

Canadian Evangelist
 PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY
 BY THE
Evangelist Publishing Co.
 55 YONGE ST. ARCADE, TORONTO.
 Terms \$1.00 per annum in advance.

GEORGE MUNRO - Editor.
 DONALD MUNRO - Business Manager.
 All matter intended for publication, and all exchanges to be addressed to George Munro, Editor, Ontario, Canada.
 All business communications and remittances to be sent to the Evangelist Publishing Co., 55 Yonge 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 arrearages.
 In ordering change of address be sure to give the old post office as well as the new.

TORONTO, JUNE 2nd, 1890.

Specimen Copies.

Many will receive specimen copies of this number also. We wish to give our friends ample means of judging whether they desire to become subscribers. From the very large number of hearty commendations we have received we expect a great increase to our list. Will all those who intend to take the paper kindly send in their names without delay so that they may not miss the next number which will contain a full report of the Annual Meeting? Send all names and remittances to our Toronto office, 55 Yonge St. Arcade.

The Annual Meeting.

RAILWAY FARES.

Some difficulty seems to be experienced in understanding the regulations for reduced rates on the railways. In response to various enquiries we repeat what was stated in last number:

"Be sure to get a certificate from every agent from whom you buy a ticket, certifying that you have paid the fare one way; that will entitle you to return for one-third single fare after the certificate has been signed by the Secretary of the meeting. If you neglect to secure a certificate you will have to pay regular rates."

The agents are now supplied with blank forms for certificates so that no certificate need to be sent as in former years. Certificates procured from the agent at starting point more than three days before the commencement of the meeting, and those presented more than three days after the close of the meeting will not be honored for return trip. The certificates are not transferable and the return trip must be made by the same route as the going trip. There need be no trouble about the matter. When you buy a ticket, tell the agent where you are going and ask him for a certificate. If you have to travel over more than one railway you will require a certificate from each railway.

IMPORTANT.

Perhaps some reader may not make up his mind to go to Owen Sound until a day or two before the meeting begins, and may think it will not be necessary for him to notify Mrs. A. Leavens, Owen Sound, that he intends to be present. Every one who expects to go should send word to that effect, although the notification might not reach Owen Sound but one day or one half day ahead of him. Let no one neglect this, thinking it will make little difference if he does.

THE PROSPECT.

All things are being got ready at Owen Sound, and the church there is looking for a large gathering of brethren and sisters from all parts of the Province, and will be disappointed if there should be a small attendance. The church is not likely to be disap-

pointed. From divers places we hear of those who intend to go. There seems to be a very general interest in the matter, and a splendid meeting may be confidently expected.

Another Word from a Baptist Minister.

DEAR EDITOR,—I am pleased to note your remarks on my letter in your issue of May the 1st, especially the following: "What the Disciples teach is that a person who believes in Jesus Christ with all his heart, who truly repents, and who confesses with his mouth Jesus as his Lord, is ready to be baptized, and should be baptized without unnecessary delay; and when he has been baptized he is a baptized believer in the true Scriptural sense, and that now but such are baptized believers in a Scriptural sense."

Concerning this I would say that I do not believe any Baptist would take one solitary exception to your position as outlined in that sentence. But the trouble is this: a comparison of the different writers among Disciples reveals the fact that *believe*, according to Disciples, means an ascent to the fact that "Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah," and Mr. Campbell says that is as far as faith goes or is requisite for salvation. (Chris. Res. pp. 118, 119.) But Baptists believe that faith in Jesus means not only belief that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah, but also the surrender of the soul as guilty and defiled to Christ's governance, and reception and appropriation of Christ as the source of pardon and spiritual life.

A comparison of the writings of Disciples reveals that to them *repentance* is equivalent to "reformation," while to Baptists it means (1) recognition of sin as involving personal guilt, defilement and helplessness; (2) sorrow for sin as committed against goodness and justice, and therefore hateful to God and hateful in itself; (3) inward turning from sin and disposition to obey Christ and be conformed to Him.

I do not claim to be in a position to speak for the Baptist denomination, but write what I believe to be the common belief among Baptists. Those who doubt are invited to examine the works of Rev. A. P. Williams, D.D., author of "Lord's Supper," "Campbellism Exposed," and "No Communion with Campbellites," which works can be had from the American Baptist Publication Society.

