

THE
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 arrears.

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

TORONTO, AUGUST 15th, 1890.

F. W. Baughman.

Those of our readers who take a daily paper would receive a shock on Saturday, August 2nd, upon finding a despatch containing the information that Bro. F. W. Baughman had been drowned the day before. It was not the only calamity of the kind recorded that day. Nevertheless, had it not been that Bro. Baughman was personally known to us, we should almost certainly have laid the paper down without emotion, possibly without a passing reflection on the number of such accidents at this season of the year. How different are our feelings when we number among our own friends the one whose life is suddenly cut off! At once our interest becomes intense; we read the paragraph over and over; we wonder if there may not be some mistake; we examine other papers to see if the same despatch is contained in them. And when we can find no rational basis for the glimmer of a hope, our hearts go out in tender sympathy to those most nearly and most pitifully bereaved. But how impotent in such a case as this seems the sympathy of the dearest friend. One thinks of Job's three friends who "sat down with him upon the ground seven days and seven nights, and none spake a word unto him; for they saw that his grief was very great." How many thoughts crowd into our minds on this occasion! First of all, the wife that was, the widow that is. Ah! who can calm her troubled heart, who can stay the wild questioning of her soul, who can preserve the integrity of her faith? One alone—"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble." To Him we reverently commend her. We think, too, of his own kindred in Indiana. It will be a great comfort for them to know that, though their son and brother lost his life far from them and in such a way, he died among those who loved him and will revere his memory. It makes us excessively sad to think of our brother's promising career being thus ended before it had well begun. We think it strange that such things should be. We feel for the Church in Bowmanville in its great loss. The Lord was blessing Bro. Baughman's labors among them.

We are fortunate in having a letter from Bro. Windatt to lay before our readers. Some friend has also sent us a copy of the *West Durham News* containing additional particulars, which we are sure our brethren will be anxious to be informed of, and so we give it also in this issue.

We had a pleasant but short visit with Bro. Lediard recently. On Lord's Day, July 27th, he spoke in the morning at Erin Centre, and in the evening at Mareville. On the following Wednesday evening he attended the prayer-meeting at Everton.

In Conclusion.

(Continued from last number)

Before reading this article please re-peruse Mr. Waddell's answer to question three as given in last EVANGELIST, and also our introductory criticism thereon.

We may now proceed to make some further observations relative to Mr. Waddell's position as to Acts ii. 38. It will be seen that not only does he not think it proper to answer earnest inquiries as Peter did on that occasion, but he also maintains that "the fact that baptism in this verse is coupled with repentance before remission of sins does not prove that it in any sense was a pre-requisite to remission of sins." We take this meaning to be that even in the case of those addressed by Peter on the day of Pentecost baptism was not in any sense a pre-requisite to remission of sins, (and by the same method of reasoning he could prove that neither was repentance to them in any sense a pre-requisite to remission of sins). He further says that "such interpretation is excluded by the fact that *true repentance*, and faith, and remission of sins are never separated in any human experience," and in proof of this latter assertion he appeals to the facts of Christian life and to the Scriptures. For the present we pass by his citations from the Scriptures and direct attention to some others. And we may be allowed to copy our friend's style for a little.

Proof that *faith* and *remission of sins* may be separated in the experience of a human being is found in John xii. 42-43, "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Those chief rulers who were afraid to confess Christ were not in a pardoned state. If *faith* and *remission of sins* co-existed in their experience there was something wrong with their experience.

Proof that *repentance* and *remission of sins* may be separated in the experience of a human being is found in the case of Saul of Tarsus, as may be seen by reference to his own narrative as given in Acts xxii. When Ananias stood before him, Saul had faith and had repented, but remission of sins did not co-exist with them in his experience else there would have been no propriety in the words with which Ananias addressed him, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." After he had been baptized remission of sins was a fact in his experience.

