

CHRISTIAN WORKER

THIRD MONTHLY

Conducted by

W. & WHITEHEAD

PUBLISHERS & PROPRIETORS

Leasford - Ontario

Subscriptions 50 cents per annum in advance, 60 cents if not in advance.

Regular Contributors.

- A. SCOTT, W. PALMER, J. A. HARDING, etc.

THE WORKER.

We have been asked by several brethren if the WORKER could be issued semi-monthly in the near future...

Editors Christian Worker,

Will you please answer the following questions:

1. Do the scriptures require one or more than one church to appoint a brother to the office of evangelist.

2. Should the church of which the brother is a member, concur in the appointment.

3. Do the scriptures give the mode, manner, or plan of appointment.

4. Can an unorganized church make or co-operate in making such appointment.

Your reply through the WORKER will oblige.

THE BIBLE CLASS

Owen Sound, April 2, '85

We publish cheerfully the questions given above and hope that our readers will be benefited by their consideration.

1. We do not know of any scripture that requires either one or more than one church to appoint a brother to the office of an evangelist.

2. The church of which a brother is a member should not concur in an appointment, until it is first found that the scriptures direct an appointment to be made.

3. We have not found the scripture that gives any mode, manner, or plan of appointment.

4. We do not know what the brethren call an unorganized church.

But as the above answers do not appear to give much information we will offer a few remarks on the subject.

Some have an idea that an appointment or ordination can make a brother an evangelist, and that until some such ceremony is performed, he cannot be an evangelist.

Why these theories prevail we do not know, for we have found nothing in the scriptures leading to such conclusions.

Who then may be called an evangelist? We answer, one who preaches the gospel, to evangelize means to proclaim good news, and as the Gospel is the Good News, evangelizing is preaching the Gospel, therefore he who preaches the Gospel is an evangelist.

In Acts 21-18, Philip is called The Evangelist, and in Acts 8-4 it is said, "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." It is said that in the Greek text the word used is evangelizing, they went everywhere evangelizing. Then Philip (one of those so scattered) went down to Samaria and preached. Christ unto them, and when they believed, Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women, Simon also believed and was baptized, Acts 8:5 to 13.

Philip also preached to the Ethiopian officer, who believed and was baptized, he then preached in all the cities from Azotus to Caesarea.

Philip evangelized as above stated, and was therefore an evangelist. But it may be asked, was not Philip ordained to the office of an Evangelist? We answer no. In Acts 6 it is stated that Philip, Stephen, and five others, were chosen by the church at Jerusalem, to serve tables; or see that the widows were cared for; these seven were men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom. The Apostles then, prayed and laid their hands on them and they received power to perform miracles. See Acts 6:3 & 5:6. These men were not chosen to be evangelists, but to care for the poor in the church, hence they are sometimes spoken of as "the seven deacons." The Apostles did not appoint them to be evangelists, but to be "over this business," caring for the poor. How then did Philip become an evangelist? We answer by evangelizing.

So to day, he who loves the Gospel, and loves to proclaim to the world the unsearchable riches of Christ, loves to point sinners to the Saviour of the world, and to the way of life as revealed in God's Book, we say such a one is not required to wait for an ordination from either a Pope, a Synod or a Conference nor from the congregation of which he is a member.

But while this is the case, we find that in scripture times the brethren reported well of those who preached the Gospel, spoke kindly of them, and wrote letters of introduction, exhorting the Disciples to receive such brethren. So it should be today, and so long as time shall last.

Zacharias' son was named "John," Luke 1:63. But when he began to baptize he was called "John the Baptist." So with Philip, after he evangelized, he was Philip the evangelist.

We will be pleased to hear from the Bible Class again on this question. Let the Good Book be studied and all passages bearing on this point brought out.

THE DEBATE.

We now give a synopsis of Bro. Harding's arguments, in opposition to the theory and practice of Infant Baptism. He urged that all should desire only truth, that we should stand by the truth, regardless of who opposes it, because the man who has God's Truth on his side is in the majority and must ultimately prevail.

He then stated that the Bible gives no authority for infant baptism, either by command, precept, inference, or example, and read from Geo. E. Stokes, Meyer, and other eminent Bible Critics who testify

that no trace of Infant Baptism is found in the Bible. That Tertullian, who wrote A. D. 200, was the first writer on record to mention Infant Baptism and he wrote to oppose it. But as the Bible is the only authority to Christians, any rite not taught in the Bible should not be practised as a religious ceremony.

Reference was here made to the fact that in August, last, a minister who was now present had taught publicly that Infant Baptism was mentioned by Irenaeus who wrote about A. D. 180. But when called upon to produce such a statement from Irenaeus, he refused to do so, although Bro Harding had offered him a handsome present if he would do so, and now as neither he nor Mr. Wilkinson could show any such statement from Irenaeus. It is evident that the statement referred to was not correct.

