

THE Canadian Evangelist

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

BY THE

Evangelist Publishing Co. 55 YONCE ST. ARCADE, TORONTO.

Terms \$1.00 per annum in advance.

GEORGE MUNRO Editor.

DONALD MUNRO, } Publishers. C. O. CRAWFORD, }

All matter intended for publication, and all exchanges to be addressed to George Munro, Erie, Ontario, Canada.

All business communications and remittances to be sent to the EVANGELIST PUBLISHING CO., 55 Yonce St. Arcade, Toronto.

Remittances sent by post office order or registered letter will come at our risk.

No paper discontinued without express orders and payment of all arrearsages.

In ordering change of address be sure to give the old post office as well as the new.

TORONTO, AUGUST 1st, 1891.

Communion.

OPEN, CLOSE AND OTHERWISE.

Communion is one of the Scriptural names for what is commonly called the Lord's Supper. It is the word used in connection with "close" and "open" when the question is being discussed as to who has a Scriptural right to sit at the Lord's table.

Open Communion signifies the practice of those who allow and invite all who profess to be Christians and are living godly lives to break bread with them.

Close Communion signifies the practice of those who allow none but those of their own faith and order to break bread with them.

"Otherwise" we use to denote the practice of (1) Those who invite none but immersed believers who are living godly lives to break bread with them; (2) Those who invite all immersed believers who are living godly lives to break bread with them; but as to other godly professing Christians, they neither invite nor debar them, saying, that it is the Lord's table, and that such persons must determine for themselves whether or not they are entitled to "eat of the bread and drink of the cup."

How shall we decide which, if any, of these practices is correct? By referring the question to the New Testament, of course. We should enquire what were the qualifications of those who in the days of the Apostles sat at the Lord's table. If we can determine that point, the question will be settled. We find, then, that the Lord told His disciples to observe this ordinance in remembrance of Him, and we find further, when any record is made of such observance, it was by disciples of Christ; and any instructions relative to it were given to such people and to such alone. So, then, we conclude that only disciples of Christ have a right to sit at the Lord's table. And if the additional question be raised, "Who is a disciple of Christ?" we must again appeal to the New Testament for an answer. Among many pertinent passages, we quote Gal. iii. 26, 27: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Those words were addressed by the Apostle Paul to churches of Christ, and we know the churches were composed of disciples of Christ. And we, therefore, learn that a disciple of Christ is a believer in Him who has been baptized into Him; and by "baptized," as a matter of course, we mean being "Buried with Him in baptism" (Col. ii. 12)—that is, immersion. And so we Scripturally reach the answer to the question, which, if any, of the aforementioned practices is correct, and affirm that only immersed believers who are living godly lives are Scripturally qualified, and should be

invited to sit at the Lord's table; we add the qualification, "who are living godly lives," because we also learn from the New Testament that a godly walk and conversation were requisite in order to continued membership in the church of Christ.

To say that it is the Lord's table, and that it is not for us to invite or debar, is the same as to say that the church of Christ is the Lord's church and it is not for us to say what are the conditions of membership in it. We have no difficulty in discovering the conditions of membership in the Lord's church, and we have no hesitation in declaring what they are; there need be no hesitation in declaring what are the qualifications for a place at the Lord's table. No consideration of policy, or of charity, so-called, should prevent us from plainly declaring the law of the Lord in the one case as in the other.

Educating the Baptists.

The editor of the Canadian Baptist is again "setting the heather on fire" among his brethren on the question of the lawfulness of man-made creeds as tests of fellowship. As was evident in the discussion we had with him last fall he is a liberal-minded Baptist, and he appears to be resolved to educate his brethren generally up to his own advanced position. We wish him much success in his heroic efforts; we say heroic efforts, because, as we affirmed in substance some time ago, and as a correspondent of the Baptist says in the July 16th number of that paper, "That nine out of every ten Baptist churches in the United States and Canada have adopted this Confession (the New Hampshire) as formulating and setting forth the leading doctrines of revelation." What gave rise to the present discussion in the Baptist was the publication in its columns recently, with strong editorial approval, of an exceptionally powerful sermon by Dr. T. E. Brown, an American Baptist minister of great courage and ability as his sermon amply proves. It is a stirring plea for liberty within New Testament lines, and an almost violent protest against those whose purpose it is to confine Baptist ministers within the limits of the Philadelphia or New Hampshire Confessions of Faith. We may say that so far as the matter in hand is concerned, Dr. Brown stands on practically the same ground as do the people known as Disciples of Christ. It is no small joy to know that able men like Dr. Brown and the editor of the Canadian Baptist are manfully fighting the same glorious battle for freedom in which the Disciples have been engaged since the early part of this century. And so while we regret to see that Baptist churches continue to be organized in this country on the basis of the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, we rejoice to observe that the editor of their denominational organ lives in the nineteenth century, and is determined that if his brethren will live in the seventeenth it will not be his fault.