By two Scriptural instances we have overthrown Mr. W.'s position. But some one will say what about the passages he quoted, do you reject them? Not at all. How do you get over them then? Let us take Acts x. 43, "Through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Mr. W. says this is proof that faith and remission of sins cannot be separated in time. The form of the language places remission of sins as a *result* of faith and therefore as something that comes after faith, and hence they must be separated in time, even on the testimony of this text. But neither are we required to conclude that faith is the only antecedent of remission of sins, although if we were to confine our attention to this passage we might think so. By referring to other passages we find that repentance also, and turning to the Lord, are placed before pardon, and so we do not so interpret Scripture as to make it contradict itself, or in such a way as to make one passage exclude another, but in such a way that the whole Book harmonizes, and that no

doctrine we hold is obnoxious to the declarations of the Word of God. If we should even find that baptism is placed before remission of sins, as we do for example in Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38, and Acts xxii. 16, we shall not stumble at that, though we are sorry to say many do stumble at it.

We may also briefly consider the use Mr. W. makes of Acts iii. 19, and, in the first place, let the reader observe that though he object to the use in the present day of Acts ii. 38, he does not object to using Acts iii. 19, although the language was addressed to precisely the same class of people, viz., those who, as the 15th verse shows, had "killed the Prince of life." By what principle of interpretation, let us ask, is it proper to exhort, in our day, unconverted people in the language of Acts iii. 19, but wrong, very wrong to exhort them in that of Acts ii. 38? This is a question for those who love the Lord to consider. We cannot refrain from smiling at the unconscious inconsistency of our friend in taking the one, and rejecting the other. Better take both and be right. In the second place notice that Mr. W. declares that Acts iii. 19 is proof that *repentance* and *conversion* and *remission of sins* co-exist. Let us quote the verse: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." It is very plain that the repenting and being converted would have to precede the blotting out of their sins. Certain conditions had to be complied with and then the blessing would be conferred. Our friend is clearly wrong again. But if he were right, then, by a similar process of reasoning, it could be just as easily established from Acts ii. 38, that *repentance* and *baptism* and *remission of sins* co-exist. In a similar manner to the above we might take up the other passages quoted by Mr. W., and still further show that his doctrine of certain things *co-existing* and *never being separated in any human experience* is entirely unknown to the Word of God, and therefore his criticism of the Disciples for attempting to separate faith, repentance, etc., has no solid basis so far as his answer to question three is concerned. It will, let us say, be an interesting and profitable exercise for any man who believes the New Testament, to examine that blessed volume with a view to learning the Scriptural meaning and place of faith, repentance, baptism, and remission of sins. And we urge all whose minds are not settled on these matters carefully and prayerfully, to search the Scriptures for themselves.

We shall now give Mr. W.'s answer to question four:—

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?"

Answer.—Yes. And I never had any one exercise so little common sense as to think that I meant that baptism had anything literally to do with the removal of sins (except where they had been under the instructions of Disciples). But they always understood that in that symbolic ordinance they were exhorted to declare themselves cleansed from their old sins by the blood of Christ.

When Pilate wished to show the multitude that no malicious desire on his part caused him to give sentence of death concerning Christ, "he took water and washed his hands, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person." But did he mean that the literal washing had done anything to cleanse him from guilt? Surely not! But in that symbolic cleansing he declared his innocence. Even so the penitent believer in the ordinance of baptism declares before others the fact that he is dead to his old ways and alive to live henceforth in newness of life.