Whatever may be your opinion or the opinion of modern school Disciples regarding Mr. Campbell's interpretations, one thing is certain, that among a large proportion of Disciples his works are considered among the best, if not the best, and fullest statement of the opinions of Disciples. In proof of this, see Mr. J. B. Brinny's letter in last issue of *Octographic Review*. After quoting from Mr. Campbell, he adds: "These are the words of 'a master of assemblies,' and they betoken a mind and heart worthy of leadership in a great cause." You say Disciples receive such of Mr. Campbell's views as seem to us upon personal investigation to be in harmony with the Word of God. Would you kindly answer the following questions: 1. Do you believe that Mr. Campbell's statement, in Chris. Res. pp. 118, 119, is in harmony with the Word of God? It is as follows: "That the belief of one fact, and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite as far as faith goes for salvation." He tells us that one fact is, "Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah." 2. In the McCalla Debate, p. 135, Mr. Campbell says, "The water of baptism, then, formally washes away our sins. Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed." The *Standard* of March the 8th, 1890, says, "The elements found here are faith and repentance and, in the order named, Saul is not yet pardoned." Which of these contradicting statements is most generally believed among Disciples? 3. If Disciples believe in a spiritual change, which is the source of what is commonly called a "Christian experience," why do they circulate Mr. Lard's work, which calls Christian experience a "farce"? (Rev. p. 35.) 4. If you admire the "truly catholic" spirit exhibited by learned men among the brethren who are careful to say Disciples of Christ instead of Disciples, why do you call them Disciples five times in your remarks on my letter, and not once call them by the

"truly catholic" name, Disciples of Christ?

In conclusion, I would say that Mr. Gaff's strictures need no answer. He knows very well that under the conditions mentioned is the only way to become a communicant in a Baptist church. Where individual Disciples have been permitted to sit with Baptists at the Lord's Table, it was when the individual was well known as regards his Christian experience and believed to be more in accord with Baptists than Disciples in his or her belief. I know a case of this kind, and the person is now one of the leading Baptists of the Dominion. Mr. Gaff's quibble upon the word "invite" is hardly worthy of a remark. He knows that if he does not "invite" he permits Pedo-Baptists to commune regularly with Disciples, even though he does not believe they are baptized. Pedo-Baptists would not permit him to commune with them if they did not believe he was baptized, hence Mr. Gaff is looser than they.

Yours respectfully,
 W. J. WADDELL.
 Hillsburg, May 1, 1890.

Mr. Waddell says he does not believe that any Baptist would take one solitary exception to our position as quoted by him. But the trouble is that the Disciples attach wrong meaning to faith. We would suggest that the trouble is that Baptists bring in their complicated, sectarian definition of faith, and because Disciples stand by the simple, scriptural view of it, they are denounced by Baptists as being heterodox. And so in regard to repentance, which Mr. W. is mistaken in thinking Disciples consider simply equivalent to "reformation." Observe how the Baptist definitions of faith and repentance, as given by Mr. W., run into each other, and note how applicable the term complicated is to them.

No wonder many good people cannot for the life of them give an intelligible account of faith and repentance. What Mr. W. and many others need is to begin at the foundation and study these and other scriptural terms *scripturally*, instead of through the muddy medium of fossilized theological works. When they have thus obtained clear scriptural views of faith and repentance they will not be found lightly denying that the person who believes with all his heart that "Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah," holds the evangelical faith, nor defining repentance, as Mr. W. says the Baptists do, as involving three distinct mental acts, whereas in Scriptural phraseology it denotes but one. On these points therefore, without further comment at present, we turn Mr. W. and his friends over to the Lord Jesus, and His Apostles for instruction.

Mr. W. does not claim to speak for the Baptist denomination, but in former articles he did speak for them as a people, and not merely for himself as an individual Baptist; as for example, where he declares in our March number "that Baptists do not believe that, in a Scriptural sense, Disciples are baptized believers." But he refers us to one who does speak *ex cathedra*, and tells us where his writings may be procured. To further so good an object we may say that we understand Dr. Williams' works are kept in stock at the Baptist Book Room, 9 Richmond St. West, Toronto. Above all literature, we desire that our brethren should at all times read the Word of God—but after that, at the present juncture, we should like them to read such books as "The Baptist Church Manual," "Campbellism Exposed," and "No Communion with Campbellites." Especially isolated Disciples, so that when some Baptist preacher comes to them and urges them to join the Baptist Church on the ground that there is no difference, or little difference, between Baptists and Disciples, they may be able to

show the preacher his error, and mayhap may be prevented from entering into fellowship with a congregation which teaches for doctrines the commandments of men.

Mr. W. does not need to quote from J. B. Brinny to prove that Disciples think Mr. Campbell was a great man. We could quote from eminent Baptists, contemporaries of Mr. Campbell, who thought him "a master of assemblies." Disciples do not take their opinions *second-hand* from Alexander Campbell; they aim to present their minds without bias and without prejudice to the Scriptures given by inspiration of God. They are glad to receive assistance from A. Campbell, C. H. Spurgeon, John Wesley, or John Knox, but they call no man on earth Rabbi, for one is their Rabbi even Christ.

