

# ONTARIO EVANGELIST.

"Go ... .. speak ... .. to the people ALL the words of this Life."

VOL. 2.

ERIN AND EVERTON, ONTARIO, SEPTEMBER, 1887.

No. 5

## POETRY.

### TYRIF ACTION.

Is the part of a coward to brood  
O'er the past that is withered and dead;  
What though the heart's roses are ashes and dust?  
What though the heart's music be fled?  
Still shine the grand heavens o'erhead,  
Whence the voice of an angel thrills clear on the soul,  
"Gird about thee thine armour, press on to the goal!"  
If the faults or the crimes of thy youth  
Are a burden too heavy to bear,  
What hope can rebloom on the desolate waste  
Of a jealous and craven despair?  
Down, down with the fetters of fear!  
In the strength of thy valour and manhood arise,  
With the faith that illumines and the will that defies.  
"Too late!" through God's infinite world,  
From his throne to life's nethermost fires—  
"Too late!" is a phantom that flies at the dawn  
Of the soul that repents and aspires.  
If pure thou hast made thy desires,  
There's no height the strong wings of immortals may gain  
Which in striving to reach thou shalt strive for in vain.  
Then up to the contest of fate,  
Unbound by the past, which is dead!  
What though the heart's roses are ashes and dust?  
What though the heart's music be fled?  
Still shine the fair heavens o'erhead:  
And sublime as the angel who rules in the sun  
Beams the promise of peace when the conflict is won!  
—Paul Hamilton Hayne.

### THE PATTERN.

"Hold the pattern of sound words which thou hast heard from me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." II Tim. 1: 13 (N. Y.)  
This injunction is not only suggestive but authoritative, being given by inspiration of God, and ought to be carefully and conscientiously obeyed in all generations by the servants of Christ. "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual"; which words, says Macknight, are more fit for expressing the doctrines of Christ than any words of human invention.  
If Moses was under the strictest obligation to make all things according to the pattern which was shown to him in the mount without the slightest deviation; are not we, under the Christian dispensation, also restricted to the pattern given to the holy apostles with whom Christ promised to be until the end of the ages? Most assuredly; and, notwithstanding the many innovations, both in words and in doctrine, which are now so popular and, apparently, successful, we ought to count it a privilege, although it involves self-denial, to hold the pattern of sound words, and so realize that we have the blessing of the Saviour resting upon us, and the bright hope of His approbation and acceptance at the great day of reward.  
We have no desire to be censorious or in any way uncharitable when we call attention to the many denominational designations that have been assumed by professed followers of Christ all at variance with the "pattern of sound words" and obstructive to that union of His people which Christ designed and prayed for. Is it not enough to "make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (N. Y.) without making sectarians of them? Is it not also better to use the words Father, Son and Holy Spirit, than to depart from the pattern and say "Trinity"? Not only in this connection, but always; for there are such incomprehensible wonders in the Godhead that the finite mind cannot comprehend, nor the wisest "natural man" find words to designate or unfold the Infinite! And, notwithstanding all the scholastic intrigues and the many specious arguments that have been used to void the appearance of departure from the command of Christ quoted above in the commission, is it not better, nobler and far safer to stand to the undoubted meaning of the sound word "Baptizing," and bury those disciples to Christ "by baptism into death that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so they also should walk in newness of life?"  
And now, dear reader, before you accept of any religious teaching in what you hear or what

you read, compare it with the pattern of sound words, if it corresponds, receive it; if it is unlike the pattern, reject it. The Bereans were a noble people, "in that they received the word with all readiness of mind and searched the scriptures daily whether these things were so." If you have never made a profession of religion, look around and discover what people are in name, in doctrine and in practice most like the pattern and unite yourself with them. Remember that it is not what is most popular with man, nor what is in the majority, that is safe for you or pleasing to God, but what God himself has appointed.  
E. SHEPPARD.

Ridgetown.

### CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

I have before my mind two men—the one a wilful sinner the other the man who is overtaken in a fault. Paul said to Timothy, "Them that sin rebuke before all that others may fear." To the Galatians he says, "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one." You will notice that those two men require different treatment. They are both in the church, however, and must be dealt with according to their offence. The one is to be restored, the other rebuked. The man who sins in the sense in which the apostle here speaks deserves to be rebuked before all. Indeed it would almost seem necessary in order to his restoration. The apostle, in extreme cases, would "deliver him over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh," or the works of the flesh, 1st Cor. 5th chap. You will see by consulting the sacred letter to this church that the man was, doubtless, restored. Just here I would like some brother just to speak right out and tell us the chapter and verse in which may be found the authority for demanding of an erring brother a confession of his fault before the whole congregation in order to his restoration. The man who is overtaken must be restored, according to Gal. 6th; or, if of the class who sin wilfully, rebuked before all that others may fear. 1st Tim. 5: 20. What is it then to be overtaken in a fault? and what is meant by "them that sin?" or is there any difference? and what is meant by the words restore and rebuke?

I once knew a man who was regarded as of high moral worth—in fact he was quite a religious character. One morning just as he was pulling on his boots, his neighbor entered and commenced such a tirade of abuse about some paltry affair, that the man's temper, like electricity, caught him and instead of pulling on the boot he pulled it off and dealt his assailant a terrible blow in the forehead. He was sorry in a moment, but it was too late: the deed was done. I presume he was overtaken in a fault.

Do you see those two men coming up the street yonder? They are in close conversation—one is a young man, just brought into the church—the other is an elderly brother, seems to be religious. They stop opposite the hotel; the "elder" says "Let's go in, the young man hesitates for a moment, and thoughtlessly enters. They engage in the conversation which does not seem particularly objectionable; the elder enjoys it—has been there before. After a little the young brother begins to feel just a little out of place. The evening passes 'tis midnight—they take a cigar, then a little ginger wine, and finally they both become intoxicated. Which of the two men is overtaken in a fault? and which deserves to be censured as a wilful sinner and rebuked before all? You will say at once the elder of the two who induced the young, inexperienced brother to enter the hotel; and this young brother should be restored by those who are spiritual, or the elders of the church, perhaps.

But have we any New Testament examples of persons overtaken in a fault and those who sin? Peter, whose ambition, at one time, led him to look for a high position in the temporal kingdom which he thought the Saviour was about to establish, it appears was sometimes overtaken in a fault. You know at one time he followed his Lord afar off. When he was charged with being one of Jesus' disciples, he said, "I know not the man." Peter was afraid to acknowledge Jesus. John wasn't, for he went right into the palace of the High Priest. Peter was overtaken

in a fault. The Saviour looked at Peter just looked at him it was enough. Peter went out and wept bitterly. The Lord restored him. Do you recollect the time he cut off the man's ear? I wonder He hadn't cut off both and the head too. Peter was very impulsive—just the man to be overtaken in a fault. Paul said at one time "he was to be blamed." Gal. 2: 11. I admire Peter as a man, but John was never even overtaken in a fault—he was indeed the beloved disciple.

But do you see that long, gaunt, hickory-faced, traitorous sneak, standing yonder with the bag open to receive what is put therein. There he goes. He is going to the priest's to make a bargain to deliver Jesus to them. He wants money—he wants the bag full. He goes, and presently he returns with a multitude of Jesus' enemies. Serpent-like he stretches his slimy form over the Man of Sorrows, and shall I say it? yes the scriptures say it—and kissed him. Is it possible? Horrid!! You would think that all the sin and degradation of fallen humanity had found its way into the heart of this miserable creature. The Saviour said, "Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?" Better to do it in almost any other way. Judas wasn't overtaken in a fault—he was not restored. But there is something to be done with the man who is overtaken in a fault, and also with them that sin. The apostle says of the man overtaken in a fault, "Restore him." Restore means to bring back, to replace, to repair, to heal, to cure; and you will notice there is no such command given concerning the man who sins, though, I presume, by taking the proper course, as marked out by the scriptures, he too may be restored like the incestuous person mentioned in the Corinthian letters.

The wilful sinner is to be rebuked before all that others may fear. What is that thing to be done to those who thus sin? Whatever it is, it is to be done before all. Paul said to Titus, regarding the Christians who were not always truthful, "Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." To rebuke, then means, sometimes to blame mildly, to reprove, to chide; all of which, if properly administered, in the spirit of meekness, will, doubtless, result in the restoration of the guilty party. If, however, the party will not stand the rebuke, deliver him over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. This is a scriptural course and may, as in the case of the incestuous person, lead to his restoration.

Winger, July 18th, 1887.