Another objection to the practice was its inconsistency, and read from the Methodist Discipline, where the minister is required to pray that the child "being delivered from thy wrath may be received into the ark of God's Church and become a lively member of the same," thus teaching that the child was subject to God's wrath, a most unscriptural doctrine and not "very full of comfort." Bro Harding also proceeded to show that infant baptism was first practised to save the child, to do away with what is called original sin, and that, in case of sickness the priest or clergyman was sent for in great haste, lest the child should die unbaptized. In which case it could not receive the benefit of the funeral service, nor be buried in the church yard, and even to this day some hold to the same theory and practice. Other conclusions equally absurd were referred to, but the worst of all was that a man should sprinkle water on an infant in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, when neither the Saviour nor his apostles commanded or practiced it. It was without faith, without repentance, without any knowledge on the part of the infant, who had never sinned, who was innocent and pure as an angel, (as Mr. W. admitted) it had nothing in it but man's device, and a little water.

He then referred to the cases of baptism mentioned in the New Testament showing from each case, 1st of single individuals, 2nd of families, 3rd of many in a community, that not one infant was included, that they believed, that they rejoiced, that they gladly received the apostles word. This was an easy task, and was so plain that Mr. Wilkinson made no attempt even to infer an example from any of all the cases of baptism mentioned in the Bible. But as Mr. Wilkinson based almost his whole argument on the plea that baptism, came in the room of and takes the place of circumcision. It was on that point that most of the work was done.

Bro Harding contended that there was no mention made in Scripture of such a change, that the covenant of circumcision was given as an everlasting covenant, Gen. 17:13. My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant, not only so but the uncircumcised male child shall be cut off from his people.

Circumcision being an everlasting covenant it could not be set aside by baptism, and to confirm the above it was shown, that Jesus was circumcised and was afterwards baptized, and the same was true of all the Jews who became Christians. Not only were those baptized who had been circumcised, but the Jews continued to circumcise their children even after they had become Christians. See Acts 21:20-21. James and the elders said thousands of the Jews believe and are zealous of the law, and they were informed that Paul taught the Jews not to circumcise their children, which was not true of Paul. But in Acts 15 it is plainly taught that the Gentile Christians should not circumcise.

In Acts 16 we find a young man, Timothy, a disciple who had been baptized and was afterwards circumcised by Paul, his mother being a Jewess. From the above it was clearly shown that circumcision never was set aside but was practised by the apostles and Jewish Christians all through the apostolic period and by Jews to the present day. It was shown that circumcision and baptism are not at all alike; that baptism could not take its place, because males only were circumcised. Males and females were baptized. He that was bought with the Jews money was circumcised. Not so with baptism, Jewish children were circumcised at eight days old. If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest be baptized.

Mr. Wilkinson argued that as circumcision was a sign and seal of the old covenant, that baptism must be the seal of the new covenant, but quoted no scripture as proof; Bro Harding showed that baptism is no where called a seal but that the Holy Spirit is the seal of the new covenant; in Ephesians 1:13 it is said, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, and again in Eph. 4:30. Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed, etc., thus showing that baptism does not take the place of circumcision as a seal.

Those who favor infant baptism cannot even agree as to what parts of scripture prove the doctrine, nor how it should be practised. Jacob Dittler the most famous Methodist debater in America, says that he finds no argument for infant baptism in the Abrahamic Covenant and circumcision, but tries to show it from cases of household baptisms.

Mr. Wilkinson finds no case in the households and clings to the other. One church will sprinkle water on an infant, for baptism whether either of the parents or members of the church or not. Another church insists that at least one of the parents must be a member of the church. A third must not only have the parents believe for the child, but also call for a God father and a God mother to promise for it.

Space will not permit us to name the numerous and confused theories held by the different parties on this question. It is sufficient for us to know that the Bible does not teach it, we should do the Saviour's commandments and where the Bible is silent let us also be silent.

We have received a copy of "The Christian Oracle" Edited by Bro. D. R. Lucas, Des Moines, Iowa. It is ably conducted and we wish our Bre. much success.

To the Editors of the Worker.

Dear Brethren, Since writing my former note to you concerning the Macford debate I have learned the following facts:

1. The manuscript of the report was given to Mr. Wilkinson to prepare for the press, and he is now publishing a report of the debate through his paper, "The Iconoclast."

2. He altered his speech only to correct what was evidently the stenographer's misconception, or to supply some connection that had been omitted to complete the sense." So Mr. Wilkinson says.

I think it is perfectly right and fair that Mr. Wilkinson should have made such corrections.

Mr. Wilkinson says that he did not change my speeches, "except to improve the sense"; and that he did not abbreviate one single line.

It is clear, then, that the difference in the length of his speeches and mine was brought about by his supplying the omissions above mentioned.

I think all will agree that it is nothing but fair and right that I should correct the misconceptions, and fill the omissions necessary to

bring out the sense, in my speeches as he has done in his. This I expect to do. Doubtless my speeches will then approximate in length to Mr. Wilkinson's; though I expect to succeed in filling out the connections more briefly than he has done.