We are pleased to learn that Mr. W. exhorts penitent believers in the

language used by Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, but we are sorry he did not see fit to answer the second part of question four, viz: "Does he refuse, as Baptists do, to baptize such a person (a penitent believer) unless he will testify that his sins are already washed away?" This, we are credibly informed, Baptist ministers in Canada continually do, and we should have been glad to have had Mr. W. state his practice. However, he probably thought his practice could be inferred from his answer to the question under consideration. We take it that he is in line with his Baptist brethren generally in this respect. We imagine that if he uses Acts xxii. 16 frequently, he may find some who have not been under the instruction of Disciples, who will require a little explanation before they will feel quite satisfied that the Baptist interpretation is correct. There is no proper parallel between what a heathen like Pilate might do, and what the Lord Jesus commands to be done with a certain object before the mind of the person receiving the command. Baptism may be a symbol, but it is more than a symbol, it is an ordinance of Jesus Christ; certain blessings are connected with its proper observance, the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is far-fetched to say that when Ananias said to Saul, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins," he meant Saul to understand him as saying, "Be baptized and declare yourself cleansed from your old sins by the blood of Christ." Whereas, if we consider Saul as one whose sins were not then forgiven, and baptism as a condition upon which God offers pardon, the words of Ananias are easily seen to be an exhortation to Saul to comply with that condition of pardon with which he had not up to that time complied, and thus we answer the question how Saul washed away his sins by being baptized. Let the mind be distinctly fixed upon this fact, that the Lord has seen fit to make baptism a condition of pardon to the penitent believer, and the devout student of the New Testament will find this whole subject cleared up for him. Baptism is not, was not to Saul, the only condition of pardon; he had believed, repented, confessed Jesus as Lord, before Ananias called upon him. The Disciples have frequently been charged with holding the doctrine of "baptism for the remission of sins," as though there were no other condition of remission of sins save baptism. As a matter of course, this is a misrepresentation of their teaching. They do hold that baptism administered according to the command of the Lord Jesus is a condition of pardon, and they fearlessly challenge the whole world with an open Bible before them to overthrow that position, and at the same time they earnestly entreat all who love the Lord to give the subject an unprejudiced and thorough examination. The scholarship, the critical scholarship, of the world is now largely with the Disciples on this subject. The Disciples, because of holding these views, have been accused, and will no doubt again be accused, of teaching that every one who is not baptized will be lost. But, as we pointed out in a last issue, the Lord did not say, "He that is not baptized shall be damned," neither do the Disciples say so. They aim to obey the Word of the Lord, and they urge others to do the same, and recommend all to leave untaught and difficult questions to Him who is far more kind and far more wise than we. We fallible creatures are not called upon to practice in the court of heaven's chancery. We are sure that the Judge of all the earth will do right; be it ours attentively to hear and faithfully to obey His voice.

b. Does he ever use Peter's language (I. Peter iii. 21): "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us, . . . by the resurrection of Jesus Christ?"

Answer.—Yes. I frequently use this passage, and also "teach that baptism is in no sense a saving ordinance."

The salvation spoken of in this text is effected "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," and as baptism symbolizes the fact that Jesus was buried and rose again, and that the believer has passed from death to life in Him; this passage is an instance of the general fact, that, in Scripture language, a single part of a complex action, and even that part of it which is most obvious to the senses, is often mentioned for the whole of it, and as in this passage the whole of the solemn transaction is designated by the external symbol. Even so the whole of the other ordinance is described by simply naming the "breaking of bread," and the whole transaction of ordaining ministers is termed the "imposition of hands."

Having now answered your questions and answered everything worthy of notice—and indeed some things unworthy of a remark—this correspondence closes so far as I am concerned.

Yours respectfully,
W. J. WADDELL.
Hillsburg, June 30, 1890.

The reader will note that Mr. W. acknowledges that he teaches "that baptism is in no sense a saving ordinance." If he lives long he may feel like modifying that declaration; it will not endure the light of the Word of God. If he will carefully study his own explanation of Peter's language he may be disposed to alter his view a little. The fact that the Apostle Peter uses the words, "baptism doth also now save us," should prevent a person who believes Peter to have been an inspired man from saying that "baptism is in no sense a saving ordinance." The particular sense in which it *saves* may very well be a question, but that it saves in some sense should not admit of question, at least with those who reverence the Scriptures. We do not care to follow our friend further in his explanation of this passage; indeed this article is much too long now; but we are anxious to have this matter disposed of; our readers are probably somewhat wearied of it. Mr. Waddell takes his leave of us for the present. We shall have some general reflections and conclusions to lay before our readers, growing out of this discussion, in a future number. We want to take all the good out of it we can. Let our friends remember that these are live questions and important ones, and be patient.

We hear that Bro. Hugh McDiarmid made a flying visit into South-Western Ontario, a few weeks ago. It is to be hoped he will cross the lines soon again, and, that when he does so, he will not return without visiting his many friends in Wellington Co. We are pleased to know that he is looking well, and enjoying his work on the *Standard*.

The following is related by a friend: Union revival services had been in progress in a certain town for some time. Great interest was taken in them; all the ministers of the town, we believe, joined in them. Meetings for counsel and encouragement were held in the afternoons. At one of these meetings one of the ministers—a man of education and of experience—expressed himself somewhat as follows: "Brethren, when I see so many anxious people at these special services, I am troubled; I do not know what to say to them; I do not know what answer to give to the query, 'What must I do to be saved?' If we had the ear of that minister we should recommend him to study attentively the fifth book in the New Testament.