H. BROWN.

### C. J. L. CRITICISED.

Owing to my arduous duties and incessant labor in the great Reform fields in this country, I have little time to note or criticize much of what my brethren say in theological lines, but still I am constrained to say a few words in reference to Bro. C. J. L.'s strictures on Bro. Firth's former articles in the EVANGELIST, on the resurrection.

Now, Bro. C. J. L. is very emphatic in pronouncing against what he calls "the materialistic teaching of to-day." From this one would judge he is an "immaterialist,"—whatever that means.

All recognized authors on philology tell us that "material is the substance of which things are composed." Now, by a parity of language, immateriality is the exact opposite; therefore, immateriality is, strictly speaking, the substance (pardon the expression) of which things are not composed! "Immateriality" then is, literally speaking, nothing—a blank vacuum!

The trouble with Bro. C. J. L. is that he takes for granted that because "flesh and blood," in its present natural state, "cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," therefore there are no material beings in that kingdom. This is the common mistake of all immaterialists.

Again I would ask: Did Jesus alter his resurrection "appear" to Thomas and the rest of his disciples in the same body which was crucified on the cross; or was He practising a deception on Thomas when He said "reach hither thy fingers and thrust them into my side, and be not faithless but believing." Was this the same material body which had been "broken" with

the cruel spear? or, was it an immaterial phantom body which only seemed to be "the same Jesus whom ye have taken and with wicked hands have crucified and slain?" Which?

The truth of the matter is, there is something radically wrong about much of the teaching we hear now-a-days upon the question of "natural bodies" and "spiritual bodies." One class of teachers conclude, because it can be proven that our future bodies are not to be composed of "flesh and blood," therefore they are immaterial—a mere phantom body.

I would say much more upon this all important question, but my time and your space will not permit; suffice it to say that when this stupendous question of the "after life" is better understood by our brethren, and the ever-living doctrine of Jesus and the resurrection is more fully preached, and better preached, than it is now, we shall see scores, where we now see one, coming to the cross of Christ.

When you ask me what I know about the state of the dead, I will answer you; I don't know anything about it; I only know, according to God's promises, that "the dead shall live again." More when time and space will allow.

E. EVANS.

Tonawanda, N. Y., June 16th, 1887.

### REPLY.

I have for Bro. E. a high regard as a Christian and an earnest worker in the church of Christ. It is, therefore, infernal that he has written hastily. All who know him, know him to be "well posted" on the subject in hand.

"All recognized authors on philology tell us," Now read what Bro. E. says they tell us, and then read the following from Worcester's Dictionary:—

### MATERIAL.

(1) Anything composed of matter. (2) The matter or substance of which anything is composed; that from which anything is formed; as the materials for a building.

### MATERIALIST.

One who denies spirit in man or in the universe is a perfect materialist.—Fleming.

### IMMATERIAL.

(1) Not consisting of matter; not possessing the properties of matter; not material; incorporeal; void of matter; spiritual.

Angels are spirits, immaterial and intellectual.—Hooper.

### IMMATERIALITY.

Is predicated of mind, to denote that, as a substance, it is different from matter.

Spirituality is the positive expression of the same idea.—Fleming.

Dr. Worcester ought to be a "recognized author" in "Uncle Sam's" domain.

Then is immateriality, "strictly speaking, nothing—a blank vacuum?" Try the authorities again, Bro. E. C. J. L. made what might be considered a bold assertion by many of the brethren. Why did not Bro. E. name the scripture which says "these animal bodies composed of flesh, blood and bones, or flesh and bones, shall be raised again." He could be helped to one or two upon which he might make a better showing than he did upon the "recognized authors." But Paul says "it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. The first man—Adam—became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." 1 Co. 15: "We shall all be changed." Of course, from natural, or animal, to spiritual. We shall together be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. 1 Thes. 4.

Now, had Jesus a natural or a spiritual body when raised from the dead? He was the first subject of the resurrection, and had his spiritual, glorified body, which no physical, or, animal eye, could see, or hand touch. He had to "appear" to be seen, and dispensing with that body provided for several occasions, He is said to have "vanished." The body which Thomas touched, or handled, was not His spiritual or glorified body. Neither does the Saviour say it was the same one which hung upon the cross. Notwithstanding it was an infallible proof of His resurrection. Lazarus and others were raised with their natural, or, animal bodies. Not so with the precious Saviour—His body was changed, which is the germ thought of the resurrection.

C. J. L.