer while producing the result stated, (v. 2), would also have a good effect upon the heathen who heard of it. 2. Our rulers while not adopting the attitude of persecutors, yet require our prayers. They have great responsibility, they are subject to strong temptation, and in need of great wisdom that their decisions may be arrived at and recorded fearlessly, in line with the will of God. More prayer on behalf of our rulers would undoubtedly produce better rulers.

**C. The reasons for prayer, (3-8).**

1. Such prayer is enjoined first of all, because of its beneficent result, (v. 2), the community life reaping the benefit in quietness, peace, and godliness. Prayer undoubtedly changes things, and if the Lord's people would pray more, there would be greater victory over sin and more happiness in the community. In the second place such prayer should be offered because it is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour,

(v. 3). There are many things we do not understand about prayer, but this we are sure of, it is God's will we should approach Him in this manner. 2. In further emphasis of this we are informed that God desires the salvation of all men, (v. 4). This clearly implies the universality of His love and salvation, and gives distinct encouragement to all efforts for the redemption of the lost at home and abroad. With such a universal application are we doing our part in spreading the good news? 3. As a further intimation of God's desire for the salvation of all men we are informed of His unity in essence and purpose, (vs. 5, 6). He is one God and as such common to all, they are all His creatures and He deals with them through one Mediator, who gave Himself a ransom for all. The manhood of our Lord is referred to as affecting His mediatorship. He took upon Himself our flesh, but He was God manifest in this manner. A mediator is one who goes between and such was and is our Lord, and apart from Him there is no salvation. From this we may therefore learn of the means of salvation, the unity and applicability of its place, and the purpose of our Lord's death on Calvary. And there is also implied the condemnation of all plans of salvation outside of Christ. 4. Having declared such a revelation the apostle adds that unto such a message was he ordained a preacher, (v. 7), and concludes this section with an exhortation concerning the attitude and condition of those who take part in prayer, (v. 8). We note therefore, that the one who prays should be holy in life, and that prayer should be unselfish in its supplication, worldwide in its intercession, particular in its application, and characterized by real faith in its expectation.

**II. WOMEN IN THE PUBLIC ASSEMBLY, (vs. 9-15).****(A) Women, their dress and deportment, (vs. 9-10).**

The apostle has just given instruction concerning men in the public assembly, now he gives direction concerning the women, dealing first with their appearance and attitude. They are to adorn themselves in modest apparel or in seemly guise. Evidently there were some who were not dressing in accord with their profession. They were adorning themselves in an objectionable manner, and required correction and direction concerning their duty in the matter. The subject is of sufficient importance to require attention. The general deportment of the person may either help or hinder the work of the Lord. Many women have a weakness for fine dresses and adornments, and while it is not wrong to be neatly dressed, yet we must remember the service in which she is engaged, and the effect upon others of her dress and deportment. Some of the modern costumes with their defects in abbreviation and otherwise, should not be countenanced by women professing godliness. The main emphasis requires to be laid upon the production of good works. Be not concerned about things, but be taken up with the persons and especially with the greatest person of all, Jesus, and wear apparel and conduct oneself in such a manner as to

bring glory to His name. Dress to live, do not live to dress. And learn not to copy the world in its hurtful customs but to bring all thoughts and desires into captivity unto Christ that the life may be used in His service.

**(B) Women and the teaching ministry. (vs. 11-14).**

1. In studying this section we are reminded of the fact, also made clear in other parts of Scripture, that God has designed men and women for distinct spheres in the work of the world, and of His service. In this design they are complementary to each other, and not competitors. Modern conditions have somewhat obscured this, but in the interest of good order, real progress and happiness, we do well to pay heed to it, remembering that it is never beneficial to depart from the Divine order. 2. In relation to the public ministry of the church, it is first of all directed that women are to learn in silence with entire submission, (v. 11) no doubt implying that they are not to interrupt the public service. This is followed by an injunction forbidding them to teach or to usurp authority over the men, (v. 12). The application of this prohibition relates to the teaching ministry and forbids women occupying the office of public teacher, including that of the pastorate. The reasons given are two, that man was first in creation, (v. 13), and two, that woman was the deceived one at the fall and was in the transgression, (v. 14). The man is the head of the race, the head of the family, and the leader in the church, and woman is his helpmate. This does not imply inferiority on her part, she is on the same plane before God. But in the reference to her transgression there would seem to be the inference that she is more easily deceived than man, possibly because of her greater trustfulness, and that consequently she is less qualified for the office of public teacher. The concluding verse emphasizes woman's particular sphere of service. She shall be saved, the apostle states, through her childbearing, if she continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety, (v. 15). This implies that woman will be kept in safety and in the enjoyment of salvation in her own natural sphere, attending to the particular and peculiar functions of her sex, if her life conforms to the will of God. Woman has her own sphere of duty and influence which man cannot enter, and it is great in its potential power. She does not require to take upon herself the office of the man, she has an equally important work of her own. Learn from this, the Divine purpose relating to the ministry, the necessity for order in the church, and the privilege and power of a mother's influence in the home.

**ON IT'S BACK.**

"According to a writer in *The Atlantic Monthly*, a sheep often dies when it gets on its back, and cannot get off. We remember our Lord compared his people to sheep. We remember that most of our sheep are on their back every Sunday morning instead of being at church and Sunday School. Wonder if they're dead?"—*The North Platte Baptist*.