As to Mr. W.'s questions we may answer briefly, and, to save the trouble of quoting here, will the reader kindly read the questions as they stand in his letter?

(1) To the first, then, we answer, yes, and ask Mr. W. what further truth according to Scripture a person is required to believe in order to salvation.

(2) To the second we would reply, that if Mr. W. will consider the whole passage referred to from the McCalla Debate, and the entire article in the *Standard* of March 8, 1890, he may find there is not so much contradiction as he supposes. And in addition we would say that Disciples do not express their opinion on the subject in either of the forms of expression quoted, but in the form of sound words found in the Living Oracles.

(3) We suppose that those Disciples who circulate Mr. Lard's tract think that there is something *farical* in speaking of a person's having a "Christian experience" before he becomes a Christian.

(4) Mr. W. does not appear to apprehend our idea, so we cannot answer him directly. The distinction we referred to is that between "The Disciples" and "Disciples," and between "The Disciples of Christ" and "Disciples of Christ;" and we are pleased to notice that leading brethren, as the late Isaac Errett, in the title of his tract "Our Position," speaks of "the people known as Disciples of Christ." The object of such phraseology is evident. And when in writing or speaking they use the expressions "The Disciples" and "The Disciples of Christ," they are to be understood as meaning the people known as Disciples or Disciples of Christ. We trust this will be a satisfactory answer to the fourth question.

Mr. W. is not satisfied with his "last word" with Bro. Gaff that appeared in our May 1st number. We did not think he would be, after reading Bro. Gaff's reply. But he should not accuse Bro. Gaff of quibbling. Bro. Gaff does not quibble; he is a Christian gentleman. Will Mr. W. give his authority for saying that Bro. Gaff "permits Pedo-Baptists to commune regularly with Disciples?"

It is really amusing to observe our friend's explanation of the grounds on which individual Disciples are allowed to sit at the Lord's Table with Baptists. He writes, too, as though he were familiar with Baptist usage all over the country in the matter. Now, we beg to say that we know of not a few instances in which individual Disciples were not only permitted but invited—cordially invited—to sit at the Lord's Table in Baptist churches when it was well known that the persons were not more in accord with Baptists than with Disciples in their belief. Evidently Mr. W. has a mission to set his brethren right on the question of

close communion, and we would suggest that he begin with the greatest Baptist of them all, C. H. Spurgeon.

As to the person once a Disciple, now one of the leading Baptists in the Dominion, we have a proposition to make. Let Mr. Waddell write out the Baptist position on the seven points published in our last number on which, as he says, Baptists differ from Disciples, then present it to the aforementioned leading Baptist and see if he will subscribe to it. We question if he would endorse the regular Baptist view on any one of the seven doctrines. We do not recollect ever hearing of one who had been a Disciple becoming a disciple of John Calvin.

Finally, although this article is assuming rather large dimensions, since we have answered Mr. Waddell's questions, we think we may have the privilege of asking him two or three.

(1) Does he believe and teach, as Jesus taught, (Mark xvi. 16) that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," or does he teach, as Baptists do, that "he that believeth and is saved may be baptized?"

(2) Does he believe and teach, as the Lord Jesus taught, (John iii. 5) "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," or does he teach, "Except a man be born of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, and after he has entered the kingdom of God he cannot enter the Baptist Church except he is born of water?"

(3) When people are pricked in their heart under the preaching of the Gospel, and enquire what they shall do, does he answer them as Peter did on the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 38) "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," or does he answer, as Baptists do, "Seeing ye have received the gift of the Holy Spirit, repent for the remission of your sins, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ because your sins are remitted?"

(4) Does he exhort a penitent believer, as Ananias did Saul of Tarsus, (Acts xxii. 16) "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," or does he refuse, as Baptists do, to baptize such a person unless he will testify that his sins are already washed away?

(5) Does he ever use Peter's language, (1 Peter iii. 21) "The like figure where unto even baptism doth also now save us . . . by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," or does he affirm, as Baptists are in the habit of affirming, that baptism is in *no sense* a saving ordinance?

These are some of the questions that demand earnest consideration in these days, and they are respectfully presented to all who reverence the Word of God and love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

We do not often refer to typographical errors in our paper, thinking that the reader can usually make out the sense, and will make allowance for occasional mistakes. But our attention has been called to some of such a nature in last No. as to justify pointing them out. In Bro. Knowles' article p. 1, column 2, line 5, "hands" should be "bonds." In Br. Fowler's, p. 8, column 2, line 10, "and to the blood, etc." should read "and nor to the blood, etc." In the obituary of Bro. Stewart, p. 7, column 2, line 17, read "houses" for "houses," and towards the foot of the same column in the sentence "no man among us understood our place better," the word "plex" is to be read instead of "plac."