

THE Canadian Evangelist PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

BY THE Evangelist Publishing Co. 65 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, Erin, Ontario, Canada.

All business communications and remittances to be sent to the EVANGELIST PUBLISHING CO., 65 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 arrearsages.

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

TORONTO, JULY 1st, 1890

A Baptist Minister Once More.

We have received another communication from Mr. Waddell, Baptist Minister, Hillsburg. We could not find space for it in last issue. It will be a convenience to the reader to divide it into sections. Let the reader peruse attentively his remarks that our observations may be as brief as possible.

I am not surprised that you ask five questions on a different subject and plead that it is my duty to answer them. It is about as good a way as I know of to prevent an exposure of the combination of ignorance and sophistry that make up your reply to my letter. We were discussing the nature of faith and repentance and you are not going to load me away from that subject by any such craftiness.

In your first answer, rather than go back on your father, you endorse the comment of Mr. Campbell that faith goes no farther than belief that "Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah," which any one can see is only the intellectual element of faith. And you seem to be willingly ignorant of the fact that saving faith has also an emotional and a voluntary element. Had you known this you would never have asked such a question as the following: "What further truth, according to scripture, is a person required to believe in order to salvation?" That question amounts to this: "Is the intellectual element of faith spent in the belief that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah?" while you know nothing of the equally important elements, the emotional and the voluntary. But such blunders are not uncommon among those who despise what you are pleased to call "fossilized theological works." Time was when disciples despised an educated, paged ministry but they found out that an intelligent people would not be led by unlearned and ignorant men, and disciples are now stepping forward along educational lines, which is indeed an encouraging sign of the times and I must say that your denomination of theological works is a relic of the past darkness.

Now, as to repentance, you say disciples do not use the word as simply equivalent to reformation. Well, if you would like proof of the fact that they do, I think I could undertake to fill a column or two for you with quotations from their ablest writers showing that they use the words "reform" and "reformation" as their translation instead of "repent" and "repentance." See Cambridge & Rico Debate, pp 436, 443.

True repentance has an intellectual, an emotional and a voluntary element. The intellectual element is indicated by the scripture phrase epignosis hamartias, an example of which we find in Romans iii. 20: "Through the law cometh the knowledge of sin." The emotional element is indicated by the scripture word metamelomai an example of which we find in 2 Cor. vii 9, 10. "Now I rejoice not that ye were made sorry but that ye were made sorry unto repentance, etc." The voluntary element is indicated in the scripture term metanoia, which includes and implies the two preceding, and is therefore the most important aspect of repentance, and this is the word used in Acts ii 38: "Repent and be baptized, etc." If disciples noted this they would see that the repentance which Peter demanded was much more than a "reformation" of life.

But notwithstanding these facts, you think that repentance and faith have not these elements and think the term "complicated" is very applicable to such definitions. Well, all I need say to that is that it just shows all you know. But I am glad that all disciples are not so ignorant on this point. Evidently Mr. Richardson knew something of these distinctions. In his principles of the Reformation, p. 30, he writes as follows: "In the Greek of the N. T. two different words are used to express these two different conditions, but in the common version these words are unfortunately always rounded "to repent" or "repentance." Mr. Isaac Errett is also against you. In his "First Principles," p. 95, he gives the meaning (metanow) as "to come to a conviction afterward," which is the intellectual element, and "a turning away from sin unto God," which is the emotional element, and "In-tornal submission to Christ," which is the voluntary element.

They are also against you in saying that faith goes no farther than belief that "Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah." On p. 19 Mr. Richardson writes: "To believe in Christ is to receive Him in all the glory of His character, personal and official, to trust in Him in all the relations He sustains to us as our Prophet our Priest our King; to behold in Him our only hope and refuge; and renouncing ourselves our own self-confidence, our righteousness and every vain device, to lean on Him only as our stay and to look to Him only as the "Lord our Righteousness," as our salvation and our life.

It is not merely to believe what is said of Him as the Son of God as the Son of Man, as living, dying, rising, reigning, returning, but believing this: "To trust in Him as our Saviour, to walk with Him as our teacher, our friend, to realize His gracious presence with us and to discern His footsteps in the path we tread. It is to be brought into direct fellowship with Him, to think of Him as a person whom we know, and to whom we are known, to speak to Him as one who hears, and listen to Him as one who speaks." With this definition of faith by Mr. R. I most heartily agree. It contains the elements I am contending for, and is opposed to your position that faith goes no farther than belief that "Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah." Mr. Errett in "First Prin." p. 67, writes: "There is therefore a moral as well as an intellectual aspect of faith. Intellectually viewed it is the belief of testimony; morally viewed it is such a belief of testimony as allows it all its legitimate results over conscience, heart and life."