Where the Money Goes.

It is not the necessities of life that keep a man poor in providing them, but the luxuries. Let any man, with or without a family, put the cost of his necessities in one column and the cost of his luxuries in another and he will very soon see that this is the case. It does not cost a great deal for a man to live. And a good thing it is that such is the case, else the hard working laboring classes would find a ready answer to the question whether life is worth living. Probably nine out of ten of those who are taking comfort from the fact that the price of sugar has been reduced will not deny themselves a single dollar's worth of the solace to be

extracted from their pipe and tobacco. Nor will there be any decrease in the consumption of strong waters, even if the price should be increased as a result of the enhanced duty.

Yet we all think it is something to rejoice over that there has been a reduction in the price of sugar. And no doubt it is, especially to the housewives who have to maintain a perpetual course of cheeseparing in order to make both ends meet on the weekly allowance. Few men think of what they spend on themselves. It does not seem to occur to them that while the current of expenditure is restricted to a very fine stream at the spigot it may be running pretty freely at the bung-hole. It is not the expenditure on sugar, nor yet on the ordinary commodities of life that keeps people poor, but the expenditure on things which could, with a little self-sacrifice, be done without. How many men leave their wives to practise economy in the household expenses while they keep no track of the money they spend themselves on tobacco and beer?—Hamilton Herald.

The above strikes us as being so sensible and well put as to justify our giving it a prominent place in THE EVANGELIST. Let all our men readers "read, mark, learn and inwardly digest." Is it not true that "Few men think of what they spend on themselves"?

"The Letter from Japan" will be found very interesting reading. We thank Bro. Snodgrass for favoring us with it.

Are you the superintendent of a Sunday school? If so, please read and reflect upon what is said in Co-operation Notes to you.

We learn from the Standard of July 25th that a great meeting was in progress at Wichita, Kansas, with 259 additions up to July 18th.

Among our selections is an article on "Dangerous and Misleading Teaching" from the Christian Guardian, the Canadian Methodist church paper. It is none too severe upon those who place their own vagaries above the Word of God.

The number of Disciples in Australasia is, approximately, as follows: Victoria, 5,000; South Australia, 2,100; New Zealand, 2,000; New South Wales, 1,000; Queensland, 500; Tasmania, 300; Western Australia, 25. Total, 10,925.—Christian Pioneer.

"The Constitution and By-Laws and Journal of Proceedings of the Canadian Press Association at Thirty-Third Annual meeting 1891," is gotten up in good style by the J. B. McLean Co., Toronto. The annual meeting was very interesting and profitable and the dinner a very pleasant affair.

It has been intimated to us that Prof. Jules de Launay intends to make a tour among the Disciples in Ontario. It is none of our business to dictate to the churches, but we feel it our duty to suggest that, in view of the paragraph concerning him from the Christian Leader, which we published in our July 1st number, it would not be prudent for our brethren to receive him or to bid him Godspeed.

They have post cards also in Japan. We received one July 22nd with the following written thereon:—

Shonai, June 30th, 1891.

Many thanks for copies of THE EVANGELIST. As we sail for America about August 20th or Sept. 1st, our address should be changed from Shonai, Yamagata Ken, Japan, to Coon Rapids, Carroll Co., Iowa. After eight years in a foreign land we are anxious to see loved ones again.

Fraternally, CHAS. E. GARST.

Elsewhere in this paper will be found a statement from Bro. A. N. Gilbert. He has had large experience as an evangelist, and has held very successful protracted meetings for large city churches. Churches may send for Bro. Gilbert with the assurance that he will preach the Gospel fully, forcibly and fervently.

Dr. Phillips Brooks on being recently asked to furnish a sketch of his career for the record of his class in Harvard, replied: "I have had no wife, no children, no particular honors, no serious misfortune and no adventures worth speaking of. It is shameful, at such times as these, not to have a history, but I have not got one and must come without."—Christian Leader.

The Michigan Disciples, so the Apostolic Guide informs us, intend to hold their annual convention in Detroit, beginning August 20th and continuing four days. President Zollars, of Hiram, is to be there, and President Loos, of Lexington, and J. H. Garrison of St. Louis. It will, therefore, be a big convention. We should not wonder if any of us Ontario people were to happen there if we should be made welcome.

I would like to learn how "Religion is the science of good manners," as THE CANADIAN EVANGELIST for July 1st states. In simplicity we thought religion was infinitely higher than manners of any quality. J. B.

