

# The Canadian Evangelist.

U. W. O. LIBRARY

"GO . . . SPEAK . . . TO THE PEOPLE ALL THE WORDS OF THIS LIFE."

Vol. VIII., No. 15.

HAMILTON, DEC. 1, 1893.

\$1 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE

## The Canadian Evangelist

Is devoted to the furtherance of the Gospel of Christ, and pleads for the union of all believers in the Lord Jesus in harmony with His own prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, and on the basis set forth by the Apostle Paul in the following terms: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."—Eph. iv. 1-6.

This paper, while not claiming to be what is styled an "organ," may be taken as fairly representing the people known as Disciples of Christ in this country.

### "De Massa ob de Sheepfol."

De massa ob de sheepfol,  
Dat guard de sheepfol' bin,  
Look out in de gloomerin meadows  
Whar de long night rain begin.  
So he call to de hirelin shepa'd,  
Is my sheep—is dey all come in?

Oh, den says the hirelin shepa'd,  
Dey's some, dey's black and thin;  
And some, dey's po' ol wedda's—  
But de res', dey's all brung in;  
But de res', dey's all brung in.

Den de massa ob de sheepfol,  
Dat guard de sheepfol bin,  
Goes down in de gloomerin meadows  
Whar de long night rain begin—  
Den he le' down de ba's ob de sheepfol',  
Callin sof, Come in, come in I  
Callin sof, come in, come in I

Den up tro' de gloomerin meadows,  
Tro' de col night rain and win,  
An up tro' de gloomerin rain paf  
Whar de sleet fa' piecin thin,  
De po' los' sheep ob de sheepfol,  
Dey all comes gadderin in;  
De po' los' sheep ob de sheepfol,  
Dey all comes gadderin in.

—Selected.

## The Principles of the Reformation.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR.

It is not my wish to prolong the controversy with those who in the Church of England are—and some of them avowedly—undoing to the best of their power the main work of the Reformation. Canon Knox Little complains that I describe them by the "insulting" title of "Ritualists." I was quite unaware that they regarded it as "insulting." If they will suggest another name which does not imply that they are the only "Catholics" or the only "Churchmen," or the only clergymen who do any work in the Church of England, I will gladly use it.

Canon Knox Little's article occupies sixteen pages. Two-thirds of it, if not more, are exclusively devoted to personal attacks upon myself. His epithets and his insults lie so thick on every page that they would make a very pretty florilegium.

I turn to Canon Knox Little's arguments, such as they are—the "half-penny worth of bread" thrown in with "all this intolerable deal of sack."

He says that, "whether I like it not, I am obliged to be that wicked thing—a priest." I am "a priest," in the meaning and derivation of the word in which it stands for "presbyter;" I am not a "priest" in the Romish sense. I

am not a "massing priest;" I am not a sacrificial priest at all, except in that very secondary sense in which all Christians, laymen every whit as much as presbyters, are so called. I offer no sacrifices, neither can Canon Knox Little offer any, except those which the New Testament and the Church of England recognize—"the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" the sacrifice of "ourselves, our souls, and bodies"—the sacrifice of doing good and forgetting not—for with such sacrifices, the only ones we can offer, God is well pleased. So far as having deliberately selected the term "priest," except in the sense of presbyter, the Church of England has most deliberately rejected it. The Ritualists, so he assures us, are the persons who believe that the Prayer-book says what it means. Why, then, does the Prayer-book, on every possible occasion, use (as the New Testament uses) "curate" or "minister"?—and "priest" scarcely ever, if at all, except in contradistinction to bishops and deacons.

My argument was (1) that "priest," in the sense of "sacrificing priest," is a title never once given to the Christian clergy in the New Testament; (2) that the word *hierus* is never once used, either by Christ or by his evangelists, or by any one of his apostles, though they do use ten other names for Christian ministers. Why? Because "the kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system."

I "take his breath away" by saying that "the Lord Christ was not a priest by birth, and never in his life performed a single priestly function." Then the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews must have taken his breath away long ago, for he says that "Christ belonged not to Levi, but to another tribe, from which no man hath given attendance at the altar." (Heb. vii. 13.) "Out of the tribe of Judah, as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests" (14); and that "if he were on earth he would not be a priest at all" (Heb. viii. 4). Canon Knox Little talks of Christ's absolutions as priestly acts; they belonged, on the contrary, to His divinity and His prophetic office.