I suppose that Mr. Munro will now try to explain as much meaning into the belief that "Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah," as is given by those two writers quoted above as definitions of faith, but if he does he will include the two elements of faith which he in last issue repudiated. But I have no doubt he can do that in such a way as to cover up his admission so that the average reader will not detect it.

Now, gentle reader, let us tell you what Mr. Waddell is like. He is like unto a prosecuting attorney who would bring a man into court and charge him with having committed a certain crime, and then upon the man's pleading guilty, he would proceed with a great flourish of trumpets to introduce witnesses to prove the man innocent. If you do not see the point, re-read the above extract. Now, you can make the application yourself. In his article in our June 2nd No., Mr. W. charged the Disciples as a people with holding unscriptural views relative to faith and repentance, and in support of his charge as to faith, quoted Alexander Campbell. Now, when we stand by Mr. Campbell's statement, what does our critic do? Why, he brings in Robert Richardson and Isaac Errett, two of the most prominent and most representative men among the Disciples to prove us wrong. We wonder he did not quote from Mr. Campbell himself. For it would not be difficult to find in his writings expressions quite similar, and even equivalent to those of Richardson and Errett, and Mr. Campbell was too clear-headed a man to be so palpably inconsistent with

himself, as Mr. W. seems to think him, with Mr. Richardson and Mr. Errett. But however that may be Mr. W. has convicted himself, over his own signature, according to his own view of the case of bearing false witness against the Disciples. And mark that he does not make the slightest attempt to answer the question proposed by us to him. "What further truth (than that 'Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah') according to Scripture a person is required to believe in order to salvation." Let Mr. W. give his mind less to the nature of faith, and more to the object of faith, and he will presently receive light which he does not now enjoy, and understand a distinction which does not yet seem to have dawned upon his mind, and he will not quote Richardson and Errett against the statement of Mr. Campbell referred to above.

Now as to repentance: Mr. Waddell in his former article charged that the Disciples hold repentance to be equivalent to reformation. We asserted that he was mistaken on that point. In the present article he repeats the charge, and offers columns of proof. We distinctly and emphatically deny the charge, and in support of our denial we refer to the quotations Mr. Waddell himself makes from Robert Richardson and Isaac Errett. It is a curious thing that Mr. Waddell in appealing to these representative Disciples to prove that repentance is not equivalent to reformation did not see that he was refuting his own charge against the Disciples. We cannot understand his lack of discernment, unless on the ground that he was so eager to put the editor of the EVANGELIST into a corner that he forgot everything else for the moment. When he reads his article in print he may leisurely contemplate the joke he has perpetrated upon himself. We may just say here that there is not much satisfaction in following a man who takes both sides of a question within the space of a few lines. For our own part, as, of course, the reader will have observed, we have not undertaken an exposition of faith and repentance; we leave that for future articles. And we have sufficient confidence in the intelligence of our readers to believe that they can, without our assistance see that Rev. W.'s paragraph on repentance contains no definition of repentance. He says it includes and implies the knowledge of sin and being sorry, and speaks of "the most important aspect" of repentance, and "the voluntary element," but he sheds no light on what repentance is. Indeed, a reasonable interpretation of his language would be that the most important aspect of repentance is repentance. Without pursuing this further at present, let us repeat that it is an entire mistake to assert that the Disciples consider repentance equivalent to reformation. The Baptist view, as expounded by our friend, is as absurd and complicated as it is unscriptural and confusing.

With regard to the statement that the "Time was when the Disciples despised an educated p-a-y-e-d ministry, etc.," we have only to remark that we never heard of a "p-a-y-e-d ministry" before, and so cannot say whether the Disciples ever despised such a ministry or not, but we can say "at the time never was when the Disciples, as a people, despised an educated ministry—a truly educated ministry, educated not merely in general knowledge but in particular in the Word of God. And, though it may astound Mr. W., we venture to offer the opinion that the prejudice against educated ministers never was so general among the Disciples as it was once among the Baptists.

We hope it will not be considered unkind to suggest to Mr. W. that it does not become one who writes about a "p-a-y-e-d ministry" to make unpleasant allusions to those who despise an educated ministry. If some Baptist churches were careful to find ministers well educated in the Scriptures rather than imperfectly educated in fossilized theological works, some Baptist ministers might find their occupation gone until they had made themselves acquainted with at least the first principles of the doctrine of Christ. Moreover, within 100 miles of Hillsburg, we can find some of those whom Mr. W. sneers at as "unlearned and ignorant," who can not only give him instruction in the Scriptures, but in orthography as well.

