

THE Canadian Evangelist

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY IN 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, 55 Yonge St. Arcade, Toronto.

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 arrearsages.

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

TORONTO, DECEMBER 1st, 1890.

Disciple or Christian?

Our worthy contemporary, THE CANADIAN EVANGELIST, informs us in a recent number that an article in its columns completely overwhelms us. All right, friend EVANGELIST, thanks for the information; we should not have known it. But really we have no time or space to discuss this further. The world needs Christ much more than hair-splitting as to whether His followers should be called disciples or Christians. Let us strive to lead the world to the truth, that's the best way to settle it, isn't it? We believe THE EVANGELIST began the criticism on the Voice, so we close it. Like the old lady who disputed with her husband as to whether it was a rat or mouse they had seen, her husband insisting on having the last word, so we say "let it go mouse, but we know it was a rat."—Christian Voice.

THE CANADIAN EVANGELIST has not been discussing with the Voice whether the followers of Jesus should be called disciples or Christians. What we took exception to was this statement endorsed by the Voice: "I am a disciple of Jesus, but I am more, I am a Christian." We have not seen a line from the Voice itself attempting to refute our criticism; and we suggest, that before the Voice drops the matter it should undertake to sustain the position so emphatically taken in its July number. Then it did not seem to be a matter of "hair-splitting," but one of "standing firm" in the face of erroneous teaching. The "overwhelming" article is that of Bro. W. O. Moore's, which was published in our November 1st number, and which the editor of the Voice had probably not read when he wrote the above paragraph. Let him read it now, and then tell us how he feels. The "mouse and rat" story is hardly in place in this connection. If we were to seek for an appropriate proverb to apply to the Voice it might be something like this: "He that fights and runs away may live to fight some other day." And we would suggest that before an editor lightly dismisses an issue of his own raising, he should look up a file of his own paper and inform himself of the true state of the case.

The "Canadian Baptist" on Union.

On page one of this issue will be found two articles from the Canadian Baptist, which the reader asked attentively to peruse before considering what follows here.

In the article, "The Disciples and Christian Union," two or three points call for a word or two. The Baptist says: "We are sorry to see, however, that the Committee issuing this document reiterate the illogical, not to say absurd, claim that the Disciples are opposed to 'sectism' or 'denominationalism,' and have a mission to protest against it, while, as must be obvious to every disinterested observer, they themselves are the most active

and aggressive of sectaries." In regard to this, we would remark, in the first place, that the Canadian Baptist being an interested, and apparently a prejudiced, observer, is not in a position to say how the Disciples appear to a "disinterested observer." The Disciples are opposed to "sectism," even as the New Testament is opposed to "sectism," and in claiming not to be a sect themselves, they mean to say that they require as tests of fellowship and conditions of church membership nothing more and nothing less than was required by the Apostles of our Lord. And they maintain that every society claiming to be a church of Christ which dispenses with any divinely appointed test of fellowship, or demands more than the New Testament demands as a condition of membership, is not a church of Christ, but a sect. The Baptist's idea of a sect, that the doctrines and practices of a people are peculiar and lead to separation, is based, perhaps, upon the etymology of the word; but it does not make the Disciples a sect, unless it can be shown that they teach and practise contrary to the New Testament, and thus cut themselves off from the church of Christ. It is not whether the doctrines and practices of a people are peculiar and lead to separation from others professing to be Christians that determines whether that people is a sect or not, but whether or not their doctrines and practices are in accord with the Word of God. And according to this standard the Disciples are willing to be judged. We can pardon the Baptist for saying that the history of the Disciples shows that an outcry against "sectarianism" may itself be made the shibboleth of a sect, but we hope that it will not be considered discourteous to say that the Baptist proves itself to be not well acquainted with the Disciples as a people when it entertains such a poor opinion of them. We do not assert, even as we do not believe, that there have been none among us with whom the grand plea for union was nothing but a cry. But we most emphatically affirm that the pioneers among us, the leaders, the representative men, and the great mass of the rank and file, have been under the influence of a profound conviction of the sinfulness of sects, and have labored earnestly and faithfully to induce all believers in the Lord Jesus Christ to lay aside everything that savors of sect, and unite upon the basis laid down by the Lord and His Apostles.

Our contemporary says many of the most intelligent Baptists are not satisfied with the name "Baptist," but thinks it is probably too late to make a change. But "it is never too late to mend." Why should they continue to wear a name which means either that they are followers of John the Baptist, rather than of Christ, or that they are the only baptized believers in the world?