Mr. Anderson, I am pleased to say, seems anxious to get out a correct report of the debate; and the Methodist publishing house at Toronto is very courteous in its dealings with me, and is doing its work well in printing the debate.

If the report proves to be a fair one, I will notify the brethren through the papers, and encourage the sale of the book, and I hope, in such an event, that all the disciples of Canada especially, will assist in the circulation of the book.

I have no pecuniary interest in the matter in any way. What I say and do about it is from love of the truth.

Truly Yours, J. A. Harding

NEWS ITEMS.

The Octograph, ably edited by Bro. D. Soumer is moved from Martel to Richwood, Ohio. This is a worthy paper.

Bro. W. Palmer, of Raysville, writes that Bro. Crewson is now holding a meeting eight miles from there.

The church at Beamsville, is building a substantial brick meeting house this year.

Read Bro Royces report of Bro Scott's meeting at Acton. Sixteen added to the church.

The Christian Standard of April 11th reports nearly one thousand additions to the Church. Very good for one week's report. At that rate one paper would report 50,000 added to the church in one year.

Bro. Palmer is greatly rejoiced with the successful meeting held by Bro Crewson. Sixteen believed and have been baptized. Six uniting with them from the Christian Connection and Baptists make with Bro and Sister Palmer a church of 24 members. They have a good Sunday School, and we hope to hear of much more good in that part through Bro. Crewson's work. They meet regularly for worship every Lord's day.

We have received a copy of "The Christian Oracle" Edited by Bro. D. R. Lucas, Des Moines, Iowa. It is ably conducted and we wish our Bre. much success.

In the article on the spirit by S. in March, the first reference should have been Math. 3. 12 instead of Math. 12.

Unfortunately a communication from Bro. C Sinclair was mislaid, and cannot be found. We learn however that he visited Otham a few weeks ago, and that a number of brethren came together to worship. This was their first meeting to break bread there. Bro. S. expects to visit them again and hopes to see a church permanently established there.

Bro E. Sheppard of Lowmanville, reports one added to the church there recently.

In the report of the death and funeral of Sister Shavelear, the fact was omitted that Bro Fry, M. D., now of Toronto, was present and took part in the services.

Bro. B. H. Cozine retires from the management of the Apostolic Times, and it is now conducted by Williamson & Newlon.

Our readers will rejoice to know that Wellington County

carried the Scott Act by a good majority. Elder Kilgour was out in some inclement weather, working for it. Bro. Fowler has laboured hard for this too.

During Bro J. A. Harding's meeting at Huntville, Ala., twenty were added to the Church there up to March 27th.

Bros. Fowler and Kilgour are holding a meeting in Guelph. We have not heard the result yet.

Bro. Sherman spent one week in a meeting at Welland. No immediate result reported.

Bro C. Sinclair spent one week with the church at Lobo. One believer was baptized. He speaks of the church there as being active.

A number of communications are laid over for want of space. We suggest that the brethren endeavor to condense their articles. Write short and to the point.

Let us return thanks to God for such "Scott Act" victories as have just been achieved in Elgin and Lambton. We go to polls in Wellington April 2, confident of success. T.L.F.

Dear Brethren, I hope you may have every success with the enterprise and that the WORKER may become a paper worthy of its name. We should have a periodical in Canada which the great body of our people could endorse. We can and ought to have such and yet it need not be a supplanter of any of the excellent papers coming to us from the other side of the lines. T.L.F.

Our meetings at the West End are still full of interest, we expect soon to have our hall filled to overflowing. One earnest man—the husband of a true and faithful sister—accepted the Gospel call, and made the good confession last Lord's day evening, has been buried with the Lord in baptism and arisen to walk in the new life. We trust that Bro. and Sister Meadows will be kept faithful until they reach the crown. The Prayer meetings held from house to house, are well attended and full of interest. O. J. B. Toronto, April 1, 85.

We copy below a few lines of Bro Walk's farewell to the brethren in Indianapolis, and wish him great success in the new field of labour. "By the time these lines come under the eye of the reader, I will have taken up the burden of life in a field where none have been found willing or able to bear it. I go hence to New Orleans, to the work of Christ, in which I expect to devote whatever remains to me of life. This choice is deliberate. It has long engaged my thoughts and prayers, and being fully persuaded that God is in it, and that he will go before me, I hesitate not to commit myself and all with which He has endowed me to the work of establishing upon a firm basis the cause of the Master in the great metropolis of the South. There is there to begin with a little struggling band of faithful Disciples who, through all the trials and discouragements incident to their helplessness and want of spiritual oversight, have never permitted the fire to die upon the altar. This single circumstance turned the scale in their favor, and I go to them full of joy and hope, and in entire confidence of final and complete success. That I shall be followed with the prayers, and dwell in the affections of those with whom I have more recently been identified, mitigates the sorrow of the final farewell. DAVID WALK.