Regarding your five questions, I would say that I frequently use all the passages you quoted, and do not see anything in them that teaches that baptism is a saving ordinance in any sense. This letter is too long now to admit of taking up these passages in order and explaining them, but if you so desire I will in a future article explain each of them as I understand them. It does not follow that because baptism is mentioned with either repentance or faith, before pardon or forgiveness of sin is named, that therefore it comes before it in Christian experience. For example, suppose I said in answer to the question "What must I do to be saved?" "Repent and be baptized, and join the Church, take communion, and pay your debts, take part in prayer, visit the sick, give as God prospers you, for the remission of your sins, etc." Would it, therefore, follow that all these were conditions in order to remission of sins? Surely not. Yet baptism is a duty among these others, and it may so happen that a person performs many of these acts of duty before he is baptized. Not so with repentance or faith; these cannot be separated from the spiritual experience which we call "new birth." John v. 1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." Our forgiveness does not depend upon acts performed by human hands. Acts xiii 38, "Through this man (Christ) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins;" Acts x. 43, "Through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Baptism and all other acts of Christian duty come after this not in order to remission; but as evidence that our faith is not the dead but the fruitful faith of which James speaks, 2nd chapter.

We shall not weary the reader by following our friend through this paragraph. It is a very good specimen of the way in which Baptists explain away the plain statements of our Lord and His apostles. But we cannot refrain from directing attention to a remark in the which we most cordially agree. We most heartily say, Amen to Rev. W.'s "Surely not!" If He said in answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" "Repent and be baptized, and join the church, etc., etc., for the remission of your sins," it certainly would not therefore follow that all these were conditions in order to the remission of sins. But (and here is where, we regret to say, Mr. W. does not agree with us), it might make a difference if the Lord Jesus gave such an answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" or, if an inspired Apostle used such words; and it was an inspired Apostle who said in response to anxious inquirers, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit;" and it was the Lord Jesus who said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The pity is that the Baptists do not agree with the Saviour, but persist in teaching that "He that believeth and is saved may be baptized."

The concluding portion of Mr W.'s article does not deal with the matters treated of in the former part; it may

therefore be omitted for the present. And, indeed, unless he insists, we do not care to publish it at all, inasmuch as it contains some very unkind and ungenerous allusions to two highly respected brethren. If Mr. W. desires to further set forth his views in the EVANGELIST, he will be expected to restrain his propensity to make offensive personal remarks. And it would also be desirable, that when he undertakes to speak for the Baptists he should be sure that he faithfully represents them, for it is the position of the Baptist people we desire to have placed before our brethren, and not the position of an individual Baptist, even though that individual should be the Baptist minister in Hillsburg.

PRESIDENT FOWLER.—We are very much pleased to learn that Bro. Fowler is to devote all his time to college work next session in Fairfield College, Nebraska; and that he has been elected President of the College. We extend to him our hearty congratulations. Bro. F. expects to spend his vacation in Ontario.

We have received a letter from Bro. M. Putman, of Smithville, stating that he wishes to spend the summer in Canada evangelizing. We understand that he has been attending Hiram College, Ohio. He has been preaching for the church at Fowler's Mills, Ohio, for sixteen months. Upon his leaving there the church passed highly complimentary resolutions and cordially commended him to the brotherhood as a strong, forcible and pleasant proclaimer of the Gospel of Christ. Churches desiring his services can address him at Smithville, Ont. He is ready to go to work at once.

Did you read the selection in last number entitled "How to have good singing in the Church?" If not, it will pay you to do so. The subject of congregational singing, has rarely received the right kind of attention. We should like to see a systematic effort put forth to carry into practice the suggestions of the Guide. Have we in Ontario a brother competent to undertake such a work and willing to do it? If so, it is our humble opinion that "the Lord hath need of him" in that capacity.

It is necessary to point out occasionally that we cannot publish any communication unless we know the name of the writer. Recently we received a note signed "A Scribbler" and "An Old Friend," with the request not to throw it into the waste basket. We would like to oblige our "old friend," but really cannot unless he will furnish us with his name.

The article on page three, clipped from the Canadian Baptist, on "Presbyterian Creed Revision," will give the reader a correct idea of the present state of the Revision question among the Presbyterians in the United States.

Annual Meeting Notes.

(CONTINUED FROM LAST NUMBER.)

Bro. Alex. McMillan was appointed reporter for the Toronto daily papers. We are glad to see his reports copied into local papers, such as the Guelph Mercury and Erin Advocate.

Saturday afternoon, according to the published programme, was devoted to Sunday School work. All the essayists were present with the exception of Miss Agnew, and Bro. Law. Mrs. Malcolm read Miss Agnew's paper. All the papers were interesting, and contained helpful suggestions to Sunday School workers. An au-