We pass now to consider the article headed "The Disciples on Baptists." We cannot refrain from expressing our astonishment at finding in a Baptist paper such words as these: "It will probably be new to our readers to learn that it is an article of Baptist belief that 'faith is the result of regeneration' rather than the means by which the change is wrought." Now to people who have adopted the "Baptist Church Manual," either formally or virtually as the Baptist churches in Canada have done! Surely not! Is the editor of the Canadian Baptist himself a Baptist and familiar with the history of Baptist doctrine? In article seven of the "Baptist Church Manual" we find these words: "And that its (regeneration's) proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repent-

ance, and faith and newness of life." Repentance and faith are declared to be fruits of regeneration, and that being the case it would seem to be a very fair representation of Baptists to say that "faith is the result of regeneration." Evidently the Committee of Disciples are better instructed in Baptist doctrine than the editor of the Baptist himself. And does the Baptist deny that with Baptists "the knowledge of forgiveness is attested experimentally in the feelings of the individual"? We shall be happy to be assured that we have hitherto misunderstood Baptist doctrine in this respect. Our astonishment knows no bounds when we find the Baptist saying that it will probably be new to Baptists to learn that it is a part of Baptist belief that "baptism is because of the remission of sins." Where is the Baptist preacher who has not over and over again labored to prove that, in Acts ii. 38, the Greek proposition should not be rendered "for" as in Authorized Version, nor "unto" as in Revised Version, nor "in order to," but "because," or "on account of," or something like these? Surely the editor of the Baptist is joking! If not, he is certainly unacquainted with the teaching of his own brethren on this point also. Will the editor of the Baptist, upon reflection, affirm that it is a misrepresentation to say that Baptists teach that "baptism is because of the remission of sins"?

We quote again from the Baptist. Further on in the same discussion the Committee say, that "when Baptists make faith in Christ and repentance a sufficient fitness for baptism, one of the barriers to union will be removed." To those who understand how closely Baptists cling to the New Testament doctrine and practice in this respect, as evidenced by their simple baptismal formula, "Or the profession of thy faith," etc., this statement needs no comment, save a note of surprise! On this we would say that the baptismal formula does not settle the question. On page 26 of the "Baptist Church Manual," under the heading "Rules of Church Order," we find, Art. 1, Sec. 1, this rule: "Any person professing faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, giving evidence of a change of heart, and adopting the views of faith and practice held by this church, as set forth in the foregoing Declaration, may, upon baptism, be received into its membership." This shows that in addition to repentance and faith, subscription to the New Hampshire Confession of Faith is required of candidates for baptism by Baptist churches. So we find it is the Canadian Baptist, and not the Committee of Disciples, that misunderstands the Baptists on this question.

The Baptist speaks of "the Committee's misunderstanding or misrepresentation, of the Baptist position" on the creed question. We are sorry our contemporary uses the odious word "misrepresentation." What ground is there for such a suggestion? We are sure the Committee had no thought of misrepresenting the Baptists, and we are confident that they do not misunderstand them on this point. Is it not a fact, as intimated above, that the Baptist churches in Canada, have either formally or virtually adopted the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, as a test of fellowship? We think it is and are prepared to give good reasons for our opinion. And we further believe it to be true that to-day Baptist ministers in doctrine and practice conform more closely to the New Hampshire Confession, than Presbyterian ministers do to the Westminster Confession. As to the matter of "going back of

all creeds to Jesus and the Apostles," we would say that the trouble with the Baptists was that they went back beyond Jesus and the Apostles to John the Baptist, and, in making the journey, they were not careful to lay aside all that had been added to the faith and practice of the church subsequent to the days of Jesus and the Apostles.

After writing the foregoing, the Canadian Baptist for Nov. 20th came to hand, in which we find a communication signed "C. G.," who, we take the liberty of guessing, is a professor in McMaster University. We give the letter entire that our readers may see how it corroborates what we have written in this article as to the Baptist view of the relation of faith and regeneration.