The brother refers to a sentence near the foot of column four, page six, of our July 1st number. The editor disclaims any responsibility for the statement; it is very far from being a complete definition of religion, especially of the Christian religion. Bro. J. B.'s point is well taken. We shall be sorry if our columns offend in that way again.

The subjoined press dispatch sets forth the latest we have seen in regard to the Briggs' case:—

New York, July 18.—Eight hundred thousand dollars, nearly the total endowment fund of the Union Theological Seminary, is in jeopardy on account of the action of the directors in Dr. Briggs' case. The endowment fund was established upon the assurance that the seminary was permanently under the control of the Presbyterian church. Now that the directors refuse to be guided by the General Assembly, disapproving of Dr. Briggs' election to the faculty, the large donations may be withdrawn. Mr. Russell Sage is waiting for the action of the directors in the fall before deciding to bring suit to recover his donation of \$5,000. Other large donors were ex-Governor Edwin D. Morgan and Banker Brown. The withdrawal of nearly the entire cash endowment of the seminary will depend on the action of the directors in the fall.

Drake University having conferred on B. W. Johnson the title of Doctor of Divinity, the honor was respectfully declined in an open letter which appears in the Christian Evangelist. The declination is based on the words of Christ: "Be not ye called Rabbi," which B. W. Johnson interprets to mean, as our fathers also did, that ecclesiastical titles given for the mere sake of honor are forbidden by the Saviour. That he is correct in this and thoroughly right in refusing the title we have no manner of doubt. Only once before, if we mistake not, has such an honor been proffered any of our ministers, and in that case it was accepted. We are glad to see that in the present instance it has been firmly and politely declined. It is a new thing for one of our institutions to confer this degree. We saw the fact announced with no small measure of astonishment. May it be a long time before this bad precedent finds any imitators.—Geo. Davis, in Guide.

Judging from the outspoken and unqualified condemnation of the innovation we notice in a number of our United States papers, "D.D.'s" will not be very thick among us for a while. We are glad to believe it is a small minority of Disciples that favors the "D.D." business.

Just now there is among English Baptists considerable questioning as to the reason why they are not making more rapid progress—why, indeed, they are not keeping pace with the increase of population. The last report of their church membership showed that they had fallen behind not far from a thousand members during the year. Of course, many reasons for such a condition might be assigned, and nearly every one has his own. But it is interesting to note that not a few are persuaded that it is due largely to the "open communion" practice, which causes Baptists to feel that their principles are hardly worth contending for, and which at the same time makes the passage from their own to other denominations exceedingly easy.—Journal and Messenger.

Is "close communion" the only thing English Baptists are contending for? And why won't the rule work both ways, so as to make the passage from other denominations to the Baptists as easy as "the passage from them to other denominations?"—Christian Evangelist.

It is the baptistery that makes it more difficult to pass from a Pædobaptist church to a Baptist church than vice versa.

Julia Ward Howe gives as a reason for exchanging the ministry of Theodore Parker for that of James Freeman Clarke that she wanted her children to attend service where their minds would be inspired with reverence. The former, with all his pulpit brilliancy, was deficient in "religious force" and in all those qualities which go to make up a religious "atmosphere." She realized the value of early impressions and wanted her children to be deeply impressed with the spirit of reverence in the house of God. She knew that such a spirit was vital to the right development of character, and for that alone she sought for them the ministry of James Freeman Clarke. And should not all parents be equally careful in regard to the same thing? And should not all ministers seek to give, as far as in them lies, a pronounced tone of reverence to every service they conduct? Does not the Watchman say the right word when it says: "We have heard much talk and read many articles on how ministers should reach 'the masses.' We have heard and seen surprisingly little on how ministers by their sermons and the conduct of public worship are to inspire reverence in the minds of young children."—Guide.

The preachers among us will do well to take heed to themselves in regard to the impression their manner in the pulpit makes upon the young and upon the old too.

What the Canada Presbyterian says in the subjoined paragraph may be accepted in a general way:—

The poorest "stick" in any church is the creature who is so bigoted that he refuses to learn anything from other denominations. There is no church better all round than the Presbyterian, but Presbyterians might learn several useful things from their neighbors. From the Episcopalians some of them might learn not to allow every tramp that comes along to use their pulpits. From the same body they might learn not to use the pulpit as a dead head advertising medium. Complaint is made of Episcopalian exclusiveness. The exclusiveness that keeps other than Episcopal ministers out of the pulpit may seem extreme, but it will wear better than the inclusiveness that admits every "ecclesiastical prowler" into the pulpit. No notices at all is better than turning the pulpit into a bulletin board and using God's house and God's day for dead-head advertising for the benefit of every crank who may want his show advertised. From the Methodists we might take many points in the way of making our church machinery flexible and adapting it to our environ-