How has Canon Knox Little met the plain issue? By the assertion that *sacerdos* (an ambiguous word) is used in Latin service-books up to the Reformation. "As to the Prayer-book," says the Canon—adopting a little of my infallibility, but in the teeth of all evidence—"there is no manner of doubt:" (1)

Of what I said about Transubstantiation he has little to say; and as he does not challenge my statements as to the clear and undoubted view of the Church of England, that Christ's presence in the consecrated elements at the Lord's Supper is purely spiritual, and solely in the heart of the faithful receiver, and only received by faith, I need not add to what I have said already. I did not (as Canon Knox Little asserts) charge all Ritualists with holding the doctrine of transubstantiation, but I said, and could show by pages of extracts from their writings, that they use language which can only be distinguished from it by minute theological distinction and intellectual

niceties which it is not worth the while of any serious man to follow.

As to auricular confession, nothing that the Canon says remotely touches my contention.

Canon Knox Little ends with a text which is one of those heart-searching exhortations to the duty of Christian love, and which all the rest of his paper is in grievous contrast. The soft note of heavenly music ill accords with the "harsh chromatic jars," by which it is preceded. If anyone tries to answer the many wholly unanswered arguments of this and my former papers, I trust it will be someone better equipped than Canon Knox Little, and someone who will write in a nobler tone. For it is well for us all to remember on our knees that, neither as Ritualists nor as Evangelicals, neither as Episcopalians nor as Dissenters; but only as good men, and men who love our enemies, shall we inherit the kingdom of God.—*Literary Digest*.

### Born of Water and the Spirit.

Every now and again a question comes in concerning the meaning of "water," in John iii. 5. A brother, who has been attending a union meeting, now calls for an explanation of the text. It seems that, at the meeting, the view prevailed that water, in the saying referred to, means the word, or truth of the gospel. This question has been considered at length more than once in the *Standard*, though not in the last few years. The view that prevailed for fifteen hundred years in the church was, that water in the text refers to the water of baptism. The creeds of to-day so represent it. In some of them this passage is quoted to prove the necessity or duty of infant baptism. The interpretation that water means the word had its origin in Calvin's day. Calvin himself held it. Dr. Schaff says: "Calvin's interpretation arose from doctrinal opposition to the Roman Catholic over-valuation of the sacrament, which must be guarded against in another way." There are several objections to this interpretation. First, it will not do to make "spirit" literal, and "water" figurative, standing as they do side by side. If Jesus had meant it, he would have said, born of the Spirit and of the word. Second, this passage is clearly of the same character as the passage that speaks of "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." When the word water, in the Scriptures, is to be taken figuratively as referring to the word, or the gospel, it is water for drinking, not for washing or bathing. Third, when water in the Bible is used to represent the truth, this fact is made clear by some modifying clause or word of explanation. When we read of "water out of the wells of salvation," the modifying words which we italicise forbid us going to our wells in the ground with bucket in hand to draw it. The same may be said in regard to such language as "the water of life," "the water that I shall give him," in contrast with the water which the woman of Samaria came to draw, "rivers of living water," "the fountain of the water of life," and "a pure river of the water of life." Let it be noticed that it is not simply water that means the word, but

"living water," "the water of life," "water out of the wells of salvation." When the water is not characterized in some such way, it is unsafe to take it figuratively.

It may be well to say that "born of water" in the passage is not the equivalent of immersion, neither does that shorn expression correctly represent anything the Saviour said to Nicodemus. His words are "born of water and the Spirit," and this birth with which the Spirit as well as water has something to do, is much more than baptism. It comprehends the planting of the spiritual seed—the word of truth—in the heart, and the production of life from that seed in new thoughts and purposes, as well as the visible and outward manifestation of that life in baptism. "Born," in Christ's statement, is used in the broad sense, as when we say, "born of Christian parents," and not in the narrow and specific sense, as when we say, "born on the first day of June." It is used to represent the entire change that is wrought out by faith in Jesus Christ—the reception of the incorruptible seed—and the outward expression of that faith in baptism. Both water and the Spirit stand in an appropriate relation to this great change which is represented as a birth—though not in the same relation. It is not wise to speak of the water as occupying a parental relation to the believer. Even the Spirit does not occupy this relationship according to Scripture style or thought, neither does the word by which we are begotten. God is our Father; the Spirit bears the word, the seed, into human hearts. This word or seed is received by faith, and we are thus begotten to spiritual life, and by obedience in baptism our change of relationship to the world, and to the church, is completed. We are born and pass from the world into the church. There are not two births in the case—one of water and one of the Spirit. To this great change, figuratively called a birth, the Father, the Spirit, the Word and the water are appropriately related; but to make that relation similar in each case, and, therefore, parental, as some have done, is to reason unwisely.