I fear an expression in your criticism of the Disciple view of Baptist doctrine may be understood. You say: "It will probably be new to our readers to learn that it is an article of Baptist belief that 'faith is the result of regeneration' rather than the means by which the change is wrought." If this is made to mean that regeneration is not held by Baptists generally to precede faith and to constitute its ground, the statement will convey a false impression. The New Hampshire and the Philadelphia Confessions of Faith are generally accepted by the Baptists of this continent as correct statements of Scripture teaching. The former declares "that its (regeneration's) proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance and faith." The latter is no less explicit. Andrew Fuller, Dr. Harvey, Dr. Dodge, and other representative Baptist teachers take the same view. Dr. Strong, indeed, says that "faith is not chronologically subsequent to regeneration," after stating that "faith is an act of the affections and will." If he means to declare by this that regeneration is not logically prior to faith, he will require to explain how faith, as "an act of the affections and will," can come from a nature which is enmity against God. For ourselves we are not prepared to hold that saving faith can have its ground in the unregenerate heart, for this would be to suppose that one of the grandest graces could come from a nature which cannot please God, Rom. vi. 8, and which can only produce that which is in moral likeness to itself. M. iii. 6. (John iii. 6, perhaps. Ed. EVANGELIST.) C. G.

It will be noted that "C. G." quotes from the "Baptist Church Manual" precisely the same words that we have quoted in the former part of this article, and makes precisely the same use of them, viz., to prove the editor of the Baptist in the wrong. We shall now expect the editor to withdraw the charge that the committee of the Disciples misrepresented the Baptists in this regard. We have not space now to give the editor's reply to "C. G."; it is in a similar line to the articles from his pen which we publish in this number, and, we may say, with them goes to prove that the editor of the Canadian Baptist, so far as the matters here discussed are concerned, is more of a Disciple than a Baptist. But how he can so misunderstand Baptist doctrine is a marvel!

The Nov. 20 number of the Baptist contains an editorial answer to a querist which confirms what we have said as to Baptists requiring more than the New Testament does of candidates for baptism. Read the paragraph:—

A reader of the paper desires an answer to the question: How are believers added to the visible church? They are added by the vote of the members of the church on condition of submitting to the ordinance of baptism according to the precept and the example of Christ, the Head of the church. The vote of the church is the decisive act by which membership in a church is secured. The church, if it be loyal to Christ, will always require the candidate to submit to baptism in obedience to Christ and as a public confession of death to sin, renunciation of the world, and resurrec-

tion to newness of life, as a condition of enjoying the privileges of church-membership.

Mark these words: "The vote of the church is the decisive act by which membership in a church is secured." That may be true of a Baptist church but it is not true of a church of Christ, hence a Baptist church is not a church of Christ. "The Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved."

We think this is a good place and time to repeat the unavailing request we have been making for three or four years; that the Canadian Baptist, or some representative Baptist, would tell us what it is that differentiates a Baptist from every other person professing to be a Christian. It is a proper request; it is respectfully made, why should it not be granted?

We thank the Apostolic Guide for kind words in a late issue.

We have pleasure in acknowledging the courtesy of the Canadian Pacific Railway officials in keeping us supplied with the latest issues of their time tables.

Grip styles itself "An Independent Journal of Humor and Caricature." It is that and more. It is a distinct and powerful moral agency. Canada is to be congratulated on having such a paper. Grip is sound on the liquor question.

The Prison Commission has naturally heard a good deal of evidence on the subject of drunkenness—prison and drink being twin words. Dr. Daniel Clarke testified that in his opinion drunkenness is a disease and mania, which it is both absurd and inhuman to endeavour to combat by the "thirty days in gaol" system. He urges the establishment of inebriate asylums as more in accordance with science. We do not notice that either this able authority or any other witness suggested the advisability of abolishing the manufacture of drunkards as a Government industry. It strikes us that this is what common sense would dictate. Talk about absurdity and inhumanity! What can better illustrate both than the legalization of a traffic of which this disease and mania are the direct and legitimate results?—Grip.

Fruit growers and gardeners will find in the Canadian Horticulturist a beautiful monthly magazine, devoted to their interests. Being published by the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association, under Government patronage, it is conducted wholly in the interests of the farmer and fruit grower. Its object is to give information suitable to each month on the growing of small fruit, the management of the orchard, the vineyard, the flower garden and lawn. Special attention is given to the crop prospects and the reports of market prices in our best markets for fruit and vegetables. It is proposed, in fruit season, to send out a weekly market bulletin free to subscribers. It also aims at exposing any frauds in the line of fruit trees and plants. The magazine is fully illustrated with colored plates and engravings, and, when a year's numbers are bound in one, makes a beautiful book for the parlor table. This journal for one year, together with the report of the Ontario F. G. Association and a choice of plants for testing, all for one dollar. A special discount is made to anyone getting up a club. L. Wolverten, Grimsby, Ont., is editor of the journal and secretary of the Association.