But it is objected at times that water can not have anything to do with a change of spiritual relationship. To this we reply that water, apart from the obedience of the soul to Christ manifested in being baptized by His authority, can not have any part in this change. Neither can the word of truth accomplish anything in the direction of a spiritual birth apart from faith in Him whom in baptism we obey. The obedience is as spiritual as the faith that prompts it.—*Christian Standard*.

### Baptism Is Immersion.

It may be well enough now, when it is being blown about that there is a certain "large" sort of interpretation which makes it contrary to the mind of Christ to hold to immersion as essential to baptism—it may be well to call attention to a statement by the renowned church historian, Dr. Philip Schaff, which I cut some time since from a religious newspaper:

"On strictly exegetical and histori-

cal grounds, baptism *must be immersion*. Without prejudice, no other interpretation would ever have been given to Bible baptism. It is the most natural interpretation, and such we must always give. Immersion is natural and historical; sprinkling is artificial and an expedient for convenience's sake. All the symbolism of the text (Rom. vi. 3, 4), and everywhere in the Bible, demands the going under water and coming up out of it to newness of life. Sprinkling has no suggestion of burial to sin and resurrection to holiness. In order to be true to its original meaning, and its vital relation to redemption through Christ Jesus, baptism must be immersion. Why do you wish to get rid of it? Eminent theologians have wasted their learning attempting to defend infant sprinkling. *Imposition is not exposition*. All the early defenders of Christianity taught that nothing but immersion was baptism, and all the Greek or Oriental churches continue to immerse to this day."

For myself, I desire no ampler largeness than the most precise obedience to the divine Christ. I think it a most dangerous thing to attempt to interpret Christ's mind against Christ's word.—*Dr. Wayland Hoyt, in the Examiner*.

### Recent Lesson of Early Civilization.

We have become possessed of certain very important indications as to the early civilization of Palestine by means of clay tablets. Not that the knowledge so attained is altogether new, or that it conflicts with that which has been deduced from yet earlier Egyptian records. It is well known to scholars that Thothmes III., when he defeated the league of Hittites and the Phoenicians at Megiddo, in 1600 B. C. (a century before Amenophis III. acceded), repeated a spoil which indicates the advanced civilization of Syria, including not only the precious metals and chariots painted and plated, but also objects of art having a high æsthetic value, and that he found corn, wine and oil abundant in the country, and many hundreds of walled towns in which there were already temples of the gods.

Such evidence has, however, been slighted by those who regard the early Hebrews as savages, and who think that though placed in the very centre of the ancient civilized world, between the Egyptians and the Assyrians, they were nevertheless unacquainted with many arts and uninfluenced by surrounding culture. The new discoveries insist on quite another understanding of their ancient history.

It is surely a lesson of humility that the modern student should learn from such discoveries. Voltaire was no doubt a writer of great originality and acumen, though from our present standpoint wonderfully ignorant of antiquity. He finds it hard to believe that Homer's poems could have been written down before 500 B. C. and asserts that papyrus had not been invented in Egypt in the time of Moses, though we now possess in the maxims Prah-hotep a manuscript as old as the pyramids.

We find, on the contrary, that not only in Egypt or in Mesopotamia was the art of writing known in the time of Moses, but that the inhabitants of Palestine also could pen a brick epistle, which, in the space of a few inches, contained as much information as can now be condensed into a sheet of note paper. Such letters were neither heavy nor bulky and could be carried in the turban or the folds of the shirt bosom just as easily as paper letters are now so carried, with the additional advantage that they were imperishable, as is witnessed by the fact that they are now being read, 3,400 years after they were written.—*Edinburg Review*.